

The GREATEST RIGHT Victoria has is to DEFEND her RIGHTS to Justice (Common Law), Remedy (due process) and Redress (to make whole) for what Jim Cutting, “BC HRT Tribunal”, “BC Attorney General”, “Victoria PD”, “City of Victoria” and “Township of Esquimalt” did to violate her Common Law rights which are her HUMAN RIGHTS! Victoria KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT HER HUMAN RIGHTS ARE! SHE WILL NOT ALLOW witches TO DENY HER RIGHT TO HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS IN REDRESS FOR BLATANT VIOLATIONS because BC “PUBLIC SERVANTS” HATE HER, REFUSE TO ACCOMMODATE/SERVE HER=A VIOLATION OF HER HUMAN RIGHTS! BC HRT evildoers DO NOT UNDERSTAND BC’s HUMAN RIGHTS CODE http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96210_01! HAVE THE “BC HRT” coven UNDERSTOOD the code? Now BC HRT is GOING TO BE FORCED BY THEIR VICTIM VICTORIA to compensate HER for their on purpose malicious injury to her dignity, feelings and self respect! FOR THEIR CONTINUAL LIES DENYING HER FOR VIOLATIONS OF HER HUMAN RIGHTS TO PURPOSELY CAUSE TRAUMA, LOSS, HARM, DAMAGE to Victoria, a Woman in need of protection! Protection from the+weeds who pretend to be “BC HRT”, Persons In Govt at large and the whole of society.

Do “BC HRT” understand Jim Cutting maliciously publicized Victoria falsely as a “prostitute” (defamation=severe mistreat) to “expose her to hatred and contempt” resulting her being sexually harassed & continually sexually solicited? VIOLATIONS of VICTORIA’S HUMAN RIGHTS as written!

Discriminatory publication

7 (1) A person must not publish, issue or display, or cause to be published, issued or displayed, any statement, publication, notice, sign, symbol, emblem or other representation that

(a) indicates discrimination or an intention to discriminate against a person or a group or class of persons, or

(b) is likely to expose a person or a group or class of persons to hatred or contempt

because of the race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or age of that person or that group or class of persons.

Do “BC HRT” coven understand every PIG=Person In Govt who did nothing for years about what Jim Cutting was doing to Victoria including the BC HRT is violating Victoria’s Human Rights for the act of discrimination in accommodation, service and facility?

Discrimination in accommodation, service and facility

8 (1) A person must not, without a bona fide and reasonable justification,

(a) deny to a person or class of persons any accommodation, service or facility customarily available to the public, or

(b) discriminate against a person or class of persons regarding any accommodation, service or facility customarily available to the public

because of the race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or age of that person or class of persons.

CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law:

EQUALITY RIGHTS

Marginal note: Equality before and under law and equal protection and benefit of law

• **15. (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.**

Victoria has THE SAME RIGHT under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to remedy and redress offered by other Canadian “*Human Rights Tribunals*” in the sum of hundreds of thousands as other Women have been awarded after subjection to sever mistreatment, sexual harassment and solicitation.

“In 2015, two temporary foreign workers who were severely mistreated and sexually harassed were awarded \$200,000 in damages. In 2018, a retail worker was awarded \$200,000 in damages for sexual harassment and solicitation by her employer.” <https://business.financialpost.com/opinion/ontario-human-rights-tribunal-orders-employer-to-pay-120000-in-damages-to-worker-it-didnt-even-hire>

According to above Human Rights cases Jim Cutting severely mistreated, sexually harassed and opened a door for others to sexually harass and solicit Victoria for prostitution services she never offered via his ONLINE defamation of her character is due \$300,000 in damages from criminal Jim Cutting for his on purpose malicious injury to her dignity, feelings and self respect. Jim Cutting can definitely afford to pay \$300,000 to Victoria in redress out of his personal financial wealth.

