

March 1, 2015

Dear

I am in **dire need** of your help for **preventing hit and run crime** and the **legal chicanery** perpetrated in the Supreme of British Columbia.

As you may already know, I am a surviving **victim of a hit and run crime** committed on the Pattullo Bridge, May 31, 2009. My offender was caught, but he was not charged or prosecuted; because, ICBC **assumed the liability** of the hit and run crime. Despite, being fully liable for the offence, ICBC refused to pay for my suffering from the **potentially fatal** hit and run crime. Later, I discovered that **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200** innocent peoples in our province, every year (ICBC quick statistics), including the cases where offenders are identified.

Obviously, assuming the liability of hit and run crimes, and providing financial benefits to criminal offenders by paying the damages they cause under the cover of "**accident insurance benefits**" and letting the offenders be free is **NOT a legitimate business practice**; especially, where the money is exacted from the Public by selling mandatory **accident insurance**. As a victim of hit and run crime, **I have a natural DUTY to bring my offender-in-law, ICBC to justice**; otherwise, if offenders fail to do so, it is impossible to prevent hit and run crime.

I have been struggling to file a **criminal case** against ICBC for over five years. Since the lawyers failed to help me with filing my case, I filed three civil actions against the Executive Director of the Law Society, the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cullen. The first two cases were dismissed with court orders **drafted** by the defendants' lawyers, that they had NO AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE. (enclosed) Now the defendants demand court costs from me, as per **unsigned court orders**.

To dismiss my third case, Mr. **Anthony Leoni** filed an application that is scheduled on March 19, 2015 at 9:45 in Vancouver. Mr. Leoni is prepared to present me as a "**vexatious litigant**" and he will state that my previous cases are dismissed, knowing that **a dismissal order without authorized signature is not a valid order**. Obviously, his conduct has no **legal merits** or any sign of **good faith**. Since signing those court orders are tantamount to judicial confirmation of the legality of assuming the liability of hit and run crimes where the offenders are identified, it is impossible for any justice to sign such an order. Therefore, the lawyers are trying to fool me to believe that unsigned court orders are valid court orders, with no chance of success.

It is absolutely necessary to stop this legal chicanery for preventing hit and run crime and protecting the credibility of the Administration of Justice. Our enjoyment of life in peace depends on it. Therefore, all the members of the Public have an obligation to resist the unusual practice of Law in the Courts that makes it **impossible for us to access to justice services**. If you like to contribute your share, please, sign the enclosed letter and drop it to a post-office box and enjoy the feeling of being a responsible citizen, while sipping your coffee at Tim Hortons. Thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut, [778 378 9009](tel:7783789009) ron@ethicsfirst.ca, www.ethicsfirst.ca

ENCL. Amended notice of civil claim, S-150231, Feb. 03, 2015

Unsigned court orders drafted by Michael Armstrong and John Waddell, S-132382, Oct. 3, 2013

Letter to Anthony Leoni, stamped envelope, Tim.Hortons. gift certificate.

March 2, 2015

Anthony Leoni
Webster Hudson & Coombe LLP
510-1040 West Georgia Street
Vancouver BC V6E 4H1

Mr. Leoni,

Ron Korkut and I work in the same office. He is a lucky survivor of a potentially fatal hit and run crime and he has been struggling to bring his offender to justice over five years. Lately, he informed me that **Michael Armstrong and John Waddell** aborted the two of his court cases, by draft court orders that had **no authorized signatures**. I am aware of that they demand court costs from him as per unsigned court orders; because, he showed me the filed orders. (Published at www.ethicsfirst.ca.) Now, you have a court application, dated March 19, 2015, to dismiss his third case on the grounds of that he is a **vexatious litigant** and you are prepared to argue his previous cases are dismissed according to the requirements of the Law.

After reading his amended notice of civil claim, I had a hard time to justify the merits of your court application, to abort the fair trial of a very significant public interest legal action.

Due to the unusual practice of law of **Michael Armstrong and John Waddell**, in the past five years, ICBC assumed the liability of 245,000 hit and run crimes; consequently **40 people have been killed, 11,000 of them injured and crippled** by hit and run criminals, in our Province, including the cases where offenders were identified. (ICBC quick statistics)

Taking into account the extend of the harm inflicted on the Public, please, consider withdrawing your application and let the Court decide, if **assuming the liability of hit and run crimes, and providing financial benefits to criminal offenders** under the cover of "*accident insurance benefits*", by the way of paying the damages they cause, are **LAWFULL** or **NOT**.

