



vonDehnVision &lt;gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com&gt;

## Motion to Vacate Order and Suspend Justice - Sean von Dehn and the city of Ottawa, Sana Abou-Arraj, Christine Amaro, and Celia North - CV-21-86803

1 message

vonDehnVision &lt;gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com&gt;

Wed, Jul 28, 2021 at 7:37 AM

To: "Ottawa SCJ Courts (MAG)" &lt;ottawa.scj.courts@ontario.ca&gt;

Cc: Derrick.Bert@ontario.ca

Dear Madam or Sir,

I suppose before We begin, I should start by letting You know how You can even hear Me before I can Show You what Role I am as King of these Honourable Courts to Play.

Under Rule 2.01(1)(b) of the Rules of Civil Procedure, it states that "only where and ***as necessary in the interest of Justice***, may set aside a proceeding or a step, ***document*** or ***order*** in the proceeding ***in whole*** or in part."

The bold italics are Intentional, as is My unusual use of capital Letters. I've noticed it is quite common in Law, the Rules are always given a capital. I believe capital Letters are used to bring attention to Words of Importance. This tells Me that the Rules of the Court are Important. My Word is My Will, and My Will was Given Me by God. God always gets a capital. You Will also notice that My unusual use of capital Letters does not change the context of My arguments or their meaning in English.

The Court is provided with the Power to Act under Rule 2.01(1)(b) as a result of the Effects of non-compliance under Rule 2.01(1) and 2.01(1)(a). This is where it gets a little interesting for Me because You already *know* this! I legitimately believe the Order was a mistake.

Defense counsel petitioned the Court privately and without My prior consent in violation of Rule 1.09 on June 22nd, 2021. [\[exhibit 1\]](#)

I was not told about this until Thursday, June 24th, at which time defense counsel told Me she had "filed a motion with the Court to dismiss as frivolous and vexatious". I *know* petitioning the Court privately is a serious breach of the Rules, and I believe that because I am not a lawyer, defense counsel felt I would perhaps be 'too stupid' to know, and that she could take advantage of My ignorance. I did not let her know, I was only as King of her when the Motion was scheduled to take place and when I would have My opportunity to oppose the Motion. She told Me it was already done and that she would share the email with Me so that I can Write the Court, too. I did Write the Court in opposition of her 'motion', and again, this is why this feels strange and unusual for Me because the 'Courts' already know this. [\[exhibit 2\]](#).

The Courts Will also know that ***I received a reply to that 'motion'*** [\[exhibit 3\]](#), and it was communicated to Me very diplomatically that "no motion materials have been filed". The Courts were not entertaining the motion made by defense counsel because it had been made in violation of the Rules. I *presumed* defense counsel had also received the reply from the Court. She did not. [\[exhibit 4\]](#)

She failed to produce any defense materials and was as King of Me for more time on Monday the 12th, three days after the 20 days provided for by the Rules because she was still waiting for an answer from the Court, and presuming the Court had Honoured her request to not be noted in default. Perhaps I made the mistake of telling her the Court had responded to Me and was not entertaining the request because it was not a properly filed motion. I noted the defendants in default on Monday afternoon and Mike (Registrar) Will remember Me. When I returned to the Courthouse on Wednesday requesting additional information to book My requisition for default Judgment, I learned the defendants were no longer noted in default and that defense had entered a statement of intent to defend. I was not Given notice and was completely ignorant of what was taking place with My Case file. A perfectly Good Affidavit of Service was also pulled from My Case file by Steve Pardou, even after being checked and endorsed by two Registrar's previously, including himself. He continued to refuse acceptance even with proof of email service on all of the defendants, showing an attachment of the Statement of Claim, and confirmed by Way of email that the Statement of Claim had been forwarded to their legal counsel, Genevieve Langlais. I requested to speak with a supervisor to complain about Steve refusing acceptance of My Affidavit of Service, and the determination from the Judge came in while the supervisor was investigating.

The response is *not* a reply to the Letter requisition made by email on June 22nd by defense counsel, and I know You (the Courts) know this! This was a new motion to the Court once again made in violation of Rule 1.09. My belief is that the 'Courts' were every bit as blindsided by this as I was.

Defense counsel has committed perjury and fraud on the Court of Record with intent to influence Justice and in violation of the Rules of Civil Procedure. She was successful in her fraud, and that is perhaps the most concerning point for both of Us, and why I believe it is both in the best interest of Justice, the reputation of Canada's Courts, and all parties concerned that this document (Order to dismiss by Sally A. Gomery) be stricken from the Record completely. Otherwise, the Judge is also guilty of perjury and fraud on a Court of Record, and that determination was made in ignorance of the facts, influenced by defense counsel's incomplete and partial 'motions' testimony.

