


THE BRICK WALL



Joyce LaPrise



Voices of Justice for His 'Bruised Reeds'.



Mr. Gordon Dauncey




Mr. Darryl Brown



Justice Guy Chicoine



Hon. Don Morgan



SK Chief Justice Robert Laing



Ms. Lian Schwann, Q.C.



Hon. SK Chief Justice Mr. John KLEBUC



The Explanations below are related to Legal Matters which Arlene Lowery Experienced.

MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE

Don't be surprised if you see a poor person being oppressed by the powerful and if justice is being miscarried throughout the land. For every official is under orders from higher up, and matters of justice get lost in red tape and bureaucracy. Ecclesiastes 5:8 New Living Translation (©2007)

BRICK WALL OF INJUSTICE

BRICK #1. - JOYCE LAPRISE, PUBLIC SERVANT FOR THE SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT ON ASSIGNMENT

This is the brick that led to lawsuit QBG. 1005 of 2002 and finally QBG 1306 of 2005. This 'brick of injustice' was hurled by **Joyce LaPrise** who was the **Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government's** 'scapegoat', hench(wo)man, 'hit(wo)man' or whatever name you attribute to someone who is assigned and paid to bring irreparable harm to another.

See Exhibit 1. attached. *This is the cover-page of fax sent to Joyce LaPrise from the Saskatchewan Regional Director for the Minister of Social Services (Saskatchewan Government) Mr. David Hedlund.* He faxed a copy of my amended claim to **Joyce LaPrise** which at that time was under a publication ban. **Ms. LaPrise** took a one year sabbatical of one year to complete the Saskatchewan Government's mission 'to get rid of Arlene Lowery and the organization she began The Anchorage and then returned to this same employer.

See Exhibit 2: *Joyce LaPrise's questionable actions are described in a letter addressed to the Board of Directors of The Anchorage that I found on the file from the Saskatchewan Labour Board through Access to Information.*

BRICK # 2. MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE SASKATCHEWAN COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA)

&

MR. DARRYL BROWN, COUNCIL FOR THE SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

IRREGULARITIES & ILLEGALITIES

- 1. TELECONFERENCE** - After the Chamber's meeting of December 01st, 2005, the Order I had written and filed with the Court of Queen's Bench was challenged by council, actually Mr. Darryl Brown, for the Attorney General for the Saskatchewan Government. Refer to the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) Affidavit of Arlene Lowery in support of an opportunity to Take Leave to Appeal the decision made by the Saskatchewan Courts. **Exhibit 3. Mr. Brown's letter to Mr. Dauncey.**
- 2. INACCURACIES IN 'EVENTS REPORT'** - ***See Exhibit 4.** Note: CHAMBER'S MEETING OF DECEMBER 01, 2005 was removed from the **Event's Report** as if it never even occurred but replaced the outcome with a revised fiat from which a REVISED order was written to satisfy council.
- 3. REWRITING THE ORDER** - Refer to the SCC Affidavit. The word proposed was to be added in brackets (proposed) after those parties that Justice Kovach said could be added to the names of the defendants. These were directions given by Justice Kovach during the teleconference. Registrar, Mr. G. Dauncey acknowledged that Government of Canada should be referred as proposed and verified this in writing to council for the Attorney General, Government of Canada as noted in letter attached. ***See Exhibit 5.**

BRICK # 3. MR. GORDON DAUNCEY

1. SENDING BACK FILED DOCUMENTS: **See these documents at Exhibit 7.*

- Documents that I had filed with the registrar Mr. Dauncey to go to Justice Chicoine re: allowing in new evidence (in the absence of a Coroner's Inquest) in particular around the death of my granddaughter Autumn Starr, *to support my pleading of a 'wrongful death' were returned to me once the registrar Mr. Dauncey got back from his holidays.*
- He overruled the Deputy Registrar's decision to allow me to leave this for Justice Chicoine to consider.
- Up 'til now the registrar Mr. Dauncey *had arranged a teleconference with Justice Kovach* who was on the bench on December 01, 2005; he had rewritten the Order that I had filed 3 weeks earlier; *he had replaced the original fiat* that read differently and did not note that not one of council objected to Joyce LaPrise being added; *he ensured that Justice Chicoine was on the bench for arguments and now he was lobbying for council with Justice Chicoine* denying me the ability to file an application to have new evidence allowed in and to have the matter heard at a different venue-that is not in Regina. So Justice Chicoine refused then to read the evidence and Mr. Dauncey simply put an 'X' through the date and sent the documents, *to support my pleading of a 'wrongful death'* back to me.
- I was so miffed over this and still grieving I sent them by registered mail to Justice Chicoine's address in Estevan, SK. The returned documents are attached at Exhibit 6. and other details are in my Affidavit to the SCC in support of an appeal.

2. WITHHOLDING INFORMATION:

- When Mr. Dauncey arranged a teleconference between Mr. Brown, Justice F. Kovach and me, I was concerned about it occurring so I attended the Registrar's office with a written number of questions to provide Justice Kovach before this teleconference began. I was led to believe that all 5 council would be included in this teleconference but only Mr. Brown was there perhaps representing all of them.
- *The registrar refused to deliver my list of questions to Justice Kovach before the teleconference.* When I insisted he do this (*believing he was simply the messenger and I was being asked to participate in a teleconference 2.5 hours later that I was not comfortable with*) *he lost it' blurting out; "Arlene you don't call the shots around here!"* to which I replied, *"No, I don't because you're the government and I'm suing you!"* I knew that I was up against an uneven balance of power and that Madame Justice was definitely playing 'peek-a-boo' through her blindfold.
- *Mr. Dauncey refuses to allow me to file a motion to be heard to have the autopsy report submitted as new evidence.* Further he refused for me to file a motion to change the venue from Regina to another city I became upset about this.
- Shortly thereafter Chief Justice Laing ordered that the motions to change venues and to allow in new evidence be heard. *These hearings were heard by no other than Justice Chicoine.*
- So I telephoned Mr. Dauncey to ask if this Chamber's meeting was special in any way as it was scheduled on a day in which Chambers does not normally meet. *He said it was NOT special in any other way but he never disclosed it was to be audio-taped.*
**The same miscarriage of justice occurred here as did on March 07th, 2006 when Justice Chicoine heard arguments. So I wrote via the Registrar's office to Chief Justice Laing with my concerns about all of this and he personally wrote me a letter assuring me I was being treated fairly. Read on.....*

3. ALTERED FILING DATE ON DECISION: see Exhibit 8. **The 2nd most grievous brick of injustice.**

- The registrar's office received through the mail as I had. Justice Chicoine's decision as to whether to strike my claim was received in the mail at my residence on March 12th, 2008.
- *The registrar's office copy of the decision was also stamped March 12th, 2008, the very date I received my copy.* *Mr. Dauncey faxed me a copy of the Style of Cause of the decision he had received in their office but not before he wrote over the stamped number 12 with the number 6.*
- *He then claimed he'd faxed me a copy* of the decision on March 06th, 2008 lying to cover-up his fraudulent act of changing the filing date in an attempt to narrow the appeal time-limit.
- Mr. Dauncey could've produced a record of having faxed me a record of this facsimile but he did not or could not because he never did this but just continued to deceive.

BRICK 4. MR. DON MORGAN: ATTORNEY GENERAL, SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

1. MISLEAD TO GAIN AN ADVANTAGE:

This item is the most grievous of all and I've reason to believe it was a criminal act.

** Exhibit 9. is the Consent Order and the various signed copies of it.*

This brick relates to the **Consent Order that Mr. Darryl Brown** council for the AG. for the SK Government having advised me that I had to remove the names of all public servants that were named on my original Statement of Claim from my amended claim. After I informed him about the death of Autumn Starr and before I completed the amended claim he advised me to remove the public servants' names. The details:

- i. At the end of October, 2005 I telephoned Mr. Brown to inform him that I had medical leave to grieve the death of Autumn Starr my infant granddaughter who died on October 28th, 2005.
- ii. Therefore I would not be attending court in November but that my husband would be there to request an adjournment. It was at this time he informed me that I could not add the public servants as defendants as they could not be litigated and had immunity from civil actions.
- iii. He advised me that the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government would be the one to add only. * The Attorney General (Mr. Don Morgan) made the Consent Order and so the government itself committed a felony as he/they knew what they (that is council, the registrar, the Attorney General, members of the judiciary) were advising me to give themselves an advantage over me. I believe they did 'hoodwink' me. Other words for 'hoodwink' are deceived, tricked, duped, deluded, took in, conned, fooled, 'pulled the wool over our eyes'. What makes this so despicable is that they collectively did this while I was grieving the death of my infant granddaughter.
- iv. The Order was first signed by my husband on my behalf when he represented me in court on November 17th, 2005. He later had me sign another one that was backdated to the date of Autumn's death.
- v. During this time of grief I did not question him advising me to sign this as he told me that I was unable to litigate any public servant and that they had immunity.
- vi. **In the decision of Justice Chicoine he points out that in taking them off that I abandoned all possibility of litigating them in the future.** Therefore these public servants' names could have remained on the Statement of Claim (Amended Fresh Copy) as I had intentions of doing. Altering the course of justice to give yourself an advantage is a criminal act. Mr. Don Morgan, Attorney General for the Saskatchewan Government who did this is not above the law, he is not the law, he represents you and I and clearly is another breach of duty and trust and a clear cut case of abuse of his 'power'. Justice Chicoine knew that this **Consent Order** was fraudulently acquired and that on my own I'd never have done this. It didn't matter as the outcome of this lawsuit was decided internally for the courts to be in control of their own processes.
- vii. **This advise by the Saskatchewan Government's council, Mr. Darryl Brown was never sought.** Mr. Brown approached me and advised me that I must remove them and acted like he was doing me a favor in advising me of this.
- viii. All the justices involved in this case and council who all signed this Consent Order knew what the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government was up to and they all 'kept quiet'.
- ix. **Council for all the defendants knew that they were doing a favor for the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government by signing this order and in their going along with it. CRIMINAL CODE that may apply is attached and is not inclusive. So who will make them be accountable? PERHAPS THE PUBLIC DOMAIN! This is our hope.**

When Crown council/ Prosecutor Lane Weigers informed me they dropped the charges against Charlene's alleged perpetrators after it was set for trial & I asked him was that not irregular at this stage and he laughed reminding me that they, the Crown are the law!