Truth is only Victoria’s race, cultural heritage and ethic identity understand+justice. Proverbs 28:5 Evil people do not know what justice is, but those who worship Common Law understand everything. Truth is under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Victoria is due the equivalent of Victoria BC resident Chris Hughes for violations of his Human Rights by federal govt “public service” agencies. Chris Hughes is due 2 million for harm inflicted to his life as a result of discrimination. For more information on Chris Hughes see <https://www.coastmountainnews.com/news/victoria-man-wins-record-breaking-human-rights-tribunal-case/>. “BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL”, “BC ATTORNEY GENERAL” (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono), “Victoria PD”, “City of Victoria”, “Township of Esquimalt” have treated Victoria with the same discrimination as Chris Hughes faced therefore the named “BC govt public service” agencies collectively owe Victoria 2 million for their on purpose malicious injury to her dignity, feelings and self respect by their refusal of service allowing the indictable crimes of Jim Cutting to continue for years against Victoria who is a Woman in need of protection.

What Victoria is due for violations of her Human Rights is non-negotiable in this case as the evidence is overwhelming, cannot be argued, refuted or denied.

GUILTY GUILTY GUILTY HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATORS Jim Cutting, “BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL”, “BC ATTORNEY GENERAL” (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono,), “Victoria PD”, “City of Victoria”, “Township of Esquimalt” for

REFUSING to “serve and protect” Victoria who is a Woman in need of protection due to her race, status, cultural heritage and ethnic identity despite her repeatedly contacting “PIGS” demanding JUSTICE, REMEDY & REDRESS to be discriminated against by their refusal to serve her.

Superior court of criminal jurisdiction

468 Every superior (**Common Law**) court of criminal jurisdiction has jurisdiction to try any indictable offence.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 426.

Parties to offence BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt Criminal Code Sec.

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 BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

(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

Person counselling offence BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew

Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

22 (1) Where a person counsels another person to be a party to an offence and that other person is afterwards a party to that offence, the person who counselled is a party to that offence, notwithstanding that the offence was committed in a way different from that which was counselled

Idem BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

(2) Every one who counsels another person to be a party to an offence is a party to every offence that the other commits in consequence of the counselling that the person who counselled knew or ought to have known was likely to be committed in consequence of the counselling.

Definition of counsel

(3) For the purposes of this Act, *counsel* includes procure, solicit or incite.
R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 22; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (1st Supp.), s. 7

Attempts BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

24 (1) Every one who, having an intent to commit an offence, does or omits to do anything for the purpose of carrying out the intention is guilty of an attempt to commit the offence whether or not it was possible under the circumstances to commit the offence.

Breach of trust by public officer BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

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. C-34, s. 111.

Disobeying a statute **BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL** (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

126 (1) Every one who, without lawful excuse, contravenes an Act of Parliament by wilfully doing anything that it forbids or by wilfully omitting to do anything that it requires to be done is, unless a punishment is expressly provided by law, guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

Common nuisance **Jim Cutting, BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL** (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

180 (1) Every one who commits a common nuisance and thereby

(a) endangers the lives, safety or health of the public, or

(b) causes physical injury to any person,
is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

Definition **Jim Cutting, BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL** (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

(2) For the purposes of this section, every one commits a common nuisance who does an unlawful act or fails to discharge a legal duty and thereby

(a) endangers the lives, safety, health, property or comfort of the public;
or

(b) obstructs the public in the exercise or enjoyment of any right that is common to all the subjects of Her Majesty in Canada.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 176.

Spreading false news **JIM CUTTING is GUILTY**

181 Every one who wilfully publishes a statement, tale or news that he knows is false and that causes or is likely to cause injury or mischief to a public interest is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 177.

Criminal negligence **BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL** (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono,), **Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt**

219 (1) Every one is criminally negligent who

(a) in doing anything, or

(b) in omitting to do anything that it is his duty to do, shows wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons.

Definition of *duty*

(2) For the purposes of this section, duty means a duty imposed by law.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 202.

Criminal harassment **Jim Cutting is GUILTY**

264 (1) No person shall, without lawful authority and knowing that another person is harassed or recklessly as to whether the other person is harassed, engage in conduct referred to in subsection (2) that causes that other person reasonably, in all the circumstances, to fear for their safety or the safety of anyone known to them.

Prohibited conduct

(2) The conduct mentioned in subsection (1) consists of

(a) repeatedly following from place to place the other person or anyone known to them;

(b) repeatedly communicating with, either directly or indirectly, the other person or anyone known to them;

(c) besetting or watching the dwelling-house, or place where the other person, or anyone known to them, resides, works, carries on business or happens to be; or

(d) engaging in threatening conduct directed at the other person or any member of their family.