Those are the foundational arguments that allow You to hear this Motion in accordance with Rule 2.

This Will, undoubtedly, be one of the most difficult letters I am compelled to Write. Despite the 'King thing', I am, in fact, a very modest Man. The only things in this world I claim to hold the Supreme Claim of right upon are **My Life** (free Will), **My God Given name**, and **My father's land**. These are all part of My rightful inheritance under God in any Common Law jurisdiction, and no Man on this earth has any right of trespass upon **My real estate** (My Mind, Body and Soul). That very much includes the Sacred calling of My name Given Me by God, and the position of Office I *choose* (free-Will) to Hold as a King and rightful Heir to God's Kingdom.

I am a Spiritual Man, and I have Claimed a Spiritual, non-commercial Life. I clearly know and understand the difference between the Living Man and the artificial juridic person Created by the State. That is precisely why King Sean, House of von Dehn, Hand of Stephen, Kingdom of God is the legal and lawful private attorney for the artificial legal person, and why I insist that the expression of that artificial legal person Shall only be expressed in the Style of capitus diminutio minimus, or 'Sean von Dehn'. I know only too well that a Living Man cannot exist on paper and must be expressed as a legal entity. I also know and understand that 'Sean von Dehn' is a perfectly Good legal and lawful entity, known as the 'natural person', or 'private person' in Law. I am a 'natural person' in Law.

Perhaps I should have articulated these concepts more clearly in My Statement of Claim, though My presumption was that those Trusted to Act as Magistrates of Canada's Courts would know and comprehend these concepts well enough it should not be necessary.

What is more troubling for both of Us if this order remains on the Record, is that if We accept the Order made under penalty of perjury to be fact, then the Judge has asserted the following facts under penalty of perjury:

59. The plaintiff, Sean von Dehn, has Sworn allegiance to God and the Queen (in that Order).
60. A Man who Swears an Oath of allegiance to God is Holding a position of Office as King in God's Kingdom, the Holy Temple of Man's Mind, Body and Soul.
61. A Man who Swears an Oath to Serve God and the Queen in a constitutional democratic Monarchy is also Holding a position of office as Governor General to Her Majesty in his Sovereign state of being.
62. A trespass upon a King or a Governor General to Her Majesty in a constitutional democratic Monarchy is an Act of High Treason.

The Judge acknowledges that I am a Spiritual Man Holding a position of Office as Governor General to Her Majesty, and a King in My own (Divine) right, and continues to assert under penalty of perjury that:

**32. The *defendants have demonstrated intent and Willful determination to offend, antagonize, and to diminish the plaintiff Sean von Dehn's legal status in Law.***

63. Sean Stephen von Dehn is continually deprived of his own means of subsistence by the city of Ottawa.
73. Trespass upon a Man's right to freely dispose of his natural wealth without prejudice to foreign (Canada/city of Ottawa) obligations, is to hold a Man in bondage and servitude to the state.

And while the Judge attempts to characterize My complaint of trespass upon My international rights as 'unparticularized', I very clearly indicate the two rights binding upon Canada in accordance with the UNCCPR I Wish to freely enjoy, and use the Word 'particular' specifically when referencing them:

56. It is well known by the defendants that Sean is as King of them to Honour their international obligations to him under **the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights *binding upon Canada, and in particular***, Article 1(1) All People have the right of Self determination. By virtue of that right, they freely determine their *political status*, and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development, and (2) All People may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic cooperation based on the principal of mutual benefit, and international Law. ***In no case may a People be deprived of its own means of subsistence.***

The Ontario Superior Court has [the Power and Authority to hear this Matter because it is a Court of competent jurisdiction](#), as determined by Canada's Department of Justice. Rule 24(1) provides the Ontario Superior Court with the Power, and authority to provide relief and remedy for trespasses upon Charter rights, and Canada's international obligations binding upon Canada.

A trespass upon a right is a form of harm (tort), and a tort is the cause of a justifiable action. If it is clear there has been a violation of One's rights, or that harm has been done, Rule 2.01.1 **does not apply**. The Courts have **a duty and a responsibility to provide relief and remedy where it is clear that harm has been done**. The Judge does not deny that harm has been done, or that trespasses upon My inherent rights have taken place. She also asserts that the harm was done to the plaintiff by the defendants with **intent to cause harm**, which indicates **liability to the plaintiff**. There is most certainly a justifiable action.