How dangerous is this for democracy?

BRICK # 5: Honourable Madame LIAN SCHWANN, Q.C. Registrar for the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal

1. THREAT OF PROSECUTION:

- So I 'got sick and tired of these tactics -the 'brick wall' and that this judiciary was determined to make my pursuit of justice an exercise in futility I refused to perfect my appeal until the registrar revised the Events Report and reversed the filing date of the decision back to the original stamped date of March 12, 2008. Further at this time I took ill and had to have surgery and was still recovering.
- **So council filed a motion to force me to perfect my appeal or be prosecuted.** The irony here is that **Mr. Don Morgan, Mr. Gordon Dauncey and Mr. Darryl Brown** and perhaps a few others **needed to be prosecuted** for their criminal acts of undermining justice, fraudulent acts of misleading and altering documents as it seems clear as to what went down.
- I didn't show-up for that Chamber's meeting and had a doctor's note.
- The matter was heard before Justice Cameron who gave me a time-limit to get it perfected or be prosecuted.
- *Justice Cameron notes that I am even late in filing my appeal which is blatantly incorrect if he had noted that the Registrar, Mr. Gordon Dauncey of the Saskatchewan court of queen's bench wrote over the actual filing date to make it appear that I was in fact late- **AND I WAS NOT LATE!** because if I had of been late the registrar with the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal would have NEVER allowed me to file an appeal on the decision - but she did because Mr. Dauncey got caught in a lie-or is it fraud?*
- Soon after all of this Mr. Dauncey was taken under The Attorney General (Mr. Don Morgan), Saskatchewan Government on a special assignment.

2. APPEAL BOOK COMMISSIONED:

- Registrar of the SK Court of Appeal the **Honourable Madame Lian Schwann Q.C.** sent Arlene Lowery a letter telling she'd asked Mr. R. Watson, Q.C. and counsel for the defendant Dr. E. Ivanochko to do my Appeal Book. She notes that he graciously agreed to do it
- **Mr. Watson served to be a serious CONFLICT OF INTEREST** for me and those I was representing. I asked myself: Why would he do this for council and me since it was he on behalf of council who would not give me a few weeks to grieve the death of Autumn but insisted I be in court and he again would not give me a reprieve on filing my appeal as my husband just had major heart surgery.
- For certain he wasn't doing it out of compassion, a favor or anything like that. I realized that Ms. Schwann having commissioned him to do it had to be 'self-serving' once again for the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government.
- **Mr. Watson, council and this court took advantage of me /us by making it possible for ALL of council's filed documents that they filed for the original claim *which they all knew were set aside and not allowed in* because **THEY NEVER FILED NEW OR AMENDED.****
- ***Council doing my Appeal Book interfered with my developing a cohesive argument in the manner I had intentions of doing.** *This Appeal Book was three Volumes of documents put together in a 'helter-skelter' manner which never did produce the original fiat.*
- The original fiat from December 01, 2005, that I wanted added was never produced. Documents that were filed with the filing date were NOT ADDED such as the Style of Cause of the Statement of Claim (Amended Claim-Fresh Copy) in which there was no filing date.
Council and this court knew what they were doing-which was more of the same -a miscarriage of justice

BRICK # 6. JUSTICE GUY CHICOINE-CHANGE OF JUDGES:

- When I saw Justice Guy Chicoine walk into Chambers and not Justice F. Kovach I was shocked considering the history on this file and the fact that even council requested the same judge due to this case being involved and complex. the way he addressed only me (Ms. Lowery you have a lot of material here and I don't want you keeping us here til' 8:00p.m.). Then he added (I was just handed this file on the way into Chambers and have not even read it).
- I was upset that Justice Kovach was no longer assigned to oversee this case. After all he had been party to a Chamber's meeting on December 01, 2005, a teleconference on January 16, 2006 and another Chamber's meeting on January 17th, 2006 and knew the case well and made the orders, it made only sense that it would be he who would hear arguments on March 07, 2006.
- But no, Justice G. Chicoine was assigned to it. Further, Justice Chicoine was assigned to oversee lawsuit QBG. 1005 of A.D. 2002 when he was still seized on a decision on this lawsuit compromising both lawsuits.

This set the stage for what transpired thereafter.

So I ask the public domain:

1. Do you believe Justice Chicoine never read the file?
2. Do you think he should have heard arguments not knowing what was going on?
3. Should we as the public expect he read it?
4. Do you believe Justice Chicoine was briefed on this file?
5. Was there favoritism towards these public servants and the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government and the Attorney General, Government of Canada and even Joyce LaPrise?

BRICK # 7. SASKATCHEWAN (SOUTHERN) CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERT LAING

So I contacted Chief Justice Robert Laing in writing my concerns re: this court hearing and other concerns providing this through the Registrar's office. Shortly thereafter I received a letter from him in the mail. He assured me that I was being treated fairly. *See **Exhibit 10**.

After his writing to me I retired Sine Die lawsuit QBG. 1005 of A.D. 2002 and low and behold who walked into Chambers but Justice Chicoine. while still seized with a decision on the lawsuit I filed and which had implications for both with him being on the bench. He asked for it to return on the day he'd be back on the bench. **This was not legally appropriate unless he consolidated the two lawsuits -which he did not.**

- The matter that day was adjourned for more information to be filed but Justice Chicoine assigned himself to this lawsuit. Was this 'the luck or bad luck of the draw'.

NOTE: 18 months later another grandbaby died because this ministry (Protection Services) came up with a lunatic case-plan for my daughter's baby.

These two precious First Nations' babies, our loved ones, still need justice.

BRICK # 8. SASKATCHEWAN CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN KLEBUC

Part way through arguments for this appeal it was noted that when Justice Klebuc reminded Mr. Brown, council for the Attorney General, Saskatchewan Government that he/they (that is all 5 of council on behalf of their clients) had not filed new (that is a motion new or amended) 'to strike my claim that Mr. Brown stated "I guess we're done then!" that the courtroom was filled with laughter in which I noted that these judges all had a really good laugh. **What was before them was no laughing matter because there were 4 grandchildren of mine who had not been protected and continued to be sexually abused** (all the while these protection workers and their counsellor knowing my daughter was in a cult and that they had been abused and they needed justice to set a precedent for all children left in this state-**IGNORED! DURING THE COURSE OF THIS LAWSUIT two more of my grandchildren lay cold in their graves because of more gross negligence and wrongful deaths. This is no laughing matter!**

Secondly Justice Klebuc told me at the end of arguments that they (the judges I presumed) would be speaking with others and that I would receive their decision. Who did they talk with? Were my rights to justice like a judicial inquiry denied? **A year later they came up with a 2 paragraph decision.**

Attached below are Exhibits 1 to 10 inclusive.

BRICK #1. - JOYCE LAPRISE

Exhibit 1. the cover-page of fax sent to Joyce Laprise from the Saskatchewan Regional Director for the Minister of Social Services (Saskatchewan Government) Mr. David Hedlund.

*QBE 166 of 2007.
A Affidavit
of Service
on Joyce Laprise*

The Regional Director of the Saskatchewan Minister of Social Services, Mr. David Hedlund was key in the damages that Joyce LaPrise was assigned to cause me. The SK Minister of Social Services Mr. Glenn Hage! was also in on this. How do i know this? I know!

- Why is Mr. David Hedlund faxing my Statement of Claim (Amended Fresh Copy) to Joyce LaPrise? The answer is clear. He was behind her assigned mission to being down The Anchorage and Arlene Lowery along with it.
- Ms. LaPrise had a one year sabbatical to get the job done and resumed her employment with this department after bringing down The Anchorage

Sent over fr. SK Justice after publication ban.



Saskatchewan Community Resources and Employment

Action Memo

From: *David Hedlund* Date: *Jan. 24/06*

To: *Joyce Laprise*

1	6
2	7
3	8
4	

Instructions

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> prepare reply for: | <input type="checkbox"/> approval please | <input type="checkbox"/> information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minister <input type="checkbox"/> Deputy | <input type="checkbox"/> handle | <input type="checkbox"/> per your request |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asst. D.M. <input type="checkbox"/> myself | <input type="checkbox"/> revise | <input type="checkbox"/> returned to you |
| <input type="checkbox"/> for your signature | <input type="checkbox"/> may we discuss? | <input type="checkbox"/> return to me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> reply directly | <input type="checkbox"/> comments please | <input type="checkbox"/> file |
| <input type="checkbox"/> send me copy of reply | <input type="checkbox"/> circulate, initial and return | <input type="checkbox"/> make _____ copies |

Time frame _____

Remarks:

As requested here is a copy of the lawsuit (amended) by Arlene Lowery.

Note:
 Proof that Mr. Hedlund providing me Laprise my amended claim that was sealed in essence he served her when I could not because she refused service x2.