As a member of the Public, I am concerned about your conduct that is undermining the credibility of the Administration of Justice and the Law Society of British Columbia.

Yours truly,

.....
Instructor, BCIT
3700 Willingdon Ave,
Burnaby, BC V5G 3H2

Tue 3/17/2015 11:02 AM

Hello Ron,

Labour Relations would like to meet with you to discuss concerns that were brought to our attention in respect of your communications with coworkers about personal lawsuits that you may be involved with. Accordingly, I have scheduled a meeting for **Monday, March 23, 2015 at 9:00am** in the Labour Relations Boardroom (SW01-2313). An outlook invitation will follow shortly.

I encourage you to bring a BCGEU Shop Steward with you to this meeting. To this end, I have copied Cory Langford, Bargaining unit Chair, on this email. Cory is aware of the meeting and I understand that he is available to attend.

Jennifer

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations Department

T 604.456.8068 | F 604.437.5289 | E jhawkins18@bcit.ca | W bcit.ca/hr

Thu 3/19/2015 11:14 AM

Ron,

I am in receipt of the attached letter that you sent to me via email yesterday. I understand that your Associate Dean has made arrangements for class coverage so that you can attend this meeting. As such, you are expected to attend our meeting scheduled for Monday, March 23rd at 9:00am. We will discuss the nature of our concerns during the meeting.

I have copied Cory Langford, your Bargaining Unit chair on this email. I encourage you to contact Cory if you have any further questions.

Jennifer

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations Department

T 604.456.8068 | F 604.437.5289 | E jhawkins18@bcit.ca | W bcit.ca/hr

Meeting follow up

DELETEREPLYREPLY ALLFORWARD

Mark as unread

Jennifer Hawkins

Wed 3/25/2015 2:31 PM

To:

Ron Korkut;

Cc:

Cory Langford;
Dan Glasner;
James Cai;
Ron,

Thank you for meeting with me, Dan Glasner (LR), your Associate Dean James Cai, and your Union representative Cory Lanford on Monday, March 23, 2015.

During our meeting we discussed that at least one of your coworkers expressed discomfort after you asked for his assistance in a lawsuit regarding ICBC. You requested that coworkers sign a letter on your behalf, and you provided a \$10 gift card to Tim Hortons. The lawsuit is not related to your employment at BCIT and is a matter that you are involved with in your personal life, outside of work.

It is our expectation of all BCIT employees that they do not solicit co-workers with monetary inducement, or otherwise, to assist them with personal matters (i.e. unrelated to work) during work hours.

If you engage in similar conduct, despite our clear directives, your conduct may attract disciplinary measures, up to and including the termination of your employment.

As I mentioned in our meeting, these expectations and our meeting on Monday relate to your employment with BCIT and not to your lawsuit which you view as a public matter. We therefore ask that you keep this email and our other correspondence to you private.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Cory Langford with any further questions.

Regards,
Jennifer

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations Department

T 604.456.8068 | F 604.437.5289 | E jhawkins18@bcit.ca | W bcit.ca/hr

April 1, 2015
Ron,

James Cai forwarded a letter from you, addressed to me, dated March 30, 2015. I did not receive a copy directly from you, but assume that you did intend for me to receive the letter.

I wish to clarify that the Institute has not alleged that you had engaged in workplace harassment. During our meeting on March 23 and in my follow up email on March 25, we discussed your conduct and set expectations going forward. You confirmed that you no longer required the assistance of your co-workers and that you would not communicate with them about your lawsuit involving ICBC at work in the future.

Therefore, assuming that you continue to meet the expectations outlined in the email on March 25 (below), this matter is concluded.

I understand that you've expressed interest in apologizing to your co-workers. If you wish to do so privately, that is your prerogative. However, a department meeting will not be called for the purpose of discussing this matter.