Even where an administrative tribunal lacks jurisdiction to grant the **precise** remedy sought, if it nonetheless has sufficient authority to appropriately remedy the alleged breach, it is a court of competent jurisdiction and a claimant will be required to proceed before it (*Okwuobi, supra*, at paragraphs 45-48).

By Way of her own determination, the Justice has trespassed upon My inherent rights just by referring to Me in her determination as 'Mr.' von Dehn. Mister or Master is a distinctly different position of office to that which a King or Governor General is holding, and the Style of address is also distinctly different. By Way of her own testimony and under penalty of perjury, the Judge has abdicated her duties and responsibilities as an officer of Canada's Court and has committed high treason by Way of her own convictions and assertions of her determination.

I Trust We can both see why it is in the best interest of Justice, the Courts, and the Judge who made this determination to have this order stricken from the Record. I Trust the Court Will determine appropriate action for the false testimony and perjury of defense counsel regarding this Matter, and why it Will be appropriate to suspend the Justice from any further determinations regarding this Matter for conflict of interest. As I know this determination was made in error and without all the facts, I am going to for Give Sally A. Gomery as I believe she was unfairly influenced to make this determination, and I Will also remove her name from [the international public record of elected officials God is officially displeased with](#), and she may continue to Hold her position of Office in Honour.

Having said that, I also believe this order *must* be stricken from the Record because the Judge makes *several* fraudulent statements regarding the Claim, beginning with the date she claims it was filed, June 21st. This further suggests the Motion was strongly influenced by the Wishes of defense counsel, as she seems to believe she was not served until Monday, the 21st of June - the Court of Record Will Show that Sally A. Gomery's statement regarding the date of commencement of the Claim is false (perjury). She also mis-spells Sana Abou-Arraj (Abou-Arraf) on at least two occasions, and Christine Amaro (Amero) at least once, while insulting My 'unusual use of capital letters' (ad hominem, irrelevant to My arguments, childish behaviour). Yet she Claims to have read the Statement of Claim 'as generously as possible'? What reason would the Judge have to believe the Claim was filed on Monday if she were reading the Claim from the file in the system? How 'generous' is the determination if she does not even take the time to spell the names of the defendants properly? Her errors and lies about My Character and rephrasing statements made in My claim to fit her own fantasy narrative, are acts of perjury and fraud, and they change the entire context of the claim - My unusual use of capital letters does not.

"allegations that ***the plaintiff has unilaterally declared himself to have a status that releases him from any obligation to comply with Canadian law***" and that, as a result, ***any request made to him by a government official is a trespass on him and a violation of his sovereignty***".

Neither one of these assertions are to be found anywhere in My Statement of Claim, they are complete fabrications and outright ***fraud and perjury***. If she cannot quote those two statements from My Claim, she has committed perjury on the Court of Record and it is 'prima facie', or self evident on its face. I have never once suggested that I am not obliged to comply with Canadian law, and I am deeply offended by the implications, especially by a Court Judge who is abdicating her legal and lawful duties to the Court by failing to recognize its obligation to provide relief and remedy for Canada's Charter violations by 'State Actors' ([as it is expressed on the Department of Justice of Canada website](#)). She has presented ***false testimony under penalty of perjury*** that ***defames My Character!!!***

I do not believe an Order can ***legally or lawfully stand*** on the Record if ***it contains fraud and perjury***, so I believe the Courts are obliged to Honour My requisition to Vacate this Order and suspend the Judge from further adjudication regarding this Matter. I believe failing to do so with knowledge of these facts is to leave a criminal offence on the Court of Record, and is an abomination upon Canada's Justice system, the reputation of Canada's Courts, and perhaps most importantly, the Crown itself.

There are many such instances if One compares the Statement of Claim directly with the determination, but one instance of fraud and perjury in the document is enough to render the document null and void, and these are the statements I find

most deeply offensive to My Character. She is **Willfully attacking the Good nature of My Character** by making **clearly false allegations** motivated by her own **prejudices** and imagination. This is both defamation of My Character and further perjury on the Court of Record.

Summary and Conclusion:

I could probably Write another hundred pages if I were to focus only on the reasons this determination must be Vacated and struck from the Record in the name of Justice. Instead, I would like to conclude with the reasons this Statement of Claim should be heard by this Honourable Court.