BRICK #1. - JOYCE LAPRISE
Exhibit 2. Joyce Laprise's questionable behavior pointed out by the defendants' (Board of Directors) lawyer in his letter to the Saskatchewan Labour Board.

L. 6. 12 1/2

re: B/B 1005 of 2002

SEMAGANIS WORME & MISSENS

Barristers & Attorneys-At-Law

Donald E. Worme, LL.B.
Bonnie D. Missens, LL.B.

Saskatoon Office
#300 - 203 Puckham Avenue
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 4K5
(Asimakanishekan Askiy Indian Reserve)

Gregory J. Curtis, B.A., B.Ed., LL.B.*
Helen G. Semaganis, B.A., LL.B.

Telephone: (306) 664-7175

Telefax: (306) 664-7176

January 3, 2003

This copy of Ms. Pat Crowe's (and all of the Board of Directors that Ms. LaPrise loaded-up on the board for The Anchorage were in 'hot water'. The person who wrote this note did not sign it but likely was perhaps their lawyer because provided by Labour Standards' lawyer.

*Not Relevant
- just suggesting that they obtain legal advice re directorship issue and express an opinion on Joyce Laprise's action.
This letter is merely opinion, not fact.
Oh, its FACT*

Ms. Candice Pete
839 Athlone Drive
Regina, SK S4X 2H2

Ms. Sarah Longman
3140 Grant Road
Regina, SK S4S 5H1

Mr. Ivan Thomson
151 Elmview Road
Regina, SK S4R 7B6

Ms. Patricia Crowe
62 Boucher Crescent
Regina, SK S4R 7E3

Mr. Erick Gordon
Box 397
Fort Qu'Appelle, SK S0G 1S0

Ms. Darlene Kennedy
Box 488
Montmartre, SK S0G 3M0

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

Re: **Arlene Lowery v. The Anchorage Counselling, et al**
Our File: 02DW6817.01

Further to our letter and enclosures of December 11, 2002, we look forward to your comments so we may be in a position to respond to the opposing solicitor. Should we be unable to respond on your behalf you can be certain that Ms. Lowery's solicitor will proceed without further regard.

You will also note from the material that was forwarded to you that it is the intention of Ms. Lowery's solicitor to hold each of you jointly and severally liable for the damages incurred by his client whether you had been involved in any of the decision making or not. Such result is, as I had explained to you in our meetings both proceeding and following the mediation, sustainable at law if you are found by a Court to have been a proper director at the material times.

....12

INDIGENOUS LAW GROUP
Comprehensive & Specific Claims
Treaty Land Entitlement Unit
Strategic Planning Unit
Criminal & Civil Litigation Group
With Offices & Affiliates
in Ottawa & Victoria
Email: legalwarrior@sasktel.net
* Mediator
Alternative Dispute Resolution
Business Law Group
Policy Research & Development
Natural Resources Law Unit

An employee at SK Labour Standards has written this. *Patricia Crowe submitted*

January 3, 2003
Page 2

"Joyce LaPrise has taken some extraordinary steps in dealing with the assets of the corporation **for which you can be held entirely liable.**" So, the defendant-AG, SK Gov't who set her up to do me/us harm (Part Three) should be liable. To date she and her employer have gotten away with it. These Directors know what happened!

1.6.12. 2/2
Unless the Directors changed the incorporation **The Anchorage Counselling & Rehabilitation Centre Inc.** to the name of the program Healing the Nation Inc., which if it was, was fast-tracked, it still remains The Anchorage... ..

In this regard, while I am not retained to advise either Healing the Nation or any of you on your corporate responsibilities as directors, it would also be most prudent for each of you to obtain specific advice in this regard. As you may know, Healing the Nation Inc. under the auspices of Director Joyce Laprise has taken some extraordinary steps in dealing with the assets of the corporation for which you can be held entirely liable. Accordingly, you are urged to seek legal advice in the event you should be confronted with such event. Of course, should you wish to continue our service in this respect we would be most happy to hear from you.

Trusting that the above is in order.

Yours very truly,


SEMAGANIS WORME & MISSENS

Per: Donald E. Worme, Q.C.
Barrister & Solicitor

DEW:dm

I already had a lawsuit against these Directors with QBG 1005 of A.D. 2002. Mr. Worme was present at a mediation hearing to avoid the matter from going to trial so I am not sure what Mr. Worme's talking about as my lawyer Mr. Perry Erhard filed a lawsuit against them which is QBG 1005 of A.D. 2002. I had wanted Ms. Laprise litigated from the beginning but litigating her vigilante actions would have exposed the conspiracy and embarrassed this government. Of course the Directors would be held liable if my lawyer with the law firm Olive Waller Zinkhan & Waller would have done his job. What he did do was hold on to it until a two year statutory time lapsed and dropped it protecting not my husband and my interests but his firm's and his interests. Two of their primary clients were at that time the Aboriginal community and the New Democratic Property (NDP). Then I was 'out of pocket for \$10,000.00 for his /their incompetence and Conflict of Interest. -Arlene Lowery

INDIGENOUS LAW GROUP

Comprehensive & Specific Claims
Treaty Land Entitlement Unit
Strategic Planning Unit
Criminal & Civil Litigation Group

With Offices & Affiliates
in Ottawa & Victoria
Email: legalwarrior@sasktel.net
* Mediator

Alternative Dispute Resolution
Business Law Group
Policy Research & Development
Natural Resources Law Unit

BRICK # 2.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE
SK COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA) &
MR. DARRYL BROWN, COUNCIL FOR SK GOVT.
EXHIBIT 3. Mr. Brown's letter to Mr. Dauncey

Saskatchewan



Justice


9th Floor, 1874 Scarth Street
Regina, Canada
S4P 3V7

Civil Law Division

January 10, 2006

Please Reply To:
Darryl J. Brown
Phone: 787-8953
Fax: 787-0581

Court House
Court of Queen's Bench
2425 Victoria Avenue
REGINA, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V7



Attention: Office of the Local Registrar

Dear Sir:

Re: Arlene Lowery v. Government of Saskatchewan et al
- Q.B.G. No. 1306 of 2005

We recently obtained a copy of the clerk's notes regarding the last return of this matter in court in front of Mr. Justice Kovach. It is our collective recollection that five things happened;

- 1) in response to a Motion brought by Arlene Lowery pursuant to Rule 165, her proposed amendments to the pleadings themselves was allowed in the form Arlene Lowery put forth in a document entitled "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS THE MOTION TO AMEND (R 165)".
- 2) given (a) no motion was brought for the adding of new parties (either pursuant to Rules 38 or 37 or any other Rule), (b) as a non-lawyer cannot act for an infant (being someone under legal disability) by virtue of Rule 10 of the Queen's Bench Rules, and (c) due to there being no notice served on any proposed new defendants; the issue of whether the 4 proposed new infant plaintiffs or proposed new defendants were to be added was set over to the next return date of the matter, being March 7, 2006, for argument;
- 3) the final version of proposed amendments to the Claim, (essentially the Claim Mrs. Lowery wishes to advance), was to be provided to the Defendants in the action by January 17th, 2006, responding materials were to be provided by the Defendants to Mrs. Lowery by the 7th of February, 2006, and Mrs. Lowery's materials in response were to be provided to the Defendants by February 28th, 2006, with the matters proceeding to argument on March 7th, 2006, at 2:00 p.m.,
- 4) The Order of Gunn, J., of November 17th, 2005, sealing parts of the file was to be continued to and including March 7, 2006, and,
- 5) Mrs. Lowery was to appear in person or by counsel.

We have also been made aware of what purports to be an issued Order which was apparently issued on December 23rd, 2005, by Arlene Lowery (copy attached). We were not approached with respect to its accuracy prior to issuance. It is our collective

Telexcopy followed

When you read this letter you will realize that all counsel knew they were to file new or amended a motion to strike my Statement of Claim (Amended-Fresh Copy) in addition to filing new or amended their substantive materials to support their motion 'to strike' it. **One of those was to have been an individual or collective Statement of Defence but they had NONE.** Justice Chicoine claimed that I had no cause of action when this is such a misrepresentation of the amended claim assisted counsel. Counsel is advising the registrar and me that my grandchildren are under disability when they know that this was NEVER established. Again deception & misleading.

where is the legal disability - if so - why are they?

where is the evidence?

was not done.