Thank you,
Jennifer

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations Department

T 604.456.8068 | F 604.437.5289 | E jhawkins18@bcit.ca | W bcit.ca/hr

May 21, 2015

Workplace harrasment

Ron Korkut

Thu 5/21/2015 12:28 PM

Mrs. Hawkins, Would you please send me a signed copy of this letter to my address: Ron Korkut 5249 Laurel St. Burnaby, BC, V5G 1N1 Thanks. Ron Korkut Ethics First

REPLYREPLY ALLFORWARD

Mark as unread

Jennifer Hawkins

Thu 5/21/2015 8:38 AM

To:

Ron Korkut;

Cc:

James Cai;

Cory Langford;

Dan Glasner;

You replied on 5/21/2015 12:28 PM.

2 attachments

Ron,

I write in response to your letter dated May 16 which I received by email on May 20, 2015.

You may recall that I responded to your March 30, 2015 letter on April 1, 2015 via email. My April 1 email response is attached, for your reference.

I reiterate that the Institute has not accused you of workplace harassment and we will not be disclosing the personal information of your colleagues. I consider this matter concluded and suggest that if you have further concerns, you speak directly with your Union representative Cory Langford.

Kind regards,
Jennifer

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations Department

T 604.456.8068 | F 604.437.5289 | E jhawkins18@bcit.ca | W bcit.ca/hr

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

March 18, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

jhawkins18@bcit.ca

Dear Mrs. Hawkins,

You sent me an email on March 17, 2015 stating that you are concerned with my communications with my coworkers about my “**personal lawsuits**”. Nevertheless, you did not mention the **reason of your concern**. Obviously, you did not read the material I presented to my coworkers. Therefore, I am sending you all the written material I shared with my coworkers.

Please read them and let me know the reason for concern.

If your concern is my lack of courtesy in my communications, misstated facts or words, please let me know them, so that I can correct my unintentional wrong, and apologize to my coworkers who I offended by communicating the attached material.

Nevertheless, if the reason for your concern is the **legality of my seeking help** from my coworkers regarding a very sensitive **public interest legal action**, let me know. I will try to explain the necessity of my seeking help from them, in more detail and using simpler language.

On March 23, I have to be in the lab with my students; therefore, I will not be attending to the meeting you arranged. I am sorry for the inconvenience.

Thanks for your concern for a better working environment where coworkers can freely communicate and help each other, regarding **public issues**, such as **prevention of hit and run crime**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. My letter to coworkers, amended notice of civil claim, two unauthorized court orders, Letter to Anthony Leoni.

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

March 30, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations
3700 Willingdon Ave.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2 jhawkins18@bcit.ca

Dear Mrs. Hawkins,

You sent me two emails on March 17 and 25, 2015 and you alleged that at least one of my coworkers expressed **discomfort** after I asked for help regarding my **personal lawsuit** regarding ICBC. Causing discomfort to a coworker to an extent that necessitates disciplinary action or termination of employment is an offence called "**harassment**". Therefore, your conduct is tantamount to official accusation of "**workplace harassment**".

Nevertheless, as a lawyer, you are supposed to know and follow the **rules of professional conduct and administrative law**, before accusing me of workplace harassment:

1. STANDARD PROCEDURE: If a reasonable person gets offended by the action of a coworker, first he/she must communicate his discomfort to his offender. If the offender persists doing the same action, he/she reports to his immediate supervisor, the supervisor attempts to correct the issue. If the offender does not follow the advice of his supervisor, than the case may be referred to human resources department, as a last resort.

Not standard procedure: In my case, none of my coworkers expressed or displayed any discomfort at the time I handed out my written communication to them, or reported any misbehavior on my part, to my supervisor, Ted Simmons. As you alleged, if any coworker complained about the way I communicated with them, you should have advised them to follow the **standard procedure**, before the issue was escalated to the level of terminating employment. Therefore, **your handling this case is IMPROPER; it is not consistent with the standard procedure.**

2. REQUIREMENTS OF LAW: In order to accuse someone of harassment, there are two requirements:

a. **A victim:** It is impossible to accuse a person of harassment, where there is NO victim.

b. **Substantiation of the harassment:** For a reasonable person, **the act of the offender must amount to harassment** or an unequivocal **authority** that prescribes the offender's act as "harassment" is required.