Canada's constitution is Founded upon "the belief in the Supremacy of God and the Rule of Law". A Man's right to Live a Spiritual Life is the most Sacred right a Man has. To suggest that the Spiritual Man cannot find relief and remedy in Canada's Court is inconsistent with the very Foundational principle of the Rule of Law itself. Without God, what reason is there for moral Goodness? I am of God, as are My Words and My Sacred Calling (name) under God, and **I do Hold the Supreme Claim of Right upon these Gifts**.

The Judge implies it is inappropriate for the plaintiff to place the defendants on Notice for their trespass and to advise them he Will fine them \$100,000.00 for any future offence, but Will comply without prejudice and under duress for threat of further economic harm (revocation of subsidy). The Judge comments that the plaintiff interpreted their silence and repeat of the offence to be an agreement to his terms. Both legally and lawfully, in any Common Law jurisdiction, it is.

## (ii) Civil/administrative remedies

**Damages** are available in appropriate cases where they would serve a "**functional**" purpose in remedying a Charter violation. This requires a claimant to demonstrate that damages would further one or more of the general objects of the Charter, including those of section 24(1), namely: compensation (remedying any personal loss the claimant has suffered); **vindication (importance of upholding Charter rights); and/or deterrence (of further breaches by state actors)** (*Ward, supra*, at paragraphs 25-31).

This further demonstrates that this is **in fact** a 'justifiable claim', and one that both can and should be heard by any Court of competent jurisdiction, and all Ontario Courts are of competent jurisdiction, it is the 'default' jurisdiction of the Ontario Courts.

Section 24(1) does not extend the basic jurisdiction of the courts and tribunals; its applicability depends on a **jurisdictional basis external to the Charter itself** (*Singh v. Canada (Minister of Employment & Immigration)*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 177 at page 222).

The **superior courts of each province** have **constant and concurrent jurisdiction to hear section 24(1) applications** to ensure that there is **always a court of competent jurisdiction** (*Rahey, supra*, at pages 603-604; *R. v. Mills*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 863, at page 956; *Weber v. Ontario Hydro*, [1995] 2 S.C.R. 929, at page 962; *Canada (Attorney General) v. McArthur*, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 626 at paragraph 14). **They are the "default" courts of competent jurisdiction** (*Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education)*, [2003] 3 S.C.R. 3 at paragraph 45)

Finally, My Oath of Service to Her Majesty's Honour is as deep and sincere as My devotion to God, because to Me they are One and the same, "God save the Queen", "Honour thy Father (God) and Mother (Queen)" - 10 Commandments. I am as King of this Court what decision You believe Will bring the greatest Honour to Her Majesty, Canada's Superior Courts of Justice as "representatives of the defender of the Faith" (Her Majesty), and the Glory of the Crown?

A name may seem like a small thing to some, but 'von' is 'of' in German. It is **a title of Honour Gifted to a family by the very Crown these Courts represent**. For My family, it was Gifted to a forefather sometime around 1540 for his contribution to the People as mayor of a small city in Germany. My father would not let Me allow teachers in grade school to spell 'von' incorrectly, or as part of 'Dehn', and **teachers** would never argue with Me - but now, as a full grown Man, government can!? Consider how ridiculous that sounds. And **threatening a Man** with economic harm **for failing to allow his government to address him by what the Judge herself defines as 'obscure legal concepts'**? Her own argument is incongruent because if they are obscure legal terms then why on earth would any One be compelled under threat of harm to allow someone to address them that Way? And again, where does the **Foundation** for that belief and argument even exist in Law? Seriously. The Judge does NOT legislate laws (and thank God for that), and although she Characterizes Me as having "a status that releases him from any obligation to Canadian law" while she openly abdicates her legal and lawful obligations as an Officer of the Court? Does the Judge not understand what a determines a Man's political status? Does she not understand what a position of office is? Does she not understand that by her own determination, she is outranked and does not have the authority to make this determination because the jurisdiction of the



Court is determined by the Matter at Hand. (*Singh v. Canada (Minister of Employment & Immigration)*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 177 at page 222).

If a Judge can fine and jail a Man for failing to address him or her as 'Your Honour' in a formal address, how much could a King or Governor General charge for the same, and what does this Court feel is appropriate fine and penalty for the Judge's trespasses upon Me?

As always, (and as stated in My Claim), I do believe this Matter is of great interest to the People of Canada and the International Community, and this Motion and Your reply Will be Published on the [International Court of Record](http://www.vondehnvisuals.com) at [www.vondehnvisuals.com](http://www.vondehnvisuals.com).