Order attached here

Acid-free Paper

BRICK # 2.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE SK
COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA) &
MR. DARRYL BROWN, COUNCIL FOR SK GOVT.
EXHIBIT 4. The Events Report

Written comments circled in red are those of Arlene Lowery

Event Report for: QBG1306/2005 Event Detail List

Effective Date: Monday, July 25, 2005

Judgment Amount: Claim Amount: \$9,563,220.00

EVENT LIST

Event Type	Event Description	Event Fee	Effective Date
STATEMENT OF CLAIM		\$200.00	25-Jul-2005
NOTICE OF INTENT TO DEFEND/ANSWE	GOVT OF SASK, CALVERT, HAGEL, NILSON,	\$0.00	15-Aug-2005
NOTICE OF INTENT TO DEFEND/ANSWE	CHIEF JOHNSTON, CPL. FERGUSON; RCP DE		16-Aug-2005
NOTICE OF INTENT TO DEFEND/ANSWE	DAVID HEDLUND		17-Aug-2005
NOTICE OF INTENT TO DEFEND/ANSWE	DR. NORMAN, DR. LEIBEL & DR. RUTHNUM,		19-Aug-2005
DEFENCE	CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON & CPR. DEBBIE FERG	\$100.00	30-Aug-2005
DEFENCE	DR. RUTHNUM; DR. NORMAN & DR. LEIBEL	\$100.00	30-Aug-2005
DEFENCE	DR. IVANOCHKO	\$100.00	31-Aug-2005
DEFENCE	OFGOVT. OF SASK EMPLOYEES, PROOF OF	\$0.00	07-Sep-2005
NOTICE OF MOTION	PROOF OF SERVICE	\$10.00	19-Oct-2005
NOTICE OF MOTION		\$10.00	28-Oct-2005
NOTICE OF MOTION		\$10.00	28-Oct-2005
ORDER		\$10.00	31-Oct-2005
NOTICE OF MOTION		\$10.00	02-Nov-2005
BRIEF OF LAW	DR. NORMAN, DR. LEIBEL & DR. RUTHNUM		09-Nov-2005
ORDER	PREVIOUS ORDER CONTINUES, APPLICATIO		18-Nov-2005
ORDER			17-Jan-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	AMENDED OF DEF BRIEF OF NOV10-05 RE		07-Feb-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	NOVEMBER BRIEF REMOVED AND RETURN		08-Feb-2006
BRIEF OF LAW			08-Feb-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	GOVT. OF SASK.		13-Feb-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	OF THE PLAINTIFF		03-Mar-2006
OFFER TO SETTLE			12-Jun-2006
NOTICE OF MOTION	VENUE CHANGE	\$10.00	03-Oct-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	ON BEHALF OF GOVT OF SASK., PROOF OF	\$0.00	12-Oct-2006
BRIEF OF LAW	ON BEHALF OF AG OF CANADA, PROOF OF S	\$0.00	12-Oct-2006
BRIEF OF LAW			13-Oct-2006
ORDER	APPLICS DISMISSED - COSTS TO DFDTS/RES		24-Oct-2006
ORDER		\$20.00	31-Oct-2006
OFFER TO SETTLE			15-Feb-2008
JUDGMENT	CHICOINE J MARCH 6-08		06-Mar-2008

Council had to have known that you do not file an amended Brief of Law before filing a Notice of Motion to strike my amended claim or filing a Statement of Defence and substantive materials to support striking my amended claim. They got away with this-Wow!

Chamber's mtg. not recorded Dec 10/05 @ ORDER; removed written by A. Lowery 12/23/05

Chamber's mtg not recorded.

Original FIAT removed

NOTE: COMMENT ABOVE.

The SK Court of QBG Registrar does not even itemize me filing of my Statement of Claim (Amended Fresh Copy). I have concluded that the reason he didn't is to HELP the defence because *it was already fixed to strike my claim and so they didn't have to follow the rules.* No one was suppose to read it either, but now you can read it. The court system, lawyers count on self-litigants being daft-*they got caught in their own fraudulent actions and they've gotten away with it!*

A very SAD DAY for justice in Canada for His 'bruised reeds' and all Canadians who wish to represent themselves.

BRICK # 2.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE SK
COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA) &
MR. DARRYL BROWN, COUNCIL FOR SK.GOVERNMENT.
EXHIBIT 5. Order- filed by Arlene Lowery

954
954

Order written by A. Lowery

1

CANADA)
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN) Q.B.G. No. 1306 of 2005
IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

BETWEEN:

ARLENE LOWERY

PLAINTIFF

- and -

SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

-namely-

SASKATCHEWAN COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND EDUCATION
PREMIER LORNE CALVERT, GLENN HAGEL, DAVID HEDLUND,
KIM WILSON, RON EPP, CHARLENE THURBIDE, JAMIE WEINTZ,
SHARON DEITNER, ARLENE BISKKEY, BILL TINGLEY

SASKATCHEWAN CHILDREN'S JUSTICE
HON. JOHN NILSON, M.L.A.,

DR. C. NORMAN, M.D.,

DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D., DR. L. P. RUTHNUM, M.D.,
DR. E. IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)

CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON, CORPORAL DEBBIE FERGUSON

QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE - REGINA
DEC 2 3 2005
FILED

CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON, CORPORAL DEBBIE FERGUSON

DEFENDANTS

EX PARTE did not need to be used here but this was not reason to change the intent of the Order that was derived from the original fiat. They had to rewrite it to remove Joyce LaPrise as added-they cheated.

EX PARTE ORDER

Presiding Judge: Judge F. J. Kovach

Date: Thursday, December 01, 2005

UPON hearing read the application of the Plaintiff's Notice of Motion 165, and with the following present: the Plaintiff, Arlene Lowery for herself; and the Defendants Solicitors: Mr. B. Werry, for the City of Regina Police Department, Chief Cal Johnston and Corporal D. Ferguson; & Mr. D. Brown, for the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. R. Watson, for Dr. Ivanochko and Mr. B. Hunter, for Doctors L.P. Ruthnum, S. Leibel and C. Norman.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Pursuant to Queen's Bench Rule 165 the Plaintiff's Application to amend claim is granted; and further may add
 - 1.1. the amended proposals as in the Draft and,
 - 1.2. the Plaintiff's infant children, namely Charlene Marie Dobson, Jonathan Peter Dobson, Kayla Christine Dobson and Lance Wayne J. LeCaine may be added as Plaintiffs, and
 - 1.3. the Defendants, Joyce LaPrise, and the Government of Canada, Attorney General; noting that the Defendants will argue the validity of adding the additional parties, with the exception of Joyce LaPrise.

2. The Plaintiff is to serve all the Defendants, including the Government of Canada the final Amended Claim, in typewritten form by Tuesday, January 17, 2006.
3. The Defendants have until February 07, 2006, to file and serve responses, either amending or filing new.
4. The Plaintiff has until February 28, 2006 to file and serve any written reply material to the Defendants' responses.
5. All matters shall be argued on the adjourned date of March 07, 2006 @ 2:00pm. This adjourned date, by consent of all parties, is made with the expectation matters shall be argued on that date.
6. Madam Justice Gunn's Order of November 17, 2005, sealing portions of the Court file to be continued up to and including March 07, 2006, unless a further Order is made by the Court.
7. the Order that Ms. Lowery is personally present or represented by Counsel is confirmed.

ISSUED at Regina, Saskatchewan this ^{23rd} ~~01st~~ day of December, 2005.

[Signature]
LOCAL REGISTRAR

The acting registrar correctly changed the date from the date of the Chamber's meeting to the actual date my Order was being filed.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 23rd day of December, 2005, by the Plaintiff, ARLENE LOWERY on her own behalf; *[Signature]*, and served

TO: LOCAL REGISTRAR

AND TO:

Mr. R. Watson, Q.C. Lawyer in Charge of the File
Your file #:452.00-628 RAW @ Fax: 347-8350,
BALFOUR MOSS
Barristers and Solicitors
700 - 2103 11th Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 4G1

In the revised fiat and there is no mention of Joyce LaPrise as in the first fiat as it was rewritten to suit COUNCIL AND MR. DAUNCEY, LEAVING OUT THAT JOYCE LAPRISE who WAS ADDED ON DECEMBER 01, 2005 with no objection to add her from all 5 members of council. **This is why Mr. Dauncey and Mr. Brown needed a teleconference with Justice F. Kovach to alter the course of justice. This is why they required a new judge -in my opinion!**

Judicial Centre of Regina

XXI
953

vs.

File # 03/1306/05

DATE	NATURE OF ORDER	JUDGE
Dec. 1/05	continued	Kovach, J
	Defendants have until Feb. 7/06 to file and serve responses - either amending or filing new. The Plaintiff has until Feb. 28/06 to file and serve any written reply material to the Defendants response.	
	All matters shall be argued on the adjourned date of March 7, 2006 @ 2:00 pm. This adjourned date, by consent of all parties, is made with the expectation matters shall be argued on that date.	
	Madam Justice Lunn's order of Nov. 17/05 sealing portions of the Court file to be continued up to and including March 7, 2006, unless further order is made by the Court.	
	Order Ms. Lowrey is personally present or represented by Counsel is continued.	
	James Smith	

There were no materials filed by council for the Defendants for me to respond to because their council never filed new or amended - nor did they even a motion 'to strike' my amended claim - & they got away with it!!!

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

OFFICE OF THE LOCAL REGISTRAR

JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

JAN 17/06
3:55 P.M.

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING 3 PAGES TO:

(including cover)

NAME: ARLIE LOWERY
ADDRESS: _____

FAX #: 5856189

SENT FROM: GORD DAUNCEY

ADDRESS: OFFICE OF THE LOCAL REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA
COURT HOUSE
2425 VICTORIA AVENUE
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN
S4P 3V7

TELEPHONE NUMBER: (306) - 787-5380

FAX NUMBER: (306) - 787-7217

COMMENTS:

MR. DAUNCEY WILL ASSUME
I'M IN AGREEMENT WITH THIS.
NO!

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This fax (and any attachment) was intended for a specific recipient. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. Any privilege that exists is not waived.

If you are not the intended recipient:

- do not copy it, distribute to another person or use it for any other purpose; and
- delete it and advise me by return e-mail or telephone.

Mr. Dauncey fails to mention my concerns in the leaving out of the names of my grandchildren as proposed infant plaintiffs & the Gov't of Canada as proposed. This was agreed upon in their teleconference. Of course Joyce Laprise should have been on period! But I had no say-no power!

The only comment on the face of the document filed as an exhibit was by A. Lowery- the comments in the arrow and circled in red.