Punishment

(3) Every person who contravenes this section is guilty of

(a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years; or

(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Defamatory Libel **Jim Cutting is GUILTY**

Definition

298 (1) A defamatory libel is matter published, without lawful justification or excuse, that is likely to injure the reputation of any person by exposing him to hatred, contempt or ridicule, or that is designed to insult the person of or concerning whom it is published.

Mode of expression

(2) A defamatory libel may be expressed directly or by insinuation or irony

(a) in words legibly marked on any substance; or

(b) by any object signifying a defamatory libel otherwise than by words.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 262.

Publishing

299 A person publishes a libel when he

(a) exhibits it in public;

(b) causes it to be read or seen; or

(c) shows or delivers it, or causes it to be shown or delivered, with intent that it should be read or seen by any person other than the person whom it defames.

R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 299; 2018, c. 29, s. 31.

Punishment of libel known to be false

300 Every one who publishes a defamatory libel that he knows is false is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 264.

Punishment for defamatory libel

301 Every one who publishes a defamatory libel is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 265.

Advocating genocide Jim Cutting, BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono), Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

318 (1) Every one who advocates or promotes genocide is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

Definition of *genocide*

(2) In this section, ***genocide*** means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part any identifiable group, namely,

(a) murdering members of the group; or

(b) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction.

Consent

(3) No proceeding for an offence under this section shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General **UNLESS THE CORRUPT BC ATTORNEY GENERAL IS GUILTY AND DAVID EBY IS GUILTY IN THIS MATTER.**

Definition of *identifiable group*

(4) In this section, identifiable group means any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or mental or physical disability.

R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 318; 2004, c. 14, s. 1; 2014, c. 31, s. 12; 2017, c. 13, s. 3.

Intimidation **VILE Victoria PD PIGS GUILTY of Intimidation of Victoria**

423 (1) Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than five years or is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction who, wrongfully and without lawful authority, for the purpose of compelling another person to abstain from doing anything that he or she has a lawful right to do, or to do anything that he or she has a lawful right to abstain from doing,

(a) uses violence or threats of violence to that person or his or her spouse or common-law partner or children, or injures his or her property;

(b) intimidates or attempts to intimidate that person or a relative of that person by threats that, in Canada or elsewhere, violence or other injury will be done to or punishment inflicted on him or her or a relative of his or hers, or that the property of any of them will be damaged;

(c) persistently follows that person;

(d) hides any tools, clothes or other property owned or used by that person, or deprives him or her of them or hinders him or her in the use of them;

Mischief **Jim Cutting, BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL** (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the

Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt GUILTY of interrupting Victoria's enjoyment and operation of property=her business

430 (1) Every one commits mischief who wilfully

- (a)** destroys or damages property;
- (b)** renders property dangerous, useless, inoperative or ineffective;
- (c)** obstructs, interrupts or interferes with the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property; or
- (d)** obstructs, interrupts or interferes with any person in the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property.

Punishment

(2) Every one who commits mischief that causes actual danger to life is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life.

Punishment

(3) Every one who commits mischief in relation to property that is a testamentary instrument or the value of which exceeds five thousand dollars

- (a)** is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years; or
- (b)** is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Idem

(4) Every one who commits mischief in relation to property, other than property described in subsection (3),

- (a)** is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or
- (b)** is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Conspiracy DEFAMATION OF CHARACTER IS MURDER Jim Cutting, BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL, BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono, Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt ALL GUILTY OF CONSPIRACY

465 (1) Except where otherwise expressly provided by law, the following provisions apply in respect of conspiracy:

(a) every one who conspires with any one to commit murder or to cause another person to be murdered, whether in Canada or not, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a maximum term of imprisonment for life;

(b) every one who conspires with any one to prosecute a person for an alleged offence, knowing that he did not commit that offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable

(i) to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years, if the alleged offence is one for which, on conviction, that person would be liable to be sentenced to imprisonment for life or for a term not exceeding fourteen years, or

(ii) to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, if the alleged offence is one for which, on conviction, that person would be liable to imprisonment for less than fourteen years;

(c) every one who conspires with any one to commit an indictable offence not provided for in paragraph (a) or (b) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to the same punishment as that to which an accused who is guilty of that offence would, on conviction, be liable; and

(d) every one who conspires with any one to commit an offence punishable on summary conviction is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Definitions

467.1 (1) The following definitions apply in this Act.

criminal organization means a group, however organized, that

(a) is composed of three or more persons in or outside Canada; and

(b) has as one of its main purposes or main activities the facilitation or commission of one or more serious offences that, if committed, would likely result in the direct or indirect receipt of a material benefit, including a financial benefit, by the group or by any of the persons who constitute the group.