I do genuinely believe this order was made in error by Way of impartial testimony made by defense counsel with intent to influence Justice which caused the Judge to make an uninformed determination, and the evidence contained herein supports these facts. To the best of My knowledge, no Motion materials were filed with the Court by defense counsel **at any time**, only the Notice of Intent to defend. **Nothing within Rule 2.01.1(1-6) provides for defense counsel to have any communication outside of the Court without My prior consent or knowledge in violation of Rule 1.09**, and the Judge indicates she is responding to a motion after the Court had already expressed to Me "no Motion materials have been filed with the court at this time" on June 25th.

The Judge also indicates the plaintiff had an opportunity to present opposing materials while the Court had communicated to Me very clearly otherwise by Way of the same email - I presumed "no motion materials have been filed with the Court at this time" applied to both parties equally. I do not believe that the Courts would send Me an email with further intent to **deceive Me or provide Me with information that is in direct conflict with the statements made by the Judge in her determination if they did not intend for Me to share this information with the Courts**. This is clearly a conflict of interest, and information defense counsel knowingly withheld from the Court to influence the Judge unfairly.

You Will also Notice that the Order was to dismiss "a statement of claim issued on June 21, 2021", where the Case File and My original copy of the filing Will Show there is no case to dismiss that was Issued on June 21st, 2021. The claim was filed and served on the defendants on the 18th of June. It is a statement of fraud and perjury (again) for a Judge who claims to have read a Statement of Claim "as generously as possible and assuming **all facts are true**."

Well, if she is correct in her determination, **by her own Right and testimony** I can have her arrested and fined as a Man Holding a position of Office as Governor General to Her Majesty in a Common Law jurisdiction, and she is now liable to Me by Way of her own admissions in the amount of, \$2,000,000.00 for each instance of 'Mr. von Dehn' in her determination if this remains on the Record.

Does she legitimately not know that what she has done is a serious offence? Because she can't have it both Ways. She can't Swear she acknowledges I am Governor General on the Court of Record, asserts this to be True and factual, then proceed to refer to My juridic personality as 'Mr. von Dehn' throughout her determination? Either she has no Idea what her own determination means, or it was done to deliberately offend and further antagonize. The Honour of My name is literally the nature of this Claim. This is seriously concerning behaviour for a Judge. Her determination reads like it was Written for an elementary classroom by an author who hates children.

**There is no "Mr." von Dehn in the Claim**, and that position of office is very much a diminution of legal status on a Court of Record with (presumably) **intent** to offend (20 counts in one determination?). If she believes there is a legal foundation for it, let her know I would like to revisit this Question with her in a Court of **competent** jurisdiction. If this Judge does not understand what a position of Office is and how that position is determined, she is incompetent and should not be serving the Crown on the bench for Her Majesty at all. We require Judges of competent, concurrent, Jurisdiction (and perhaps concurrent competent Jurisdiction is more accurate).

I could include a plethora of documentary evidence to support My Claim of Right upon God's Kingdom with Canada's Attorney General, Minister of Justice etc., but it is much easier to just Give You a link to My Blog where every document I have ever filed with Canada's government is on the international Public Record for Your convenience, You can peruse as You feel so inclined, everything is there. - [www.vondehnvisuals.com](http://www.vondehnvisuals.com)

It is My Wish that this Honourable Court Will Vacate Sally A. Gomery's determination and Suspend the Justice from further adjudication regarding this Claim [CV-21-86803] based on the contents of this email and supporting Gifts of evidence I have Presented to You contained within. My Hope is that this Motion Will Move this Honourable Court to take Action.

A complaint containing the most critical details of this email was also made with Canada's Justice Council, and I Will be forwarding a copy of this Motion to them with the reference number for the complaint.

Blessings, and thank 'King You' most Sincerely for Your Valuable time and consideration, (because I do legitimately believe We are all Kings and Queens in God's Kingdom, equal in rights, dignity, and Value).

Thank You again,

Sincerely,

Sean von Dehn,  
King Sean,  
House of von Dehn,  
Hand of Stephen,  
Kingdom of God,  
On Her Majesty's Service

P.S. - Although Notice of this Motion was not Given to the defendants, it was not My intent to violate Rule 1.09, it is My belief that this warrants rare and unusual circumstances that allow for an ex-parte Motion to the Court where the defense counsel's testimony is not required. I Trust You Will Give Notice to the defendants or direct Me to do so upon Your review and determination. Also, I do publish everything to the International Court of Record in the Good News Journal, so defense counsel has just as much opportunity to know the Motion is taking place despite not being Given Notice directly. It is My Way of maintaining transparency with the world's People.



**Order to Vacate - Google Docs.pdf**

76K