I called back because he said he would file it if he did not hear from me. After all of this I had no say anyway. I did emphasize that my Order was fine except for the removal of the word Ex Parte and that as directed by Justice Kovach the addition of parties were to be added to the Style of Cause with the word proposed put in brackets behind their designation as either infant children plaintiffs or defendants. This Order was not O.K. but feeling bullied into accepting it -A.L.

4:10 P.M.
ARLIE CALLED.
ORDER OK.
ARLIE:
THE NEW ORDER
DRAFTED BY MR BROWN
LOOKS SATISFACTORY TO ME
I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE
TO GET THROUGH TO YOU ON
THE PHONE, SO I AM FILING IT TO
YOU. IF I DON'T HEAR BACK FROM YOU BY
4:20 P.M. TODAY, I WILL ASSUME YOU ARE
IN AGREEMENT WITH IT. I WILL THEN ISSUE
AND FAX A COPY TO YOU, AND PUT AN
ORIGINAL AT THE COURTER FOR
YOU TO PICK UP ON JAN 17. GORD

BRICK # 2.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE SK COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA) &
MR. DARRYL BROWN, COUNCIL FOR SK.GOVERNMENT.
EXHIBIT 6. Order- Mr. Brown drafted & approved by & filed by Mr. Dauncey to replace
Arlene Lowery's Order WHICH WAS DONE RIGHT AFTER THE TELECONFERENCE.

Handwritten: 958 9

CANADA)
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN)

Q.B. No. 1306 of 2005

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

BETWEEN:

ARLENE LOWERY

PLAINTIFF

- and -

SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

- namely -

SASKATCHEWAN COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND EDUCATION,
SASKATCHEWAN CHILDREN'S JUSTICE,
DR. C. NORMAN, M.D.
DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D., DR. L.P. RUTHNUM, M.D.
DR. E IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)
CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON, CORPORAL DEBBIE FERGUSON

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Honourable)
F Kovach)

Thursday the 1st
day of December, 2005

Handwritten in red circle: * outcome of a teleconference 01/16/06

UPON THE Appearance of Arlene Lowery, and Counsel for the Defendants, and upon having heard the representations of each, it is hereby ordered that:

- A) The Plaintiff's Motion to amend the pleadings pursuant to Rule 165 is allowed in the form set out in the document filed herein and entitled "PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS THE MOTION TO AMEND (R 165)" other than with respect to the addition of parties therein;
- B) the issue of addition of parties and whether the proposed 4 new infant plaintiffs or

proposed new defendants are to be added is set over to the next return date of this matter, being March 7th, 2006. The style of cause in the Plaintiff's Amended Claim or proposed Amended Claim is to describe such proposed additional parties either as "proposed Plaintiff" or "proposed Defendant" as the case may be;

C) the final version of the proposed amended Claim the Plaintiff wishes to advance is to be provided to the Defendants by January 18th, 2006, responding materials to these proposed amendments by the Defendants are to be provided to the Plaintiff by the 7th of February, 2006, and the Plaintiff's materials in response are to be provided to the Defendants by February 28th, 2006;

D) all matters including the applications to strike this Claim and the other matters raised herein are to be adjourned to March 7th, 2006, at 2:00 p.m., when it is anticipated that all matters will be argued;

E) the Order of Gunn, J. of November 17th, 2005, sealing portions of the file is to be continued to and including March 7, 2006, or as otherwise Ordered by the Court;

F) the Plaintiff is to appear in person or by counsel; and

G) there will be no costs awarded as against any parties for the within Order.

Issued at the City of Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 16 day of

JANUARY, 2006

Deputy Local Registrar

The tele-conference was January 17th, 2006 & the filing date is January 17th, 2006 and Arlene Lowery's Order filed with the court on December 23rd, 2005 is now in the waste-paper basket.

All of this is leading up to a new judge-an uninformed one at that who never read the file before hearing so he told us.

The Order that council & the Registrar produced to replace the Order I had filed refers to the claim to be argued on March 07th, 2006 as both the Plaintiff's Amended Claim or proposed Amended Claim. Which is it? Of course it is the Amended Claim entitled: Statement of Claim (Amended-Fresh Copy) that was filed on the same day that they rewrote my Order. Also 'proposed amendments' is inaccurate & they all know it!!!

BRICK # 3.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE
SASKATCHEWAN COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA)
EXHIBIT 7. DOCUMENTS filed by Arlene Lowery are
returned to her with his writing an 'X' through the filing date.

X
at

CANADA
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

Q.B.G. No. 1306 of 2005

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

BETWEEN:

ARLENE LOWERY
and Infant Children
CHARLENE DOBSON, JONATHAN DOBSON
(PROPOSED)
PLAINTIFFS




- and -
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, ATTORNEY GENERAL
(PROPOSED)
for
Her Majesty the Queen as represented by:
Minister of Human Resources Skills and Development of Canada, Hon. Belinda Stronach
and
Minister of Canadian Heritage, Hon. Liza Frulla
and
Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Hon. Andy Scott
- and -
SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT, ATTORNEY GENERAL
for
Her Majesty the Queen as represented by:
Minister of Community Resources and Employment, Joan Crawford
and
Minister of Justice, Mr. Quenell
- and -
DR. L. P. RUTHNUM, M.D., DR. C. NORMAN, M.D., DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D.
-and-
DR. E. IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)
- and -
CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT
Board of Commissioners, Chief Cal Johnston, Corporal Debbie Ferguson
- and -
JOYCE LAPRISE (PROPOSED) **DEFENDANTS**

AFFIDAVIT OF ARLENE LOWERY, PLAINTIFF
In Support of Part 2 of the Amended Statement of Claim (Rule 165)

ARLENE LOWERY
FORGET STREET, REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, S4S 0G5
Telephone: Residence: or Business: (306) 584-2625 Cell: 596-2292

July 26, 2006

To the Local Registrar
COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
2425 Victoria Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 4W6



Attention: Local Registrar for Honourable Justice G. Chicoine
Re: Admission of Affidavit and Exhibits concerning Q.B.G. 1306 of A.D. 2005


Please be advised that I was in contact with the Honourable Justice Guy Chicoine by telephone on Thursday, July 20th, 2006 concerning the above matter.

Justice Chicoine has agreed to look over this document and provide me an answer as to whether it can be admitted as supporting materials to my arguments for Rule 165; and has requested that I submit this document to the Registrar's Office to forward to him.

Once I know if it will be admitted, I will at that time provide all of the Defendants or legal counsel for them, a copy of this Affidavit with supporting Exhibits.

Thank-you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,


Arlene Lowery, B.Sc.N., M.A.

cc. Defendants
file

Certainly this is not proper to contact a judge directly as I did. The reason it came to this was because of teleconferences occurring, rewriting of an Order to suit Council, changing a judge at a crucial juncture, Mr. Dorelly being ignorant to me as was Justice Chicoine March 05/06 - an infant granddaughter dying in care of one of the defendants (K. Coit, D.S.) & being refused to have a Justice Chicoine read the new evidence for the need of pleading of a Wrongful Death.

CANADA
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

BETWEEN:

QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

AUG 19 2006

FILED

ARLENE LOWERY
and Infant Children
CHARLENE DOBSON, JONATHAN DOBSON

[REDACTED] (PROPOSED)

LESLIE, LYLE

PLAINTIFFS

- and -

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, ATTORNEY GENERAL
(PROPOSED)

for

Her Majesty the Queen as represented by:
Minister of Human Resources Skills and Development of Canada, Hon. Belinda Stronach

and

Minister of Canadian Heritage, Hon. Liza Frulla

and

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Hon. Andy Scott

- and -

SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT, ATTORNEY GENERAL

for

Her Majesty the Queen as represented by:
Minister of Community Resources and Employment, Joan Crawford

and

Minister of Justice, Mr. Quenell

- and -

DR. L. P. RUTHNUM, M.D., DR. C. NORMAN, M.D., DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D.

-and-

DR. E. IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)

- and -

CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Board of Commissioners, Chief Cal Johnston, Corporal Debbie Ferguson

- and -

JOYCE LAPRISE (PROPOSED) DEFENDANTS

AFFIDAVIT OF ARLENE LOWERY, PLAINTIFF

In Support of Part 2 of the Amended Statement of Claim (Rule 165)

ARLENE LOWERY

[REDACTED] FORGET STREET, REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, S4T [REDACTED]

Telephone: Residence: or Business: (306) 584-2625 Cell: 596-2292

*Service of this affidavit
of Mr. Brown's Copy as accepted
he photocopied what was served
to him - wrote on
the one he was
served & returned to me/gh*

*then Mr. Dauncey returns
this page X'ed out - FUNNY
NESS.*

*Solicitor for the
Government of S.C.*

#4

BRICK # 3.
MR. GORDON DAUNCEY, REGISTRAR OF THE
SK COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (REGINA)
EXHIBIT 8. DECISION FILING DATE that was stamped on it was
manually changed by Mr. Dauncey.

MAR-12-2008 12:31

REGINA LR OFFICE

306 787 7217

P.002

2b. Exhibit D-
D-1/2
EXHIBIT 8
(4.6.)

QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN

Citation: 2008 SKQB 115

Date: 20080306
Docket: Q.B.G. 1306 of 2005
Judicial Centre: Regina

Changing the actual filing date of the decision
& then lying about it goes to the credibility of
the Canadian Court System.

BETWEEN:

ARLENE LOWERY

PLAINTIFF

- and -

SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

- and -


DR. C. NORMAN, M.D.

DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D., DR. L.P. RUTHNUM, M.D.