It does not include a group of persons that forms randomly for the immediate commission of a single offence. (*organisation criminelle*)

serious offence means an indictable offence under this or any other Act of Parliament for which the maximum punishment is imprisonment for five years or more, or another offence that is prescribed by regulation. (*infraction grave*)

Facilitation

(2) For the purposes of this section, section 467.11 and 467.111, facilitation of an offence does not require knowledge of a particular offence the commission of which is facilitated, or that an offence actually be committed.

Commission of offence

(3) In this section and in sections 467.11 to 467.13, committing an offence means being a party to it or counselling any person to be a party to it.

Regulations

(4) The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing offences that are included in the definition serious offence in subsection (1).

1997, c. 23, s. 11; 2001, c. 32, s. 27; 2014, c. 17, s. 8.

Participation in activities of criminal organization BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL "PUBLIC SERVANTS" GUILTY BY OMISSION, PARTICIPATION and CONTRIBUTION TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF THESE CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono), Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

467.11 (1) Every person who, for the purpose of enhancing the ability of a criminal organization to facilitate or commit an indictable offence under this or any other Act of Parliament, knowingly, by act or omission, participates in or contributes to any activity of the criminal organization is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

Prosecution

(2) In a prosecution for an offence under subsection (1), it is not necessary for the prosecutor to prove that

- (a)** the criminal organization actually facilitated or committed an indictable offence;
- (b)** the participation or contribution of the accused actually enhanced the ability of the criminal organization to facilitate or commit an indictable offence;
- (c)** the accused knew the specific nature of any indictable offence that may have been facilitated or committed by the criminal organization; or
- (d)** the accused knew the identity of any of the persons who constitute the criminal organization.

Factors

(3) In determining whether an accused participates in or contributes to any activity of a criminal organization, the Court may consider, among other factors, whether the accused

- (a)** uses a name, word, symbol or other representation that identifies, or is associated with, the criminal organization;
- (b)** frequently associates with any of the persons who constitute the criminal organization;
- (c)** receives any benefit from the criminal organization; or
- (d)** repeatedly engages in activities at the instruction of any of the persons who constitute the criminal organization. 2001, c. 32, s. 27.

Recruitment of members by a criminal organization

467.111 Every person who, for the purpose of enhancing the ability of a criminal organization to facilitate or commit an indictable offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, recruits, solicits, encourages, coerces or invites a person to join the criminal organization, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable,

(a) in the case where the person recruited, solicited, encouraged or invited is under 18 years of age, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of six months; and

(b) in any other case, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

2014, c. 17, s. 9.

Commission of offence for criminal organization

467.12 (1) Every person who commits an indictable offence under this or any other Act of Parliament for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with, a criminal organization is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years.

Prosecution

(2) In a prosecution for an offence under subsection (1), it is not necessary for the prosecutor to prove that the accused knew the identity of any of the persons who constitute the criminal organization.

2001, c. 32, s. 27.

Instructing commission of offence for criminal organization BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL "PUBLIC SERVANTS" GUILTY BY OMISSION, PARTICIPATION and CONTRIBUTION TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF THESE CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS BC ATTORNEY GENERAL (is 100% responsible for BAR member Andrew Broadley, the Law Centre, Access Pro Bono), Victoria PD, City of Victoria, Township of Esquimalt

467.13 (1) Every person who is one of the persons who constitute a criminal organization and who knowingly instructs, directly or indirectly, any person to commit an offence under this or any other Act of Parliament for the benefit

of, at the direction of, or in association with, the criminal organization is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life.