DR. E. IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)

CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT,

CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON, CORPORAL DEBBIE FERGUSON



DEFENDANTS

Counsel:

Arlene Lowery
Daryl J. Brown
Brad D. Hunter

Reginald A. Watson, Q.C.
Katrina M. Swan

Scott R. Moffat

the plaintiff, for herself
for the defendant, Saskatchewan Government
for the defendants, Dr. C. Norman, Dr. S. Leibel,
and Dr. L.P. Ruthnam
for the defendant, Dr. E. Ivanochko
for the Board of Police Commissioners for
the City of Regina, and the defendants,
Chief Cal Johnston and Corporal Debbie Ferguson
for the Government of Canada

DECISION
March 6, 2008

CHICOINE J.

TOTAL P.002

BRICK # 4.- THE BIGGEST BRICK OF ALL - CONSENT ORDER-Exhibit 9

HON. DON MORGAN-Attorney General for the Saskatchewan Government on the council of MR. D. BROWN ILL-ADVICES ARLENE LOWERY TO REMOVE ALL THE NAMES OF PUBLIC SERVANTS FROM HER AMENDED CLAIM SOON TO BE FILED. FURTHERMORE MR. BROWN ADVISES HER HE WILL DO THE CONSENT ORDER FOR ME TO SIGN ALONG WITH ALL OF COUNCIL. MR. DON MORGAN'S DEPUTY THEN PRODUCES HIS ORDER TO BE SIGNED.

AFTER THE FACT I FIND OUT THIS WAS ILLEGALLY OBTAINED AND I HAD BEEN PURPOSELY TRICKED TO PROTECT THESE PUBLIC SERVANTS.

THEY'VE ALL ACTED 'SHAMELESS' & 'LAWLESS'! WHY?-because they are the law???

XTC

CANADA)
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN)

Q.B. No. 1306 of 2005

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
JUDICIAL CENTRE OF REGINA

BETWEEN:

ARLENE LOWERY

PLAINTIFF

- and -

SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT

- namely-

SASKATCHEWAN COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND EDUCATION,
PREMIER LORNE CALVERT, GLEN HAGEL, DAVID HEDLUND, KIM WILSON, RON EPP,
CHARLENE THURBIDE, JAMIE WEINTZ, SHARON DEITNER, ARLENE BISKKEY, BILL
TINGLEY,

SASKATCHEWAN CHILDREN'S JUSTICE,
HON. JOHN NILSON, M.L.A., DR. C. NORMAN, M.D.
DR. S. LEIBEL, M.D., DR. L.P. RUTHNUM, M.D.
DR. E IVANOCHKO (REG. PSYCHOLOGIST)
CITY OF REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CHIEF CAL JOHNSTON, CORPORAL DEBBIE FERGUSON

DEFENDANTS

CONSENT ORDER

Before the Honourable) Tuesday the 1st
) day of November, 2005
in Chambers)

UPON THE Agreement of all parties to the within matter either individually or through their counsel it is hereby ordered that:

- A) The applications brought in this matter by the Defendants to strike the Plaintiff's Claim originally made returnable on November 1st, 2005, at the Court of Queen's Bench, 2425 Victoria Avenue, Regina, and the Plaintiff's Motion to amend pleadings, to extend time to deliver amended pleadings, and to strike the Statements of Defence pursuant to Rule 174 (a),

X 2021
JR

(i) and (ii), made returnable November 15th, 2005, at the Court of Queen's Bench, 2425 Victoria Avenue, Regina, are adjourned to November 17, 2005, 10:00 a.m., at the Court of Queen's Bench, 2425 Victoria Avenue, Regina.


B) Through application of *The Proceedings Against the Crown Act* and *The Public Officer's Protection Act*, Premier Lorne Calvert, Glenn Hagel, David Hedlund, Kim Wilson, Ron Epp, Charlene Thurbide, Jamie Weintz, Sharon Deitner, Arlene Bisskey, Bill Tingley, and Honourable John Nilson M.L.A. are hereby removed as Defendant's from the Claim. The Style of Cause is to be amended accordingly.

C) There will be no costs awarded as against any parties for the within Order.

DATED at the City of Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this ____ day of _____, 2005.

Deputy Local Registrar

CONSENTED to this 28th day of October, 2005.



Solicitor for the Government of Saskatchewan,
Premier Lorne Calvert, Glenn Hagel, David Hedlund, Kim Wilson, Ron Epp, Charlene Thurbide, Jaime Weintz, Sharon Deitner, Arlene Bisskey, Bill Tingley, and Honourable John Nilson M.L.A.

CONSENTED to this 28th day of October, 2005. 2:55PM

Arlene Lowery
per check Lowery
Arlene Lowery, Plaintiff

Mr. Brown back dated this the very day that Autumn Starr died. He had my husband fill it out in his presence on Nov. 18/05. & sign it for me. This is a felony. JLD

Likely this was never filed as when Mr. Watson, Q.C. did my Appeal Book this is another document that he forgot (?) to add. Wow! This is our justice system.



5

Oct. 28 '05 15:05

U

FAX 5855169

P. 4

CONSENTED to this 28th day of October, 2005.


Solicitor for Chief Cal Johnston, City of Regina
Police Department and Corporal Debbie
Ferguson

CONSENTED to this 28 day of October, 2005.


Solicitor for Dr. E. Ivonachka (Reg.
Psychologist)

CONSENTED to this 28 day of October, 2005.


Solicitor for Dr. C. Norman, M.D., Dr. S.
Leibel, M.D., Dr. J.P. Ruffner, M.D.

It states below: "This Order was prepared by the Deputy Attorney General and These are the parties responsible plus all others who had ANY part in it!"

This Order was prepared by:

Deputy Attorney General and

Oct. 28 2005 15:19

U

FAX 5856189

P. 4

3

CONSENTED to this 28th day of October, 2005.

Solicitor for Chief Cal Johnston, City of Regina
Police Department and Corporal Debbie
Ferguson

CONSENTED to this _____ day of _____, 2005.

Solicitor for Dr. E. Ivonochko (Reg.
Psychologist)

CONSENTED to this _____ day of _____, 2005.

Solicitor for Dr. C. Norman, M.D., Dr. S.
Leibel, M.D., Dr. L.P. Ruthnum, M.D.

This Order was prepared by:

Deputy Attorney General and

NOTE: * At this time I am awaiting for these lawyers and public servants to be charged and PROSECUTED by those in authority to do so after which time I will file a lawsuit. - A. Lowery

CRIMINAL CCODE THAT APPLIES TO THE CONSENT ORDER

5. Breach of trust by public officer

122. Every official who, in connection with the duties of his office, commits fraud or a breach of trust is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, whether or not the fraud or breach of trust would be an offence if it were committed in relation to a private person.

R.S., c.
111.

C-34, s.

PARTIES TO OFFENCES

Parties to offence

- 21. (1) Every one is a party to an offence who**
- (a) actually commits it;**
 - (b) does or omits to do anything for the purpose of aiding any person to commit it; or**
 - (c) abets any person in committing it.**

Common intention

(2) Where two or more persons form an intention in common to carry out an unlawful purpose and to assist each other therein and any one of them, in carrying out the common purpose, commits an offence, each of them who knew or ought to have known that the commission of the offence would be a probable consequence of carrying out the common purpose is a party to that offence.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 21.

October 19, 2006

From: Arlene Lowery
1719 Forget Street,
Regina, Sk.,
S4T 4Y6

To: Regina Local Registrar's Office
The Court House
2425 Victoria Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V7

Attention: Mr. Chief Justice Laing

Re: Arlene Lowery v. Government of Saskatchewan et al
Q.B.G. No. 1306 of 2005

Re: Concerns of FIAT of December 01, 2005 and October 16, 2006.

Dear Chief Justice Laing:

This letter is a request for you to review my concerns on the above 2 matters.

Today, I have received from the Registrar's office the return of my Affidavit material which was the new evidence which I had on July 20, 2006, personally requested Justice Chicoine to read over as to its admissibility. Certain parts of his Fiat I am troubled by and wish to bring this to your attention.

Firstly, I wish you to review the Briefs of Law for the 2 applications that I put forward before Justice Chicoine this past Monday, October 16, 2006, 'in light' of my concerns, which are:

1. page one:

Justice Chicoine states:

paragraph one:

“ On December 1, 2005, Mr. Justice Kovach ordered that the Plaintiff's application to amend her claim and to add new parties as well as the defendants' joint motion to strike the statement of claim be adjourned to March 07, 2006.”

Please review what I said in my Brief of Law for Rule 190 concerning the actions of the defendants and Mr. Dauncey, and review with Justice Kovach his original FIAT and my filing of the order on December 23, 2005, and the concerns that arose for myself after that, which are described in this brief.

Please clarify for me the intent of the FIAT of December 01, 2005 given by Justice Kovach; and if Rule 165 to amend my claim was satisfied on December 01, 2005, except for submitting the final amended claim, which I did on March 07, 2006. Dates were moved ahead due to time constraints as described. As per his FIAT the defendants were “to file and serve responses, either amending or filing new” on March 07, 2006 to my “final amended claim”. Instead they

In your letter, page 2, par. 2, you point out that Justice Chicoine declined to read my affidavit of September 15/06 using the same rationale as he did in not reading my affidavit concerning the fresh/new evidence. Yet, this does not make sense since this affidavit was all about my concerns with the registrar and certain of his staff, and what I deemed as unacceptable behavior and blocking my attempts to file documents, and why I was stressed and felt a need to change venue. It was not about these 3 reports. There is one reference to them on page 9, #29. How would Justice Chicoine know the contents of either affidavit in that he refused to read them.