Prosecution

(2) In a prosecution for an offence under subsection (1), it is not necessary for the prosecutor to prove that

(a) an offence other than the offence under subsection (1) was actually committed;

(b) the accused instructed a particular person to commit an offence; or

(c) the accused knew the identity of all of the persons who constitute the criminal organization.

2001, c. 32, s. 27.

Sentences to be served consecutively

467.14 A sentence imposed on a person for an offence under section 467.11, 467.111, 467.12 or 467.13 shall be served consecutively to any other punishment imposed on the person for an offence arising out of the same event or series of events and to any other sentence to which the person is subject at the time the sentence is imposed on the person for an offence under any of those sections.

2001, c. 32, s. 27; 2014, c. 17, s. 10.

Powers of the Attorney General of Canada

467.2 (1) Notwithstanding the definition of *Attorney General* in section 2, the Attorney General of Canada may conduct proceedings in respect of

(a) an offence under section 467.11 or 467.111; or

(b) another criminal organization offence where the alleged offence arises out of conduct that in whole or in part is in relation to an alleged contravention of an Act of Parliament or a regulation made under such an Act, other than this Act or a regulation made under this Act.

For those purposes, the Attorney General of Canada may exercise all the powers and perform all the duties and functions assigned to the Attorney General by or under this Act.

Powers of the Attorney General of a province

(2) Subsection (1) does not affect the authority of the Attorney General of a province to conduct proceedings in respect of an offence referred to in section 467.11, 467.111, 467.12 or 467.13 or to exercise any of the powers or perform any of the duties and functions assigned to the Attorney General by or under this Act.

1997, c. 23, s. 11; 2001, c. 32, s. 28; 2014, c. 17, s. 11.

Jim Cutting’s blatant lies are known legally as defamation and he along with all “public service agencies” who aided and abetted the years of indictable crimes, terror and abuse of Victoria owe her for the damage they do.

Defamation remedy & redress is not about protecting pride; it is about protecting reputation and offering restitution to people whose reputations have been wrongly damaged. [Defamation](#) refers to harming another person’s reputation by making a false written or oral statement about that person to a third party which is exactly what [arrogant](#) and [evil](#) Jim Cutting became guilty of when he lied about Victoria’s character and business practises.

Defamation redress is about paying damages to people that have been harmed by your speech or statements. Jim Cutting can say whatever he wants, but he will have to pay for it (and he will have to pay a lot).

Defamation can be subdivided into [libel and slander](#):

On May 20, 2011, a jury found that all eight statements by Verdun that Astley complained of were defamatory, and that Verdun had acted with [malice](#). These statements included the emails to the Bank of Montreal board, the letter to the Ontario Securities Commission, the public statements made at the shareholder meetings, and the statements made in the shareholder proposals. The jury rejected the defences of [qualified privilege](#) and [responsible communication](#).^[2]

The jury awarded damages against Verdun in the amount of \$650,000, including \$400,000 in aggravated damages. This is considered to be one of the largest amounts of aggravated damages for a defamation case in Canadian history.^[2]

- **[Libel](#):** defamation with a permanent record, such as an email, a radio or TV broadcast, a newspaper, a website posting, etc.
- **[Slander](#):** defamation with no permanent record, such as a spoken statement or even a hand gesture.

Victoria has no choice but to hold Jim Cutting and his aiders and abettors financially accountable for libel, and will not need to prove that her and her business suffered damages—Victoria only needs to prove that a false statement with a permanent record was made about her innocent reputation and character to a third party and “*the tribunal*” or “*court*” will be forced to presume damages were suffered.

Key rulings in Canadian defamation law

In *Hill v Church of Scientology of Toronto* (1995), the Supreme Court departed from the American standard of requiring “actual malice” for libel; this makes libel easier to prove.

The Court also dismissed arguments that awarding damages in this case would cause “libel chill”—refraining from speaking out for fear of being sued for defamation—in Canada. In this case, **the Court awarded Mr. Hill over \$1.5 million in damages.**

While defamation tort law does not technically prevent defamation or make it illegal, **the amount of money you may have to pay in damages for defamation can be financially crippling.** In *Leenan v CBC* and *Myers v CBC*, the CBC was **ordered** to pay damages to two cardiologists [950K to Leenan and 150K to Myers] in damages who were wrongly portrayed in a negative light on a CBC program, showing that both Crown corporations and broadcasters of defamatory content, including broadcasters of content created by others, can also be liable for defamation.

In another case out of Halifax Laura Doucette sued for **defamation** to be awarded by the court **\$67,000 in damages.**

The B.C. Supreme Court's recent decision regarding **defamation** damages in *Pritchard v. Van Nes* (2016 BCSC 686) the court's **damage award was \$65,000.** The court acknowledged the devastation that an accusation of paedophilic behaviour could wreak on a teacher's reputation, career, and individual dignity, and noted that this impact would likely continue into the future. Considering these factors, the court found a \$50,000 damages award appropriate. Further, to dissuade similar thoughtless and reckless behaviour, and as a rebuke against the defendant, the court found it appropriate to award an additional \$15,000 in punitive damages.

The Ontario Court of Appeal has upheld **\$700,000 in damages** in what lawyers say is an important case **for** internet **defamation** law. In *Rutman v. Rabinowitz*, two businessmen, Moishe Bergman and Saul Rabinowitz, appealed various parts of an Ontario Superior Court judgment that found they were liable for an internet campaign that had defamed a former businesses associate, Ronald Rutman. (SAME DEFAMTION VICTORIA SUFFERS as a result of JIM CUTTING'S INTERNET ADS FALSELY ADVERTISING HER AS A PROSTITUTE)

Defamation and privacy cases can be extremely complex, time-consuming and costly to defend which will be the case for Jim Cutting, “BC Attorney General”, “Victoria PD”, “City of Victoria” and “Township of Esquimalt” if these covens

cannot see fit to agree to settle with Victoria for the harm, damage and loss they caused by their blatant defamation of Victoria, their refusal to act which completely destroyed her life and livelihood. What kind of fees could these "public service" corporations have to pay for 'legal fees' if they lose? Many lawyers ask for an opening retainer of \$10,000, defendant being lucky to finish documentary and oral discoveries at under \$25,000. Currently the **average cost to run a full-blown civil action to trial is \$100,000**, assuming there are several (but not a ridiculous number) of trial days. There is no defence Jim Cutting, "BC Attorney General", "Victoria PD", "City of Victoria" and "Township of Esquimalt" could present therefore it is insane for these corporations to not settle with Victoria for the financial harm and loss they cause her.

Most cases settle far short of a full-blown trial. Both plaintiffs and defendants need to carefully assess is it worth it - meaning bitterly contested fights in court rather than **some kind of out of court solution - at an early stage**. Remember, the problem isn't the hourly cost of a lawyer, it's the number of lawyer hours burned by protracted court proceedings.

Victoria will average out the above defamation cases to prove the average award from five of the cases cited is approx. 385K which is approx.. what Jim

Cutting owes Victoria for his violations of her Human Rights. Jim Cutting will be making Victoria whole with \$300,000 in redress.

BC govt is responsible for the harm, loss and damage its public servants and public service agencies cause Victoria. With a \$274 million surplus racist BC govt have NO EXCUSE to deny Victoria the 2 million due her in redress for violations of her Human Rights as a result of their blatant discrimination of her by their repeated refusal to accommodation and/or service of/to her.

KATIE DeROSA
Times Colonist

Parents will receive a larger child benefit until their child is 18, students will no longer have to pay interest on B.C. student loans, and people on income and disability assistance will receive \$50 more a month, in a B.C. budget that's heavy on social spending and light on new taxes.

The NDP government on Feb. 19 unveiled a \$58-billion budget for the 2019-20 fiscal year, with a surplus of \$274 million in 2019-20.

The biggest goody for families in the budget is the B.C. Child Opportunity Benefit that replaces the Early Childhood Tax Benefit. Under the new benefit, families with one child will receive up to \$1,600 a year, compared with \$660 a year. Families with two children will receive a maximum of \$2,600 a year, up from \$1,320, and parents of three will receive \$3,400, up from \$1,980. The benefit continues until age 18, 12 years longer than the current benefit, which ends at age six.

"Our government believes that every parent should be able to give their kids a good start in



Finance Minister Carole James waves to people the budget speech. CHAD HIPOLITO, CP

The benefit takes effect in October 2020 and will cost the government \$1.5 billion a year. It turns six, and the government will have to pay down. So to