He also states in his Fiat that I have *great confusion between pleadings and evidence*, which is definitely overstated and not backed-up by concrete examples.

The matter of unilaterally contacting Justice Chicoine, occurred right after the acting registrar lied to me in telling me that he could not be reached, and putting me off until next week.

Justice Chicoine mentions in his Fiat that when I spoke with him on July 20th, 2006, that I misunderstood his directives to me, but I claim that I never did. I wrote down what he said to me at the time. He also indicates that I tried him later in the day after speaking with someone (which was the acting registrar) in the morning. I testified that I tried him right after speaking with the registrar (acting), and my telephone record confirms this. These matters may seem trivial, but in a court of law where the truth of everything is key to receiving justice, this is very important.

On August 18, 2006, believing there was an obstruction of justice, I mailed my materials that were sent back to me. I have since apologized and promised not to contact any judge again (unilaterally), but Justice Chicoine felt it noteworthy to indicate this without validating my concerns.

On March 07, 2006 Mr. Justice Chicoine, directed his first comments to me, directing me not to keep everyone there until after 8:00 o'clock p.m. and later when I suggested consolidation of Part Three of this litigation with Q.B.G. 1005 of 2002, due to overlap of issues, he snapped at me stating that he wasn't going to run down to the registrar's office right then to pull the file.

Justice Kovach demonstrated respect to me and I felt listened to and comfortable in a very intimidating arena. He never talked down to me. It is a different story with Justice Chicoine, and the examples I have provided to you cause me concern as to how he will handle the matters he is seized with. Yet, with my faith in God, I chose to believe that truth and justice will prevail in the end.

Once again, thank-you for taking the time to write to me. I realize that one has to pick their battles wisely so for now my pursuit to take leave to appeal will be set aside.

Yours very truly,


Arlene Lowery

cc. file

Sent by facsimile to the Registrar, Mr. Dauncey, for delivery as per cover page.

BRICK #7. Exhibit 10.
SASKATCHEWAN (SOUTHERN)
CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERT LAING addressing Arlene Lowery's concerns-claims
Arlene Lowery's being treated justly.

THE HONOURABLE ROBERT D. LAING
CHIEF JUSTICE, COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH



LAW COURTS, 2425 VICTORIA AVENUE
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN S4P 4W6
PHONE (306) 787-0010
FAX (306) 787-7160

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

October 26, 2006

Ms. Arlene Lowery
1719 Forget Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4T 4Y6

Dear Ms. Lowery:

Re: *Arlene Lowery v. Government of Saskatchewan et al.*
Q.B.G. 1306 of 2005
Concerns of Fiat of Dec. 1/05 and Oct. 16/06

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated October 19, 2006, in which you request clarification on a number of matters raised therein. I have reviewed the portions of the file you have referred me to, and I offer the following comment.

The Fiat of Justice Kovach dated December 1, 2005 was not as happily worded as it could have been (the clerk writes the fiat based on what she understands the judge said), but the intent appears clear to a legally trained person where the Fiat states "She may include the addition of four plaintiffs, but Defendants will argue to validity of adding the additional parties". Once an action has been commenced, neither the plaintiff nor the defendant can join parties to an action without providing the existing parties with an opportunity to make submission with respect to the matter. The Fiat of Justice Kovach dated December 1, 2005, went on to state "All matters shall be argued on the adjourned date of March 7, 2006 @ 2:00 p.m." Following the notice to the parties ordered in the December 1, 2005 Fiat, the matter was argued on its merits on March 7, 2006 for the first time. There is nothing irregular about the manner in which your application was dealt with up to and including the argument on March 7, 2006, which Justice Chicoine reserved.

As far as your comment on Justice Chicoine taking over the file from Justice Kovach, again this is routine on our Court. We are an itinerant Court, meaning that our judges travel to all judicial centres in the province (12). Our Chamber days are fixed in advance. The judge assigned to the chamber day deals with all matters that have been adjourned to that particular day. That is what happened in this matter.

With respect to any misunderstanding as to your ability to unilaterally file materials with the judge after the matter has been argued, I accept you misunderstood what Justice Chicoine said, but the fact is the law requires that no party file materials after the matter has been fully

but they never filed an application or amended anything.

argued unless the other side consents, or unless the Court so orders. I mention the forgoing simply to point out that you were not treated differently than any other party would be treated in attempting to file materials after the fact.

As far as Justice Chicoine declining to read your affidavit that you submitted as part of your application to file "newly discovered documents", Justice Chicoine in his Fiat of October 16, 2006, explains why he did not read it. He indicates the purpose of the affidavit was to comment on the various reports referred to in the Fiat, but that such reports are not relevant to the application you brought to amend your claim and to add new parties. He states on the last page of his Fiat:

already argued Dec. 01/05.

"... The documents which the plaintiff claims should have been disclosed prior to the hearing on March 7, 2006, may indeed be of some evidentiary significance in the trial of the action, but they are not relevant to the issue of whether the statement of claim should be amended, whether new parties should be added or whether the statement of claim should be struck under Rule 173. The same rational applies to the affidavit which the plaintiff wishes to submit dated September 15, 2006, which explains or criticizes the contents of these reports."

Statement of Claim can be amended? It was amended!

where is that p9 #34 critiques/ld

If material is not relevant to the application (even though it may be relevant for other purposes) it is proper for the judge to not consider such irrelevant material.

If in fact it would be irrelevant! Ad.

With respect to your concern about having costs awarded against you for the applications, again, costs are routinely awarded against the party who was unsuccessful in any application. This is what occurred. The costs awarded are "In any event of the cause" which means that you do not have to pay them at this time, but once the litigation is concluded and one party is awarded costs, the costs awarded against you on these applications will be deducted from any costs you are entitled to collect if you are the successful party, and will be payable by you in any event if you are the unsuccessful party. Costs awarded in litigation are what we refer to as "party and party" costs and arise under a fixed tariff appended to the Rules of Court. The tariff of costs very seldom amounts to a complete indemnification of the costs actually incurred in any one application.

In conclusion, you have been treated as every other litigant would be treated in this matter to date whether such litigants are represented by lawyers or not. Hopefully the foregoing assists your understanding.

Yours very truly,

R.D. Laing

RDL:cg

November 03, 2006

ATTENTION: THE HONOURABLE ROBERT D. LAING
CHIEF JUSTICE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
LAW COURTS, 2425 VICTORIA AVENUE
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN S4P 4W6

Dear Mr. Chief Justice Laing:

RE: *Arlene Lowery v. Government of Saskatchewan et al.*

Q.B.G. 1306 of 2005

Concerns of Fiat of Dec. 01, 2005 and Oct. 16, 2006.

Address: 1719 Forget Street,

Regina, Saskatchewan, S4T 4Y6

This correspondence is to acknowledge receipt of your response to my letter to you of October 19, 2006, and to still highlight some concerns I have, but will lay aside for the time being, in that I will withdraw my current application to appeal Justice Chicoine's decision from October 16, 2006.

First, I wish to thank-you for taking the time to write to me about my concerns and provide answers to my questions, and your perspective on other matters.

I now understand that although a judge indicates you can add parties and amend your claim, that if counsel objects it must be argued. I had thought that when there is a judgment, as was the Fiat of October 16, 2006, it could be appealed but never overturned unless successful.

I am still concerned that I ~~was~~ ^{am} about the way my request to have Justice Chicoine look at the admissibility of the fresh evidence was handled from the start. For instance, in your letter on page 2, paragraph 2, I do not understand how Justice Chicoine can comment intelligibly on the fresh evidence I had, its' relevancy to the overall application, when he refuses to even read it. I was hoping that my application under Rule 174 which Justice Chicoine has reserved pending the matter he is seized with, may then be moved forward and it would go to judgment and a trial avoided.

I am disturbed that Justice Chicoine's opinion on my materials appears to be heavily weighted by counsels' opinion. During arguments on October 16th, he does not allow me to comment on the details of my affidavit concerning the fresh evidence because he has not read it; yet he allows Mr. Brown for the Attorney General, Government of Saskatchewan to refer to it as "hodgepodge" and discredit it.

In his Fiat he uses words which originated with Mr. Brown to describe my treatment of these reports. What I did was critique these 3 medical reports with the medical knowledge base I had, to make sense of them, and made some troubling discoveries. I realized that her death was preventable if she had been properly taken care of, and the probable cause of death was attributed to the foster mother stopping her medication which likely led to a seizure and her suffocating face-down. Yet, the reports do not add up and the errors in dates, age and other areas indicate gross negligence.

moved forward with their motion to strike my claim. Why was my motion to amend my claim as per Rule 165 even being considered again on March 07, 2006. It is my understanding that the Defendants were to put forth arguments why the Infant Children as Plaintiffs should be removed as they already were added as per Justice Kovach's order of December 01, 2005, as well as the other parties. The burden was on the defendants to convince Justice Kovach as per arguments why the parties should come off (or why his order should change). What happened was that Justice Chicoine took over the case and something got lost here. Why was a new judge assigned and how did this happen?

2. page one: last paragraph:

Justice Chicoine clearly told me to provide my materials to the local registrar and request that they be sent to him. He told me that he would read them over *and he would decide if they should be allowed in or not*. As far as I am concerned there never was any misunderstanding in what he directed me to do.

3. page 4: paragraph 3

Justice Chicoine comments that she 'apparently attempts' to criticize the above noted reports on that same page, and yet he admits that "I have not read the affidavit". He uses the defendants' words of 'apparently attempts' to criticize these reports, when what I did was critique them with the medical knowledge that I have and which was supported by my Exhibits.


These applications were about fairness and this joint hearing and FIAT never provided that. My Affidavit and Exhibits (the 3 reports) were never read or considered, even after Justice Chicoine was provided them in the end before this hearing.

A FIAT should have been rendered in August, 2006, as I had made a verbal application as per Rule 218. I believed my arguments should have been heard as described in my affidavit even if he came to the same decision. If I had not been excluded and if a FIAT had at least been written earlier then these 2 applications would not have occurred.

Under the circumstances I do not accept that I should pay for the costs of these 2 applications, as Justice Chicoine's recollection of what he said to me, and what I recorded that he told me should be considered, as well as the other issues brought forward in my letter.

I will not appeal the judgment that has been rendered, if my request for *the costs of these 2 applications be waived or redirected*. I believe that I should not be penalized for my version of the facts, as to what was said and/or understood.

Yours truly,


Arlene Lowery

cc. file

January 07, 2007

ARLENE LOWERY
1719 FORGET STREET
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN S4T 4Y6

LAW COURTS, 2425 VICTORIA AVENUE
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN S4P 4W6
PHONE (306) 787-0010
FAX (306) 787-7160

**ATTENTION TO: THE HONOURABLE ROBERT D. LAING
CHIEF JUSTICE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH**

RE: JUDICIAL CONCERNS for OGB. 1005 of A.D. 2002 and OGB. 1306 of 2005

Dear Chief Justice Laing:

When I was on the Internet recently, I came across the CANADIAN JUDICIAL COUNCIL STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS AND ACCUSED PERSONS *. In reading it I became more aware of what my responsibilities are and how the court views self-litigants in general and the special challenges we pose to the courts, and duties the courts have to us.

I am now knowledgeable in how to make a complaint about a judge if that ever became necessary, and how to make an application to have a judge removed. I will be doing neither, although I have given it considerable thought due to my concerns of a lack of trust on my part.

I have concerns about Justice Chicoine's ability to be free from biases and the matter of my having called him personally, and challenging his Fiat, if he can maintain his objectivity. I wish to relay these concerns again and therefore I am faxing you a copy of the above letter (which I believe you were in receipt of) along with this letter.

Please note page 2 of that letter, paragraph 4, line 3 with regards to my telephone record, which I have decided to also fax you a copy of, which shows that I did not phone Justice Chicoine later that day as he reported I did, but that it was right after the acting registrar put me off until the next week stating he could not be reached.

If I am challenged as having said or heard something else, I carefully examine this, as it is possible I could have made an error, *but in very important matters, such as with the directives Mr. Justice Chicoine provided to me, and the matters within this lawsuit I take special notes to ensure I do not misunderstand.* Yet, I have nothing to back-up what it is that I heard him tell me to do, to counter his claim of what he told me to do. My word is my bond, but of course the judge's word would go before mine. I had already been reprimanded for this and had promised not to be reactionary and his bringing this matter into his Fiat, served only to assist the acting registrar and counsel, and prejudice me.

Additional concerns I have about the judicial process is that all the materials that I filed with the registrar's office in July and August, 2006, were sent back to me by Mr. Dauncey, with the exceptions of my 2 applications: *to have the venue changed and to allow new evidence in after closing arguments; and* if my appeal had gone forward, these documents I had filed with Mr. Dauncey would not be available to the appeal judge to read and understand the history on this file to date. Missing would be my Affidavit of Service of these documents, my Affidavit and Exhibits to support my application and my letter to him. Justice Chicoine is now the designated judge for both lawsuits. This is what I had wanted from the start, and I am uncertain if he will prejudice me.

I have searched the web for information on judges to see their political alliances. My concerns were heightened when I became aware that Justice Chicoine was appointed by the NDP Attorney General, Chris Axworthy and the Liberal federal counterpart November 2002. His political alliance with the parties that were in power when the damages I am claiming for occurred, makes me wonder how he will handle this, if my last experiences were a test run of what is to come.

One of the reasons I wanted a change of venue out of Regina is because this city is an NDP political stronghold and lawsuit QGB. 1306 is extremely politically sensitive and for sure the defendants want it stricken. To also request a change of the judge seems reasonable, but would never be viewed as such.

Justice Chicoine's strong political alliances made me wonder if he would prejudice me in obtaining a fair access to justice, due to the highly political sensitivity of them. Justice Chicoine is hopefully a man of high moral and ethical integrity, who is intelligent and will be thorough with these lawsuits, as vulnerable children and infants and the participants 'at risk' that the organization served, are counting on it, as well as myself and my husband and grandchildren.

Certain evidence I entered in, was to provide enough validity to my pleadings /claim, due to the very serious and complex nature of them, with the hope they would not be stricken.

In my pursuit of truth and justice I am requesting that you oversee these 2 lawsuits to ensure that fair and equitable treatment is received. For this to occur the areas which I have brought to Justice Chicoine's attention which may be of a criminal nature, need to be carefully examined; as well as those matters which violated our civil /human rights. Examples of possible criminal elements which need to be determined are the theft of a house, illegally disposing of and destroying our possessions, destroying or misappropriating files and records to be used as evidence; tampering with evidence (such as the social worker's case notes being altered or concealed); manipulating evidence such as the videotaping of myself by the police and the laundering of public program funds.

There needs to be an investigation at the judicial level, whereby protected information is read by the judge, such as information that I was privy to of April 10, 2002, when I examined Canadian Heritage documents which were upon receipt of my photocopying order, ~~was~~ now protected. These matter speak to the integrity, or lack thereof, of our governments when dealing with the vulnerable and the public, such as the Plaintiffs in these 2 cases. Truth, accountability and justice are needed for closure. Please ensure that the court uncovers the truth, ensures accountability and renders justice, - for all!

Should these lawsuits proceed to trial, we the Plaintiffs request that you will ensure it is tried by jury. I further request all hearings to be audio-taped, as I believe that the March 07, 2006, hearing was not. Mr. Watson, counsel for Dr. Ivanochko sat near me with a hand-held tape recorder, taping me while I spoke. and I thought this was not allowed unless the court provided permission and the parties were all notified.

Thank-you for considering these concerns and possible avenues to address them. Let me assure you that I will not trouble you with any further concerns but utilize the other recourses available to me, should that be necessary.

Yours very truly,


Arlene Lewer

cc. enclosures pps 5
file

TOTAL pp's faxed 7 pps. - Cover is page one of this letter.
& date sent is January 07th, 2007 @ approx 7:47 pm (19:47)
gd.

My appeal letter to the Hon. Chief Justice of Saskatchewan Mr. John Klebuc to look into all of these matters. He did not respond.

February 08, 2007

This letter was provided to Mr. Herand the registrar for SKCA to forward. Reply was from Chief Justice Klebuc via Mr. Herand that they should deal with this - DEAD END!

**Attention: Chief Justice Klebuc, Province of Saskatchewan
Court of Appeal, Saskatchewan**

Re: Administrative and Unethical and Criminal Concerns of:

QGB. 1306 of 2005 - Arlene Lowery vs. Government of Saskatchewan et al.

**QGB. 1005 of 2002 - Arlene Lowery vs. Directors of The Anchorage
Counselling & Rehabilitation Services Inc. et al.**

Dear Chief Justice Klebuc:

I entered the legal process as a self-litigant out of necessity in February, 2005 and have found the path to receiving justice is often unfair and hard, particularly when you are not a lawyer, and it feels as if the court system takes unfair advantage of that, particularly when 2 of the defendants are the government, and where judges are politically aligned.

To think for a minute that the lawsuit that Justice Chicoine is seized with QGB. 1306 of 2005, since March 06, 2006, would be stricken, was not a concern; now with what has transpired in both lawsuits to date my confidence is waning and this is why I am asking for your assistance.

He is the presiding judge for my other lawsuit, and his Order of January 11, 2007 in which he does not grant me leave to amend my claim and his ruling to not allow the AHF to be added and the difficulties that I have experienced since he has presided over both lawsuits has been troubling. My affidavit in support of my application to appeal, will further address these concerns as well as the attachments.

I promised my 4 grandchildren (and my 5th one who died in care) who are First Nations, that before I left this world I would do my part to help make this world a better and safer place for them to live in, where children would be *safe from abusive, addicted and unsafe caregivers*, where babies in care of Social Services would have a greater survival rate, where there would be rehabilitation programs to help families 'at risk' who were Aboriginal, or who were families like ours, blended, non-Aboriginal / Aboriginal so these legacies no longer control us.

Please help me to keep those promises and ensure that the government becomes transparent and accountable so we, the public, can be privy to the truth and receive justice. Please 'use your power' and do whatever you can to assist me to arrive at the truth and bring me and my family relief.

I have come to these halls of justice seeking truth and justice, and am determined to stay until it has been served, but I need your help and God's to intervene and bring relief as quickly as possible. I pray that God, who is judge of all, will provide you wisdom.

Yours very truly,

Arlene Lowery
Arlene Lowery

cc. Registrar, Appeal Court
Respondents of QGB. 1005 of 2002
Law Society of Saskatchewan
file

To my precious grandchildren & grandbabies & to those who have suffered similar tragedies & injustices (the 'bruised reeds' of our nation) I did my best. God is in all efforts in seeking justice for the vulnerable. - Arlene

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Sadly, another grandbaby Lily died 13 months later as the SK Ministry of Child Protection gave my daughter their role to find a caregiver - totally absurd. If this justice system was just with the death of her baby sister Autumn Starr and provided a Coroner's Inquest which she was denied only to protect the SK Gov't.