a. Unidentified victim: In my case, you failed to disclose the name of my alleged victim(s). There are two possibilities for not disclosing the name of a victim: **1. Protecting the victim from further harm**, or **2. There is no victim**. Since everyone knows that I am not a dangerous criminal, I am inclined to think that there was **no victim** in my case. Therefore, I request that you identify the name of my victim(s), in order to verify your allegation of harassment. In this respect, I notified my supervisor, Ted Simmons, to arrange a short staff meeting, so that I can find out extend of the discomfort I caused to my victim(s) and apologize publicly, for my offensive behavior. **That is the proper procedure, in order to maintain my pristine record of employment.**

b. Unsubstantiated workplace harassment: No reasonable person would classify "asking for help from a coworker with the compliment of a small gift certificate", as a "**workplace harassment**" that may require disciplinary action or termination of employment. Therefore, **your accusing me of harassment is NOT REASONABLE.**

Lack of authority: As a legitimate alternative, if there is an authority that prescribes communicating with coworkers and asking help regarding a public issue as a workplace harassment, your accusation may have tangible grounds. Nevertheless, you have the onus to cite such an authority. If you fail to do so, it is conclusive that **your allegation of harassment is FALSE**.

3. MISSTATING MATERIAL FACTS: If an offender offends a significant number of people including the victim, such a lawsuit cannot be classified as “personal lawsuit”. Therefore, no reasonable person would classify the following case as a “personal lawsuit”, considering the **substantiated facts**:

ICBC **assumes** the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent peoples in British Columbia, every year, and **provides** financial benefits to hit and run criminals under to cover of “**accident insurance benefits**”, by paying the damages they cause.

Therefore, **your misstating the material facts is not consistent with the rules of professional conduct**.

4. MY REQUEST: In order to resolve this issue within the bounds of professional ethics and administrative law, please provide me with the name of my victim(s) and an authority that prescribes communicating with coworkers and asking help for a serious public issue, as a “workplace harassment”.

5. YOUR FAILURE WILL BE THE CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF THE FACT THAT YOUR ACCUSATION WAS FALSE. As you may know, **false accusation of workplace harassment** has legal consequences.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DOCUMENTS: Since, as a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime, I am obliged to inform the Public regarding the legal chicanery perpetrated in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, as soon as my access to Court Services is completely obstructed, **you may not count on the confidentiality of these documents**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

CC. Ted Simmons; Dan Glasner; James Cai; Cory Langford.

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

May 16, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Final Request

Jennifer Hawkins, Labour Relations
3700 Willingdon Ave.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2 jhawkins18@bcit.ca

Dear Mrs. Hawkins,

I have not received your response to my letter, dated March 30, 2015. Please, let me know the person who was uncomfortable with my communication. This information is very important for my record of employment, since you accused me of **workplace harassment** that may require disciplinary action or termination of employment.

Since it is unlawful to accuse someone of harassment where there is no complainant, if you fail to disclose the name of my victim, I will conclude that you have **falsely accused me of workplace harassment** to deter me from communicating with my colleagues regarding the legal chicanery perpetrated in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and I will include your name and the relevant documents, in my legal file.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

CC. Ted Simmons; Dan Glasner; James Cai; Cory Langford.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

MEETING, **Monday, March 23, 2015 at 9:00am** in the Labour Relations Boardroom (SW01-2313)

Jennifer Hawkins;
Dan Glasner;
James Cai;
Cory Langford;
Ron Korkut;

Dear Mrs. Hawkin,

On March 17, 2015, you sent me an email and you were concerned with my communications with coworkers about my **personal lawsuits**. I thought, you were not informed about the content of my communications. Therefore, I sent you all the documents. Nevertheless, **you did not correct** your choice of words in your second email, dated March 19, 2015.

No reasonable person can classify a lawsuit on the following grounds, as "**personal lawsuit**":

1. ICBC, **knowing** that hit and run criminals kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent people in British Columbia, every year,
2. **Assumes** the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes,
3. **Provides** financial benefits to hit and run criminals under to cover of "**accident insurance benefits**", by paying the damages they cause.

Under the circumstances, it is inappropriate for me to discuss any of your concerns; therefore, I am not prepared to respond to any of your questions regarding this issue.

The sole reason for my attending to this meeting is to listen your **reasonable concerns**, because, you declined to state your concerns in writing. Due to the sensitivity of the issue, I will respond to them in writing, in a week. I am sorry for the inconvenience.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

June 1, 2015

Mrs. Walker,

As explained in the attached letter, Jennifer Hawkins falsely accused me of workplace harassment. Now she denies her misconduct. What can I do? Thanks.

Ron Korkut

June 1, 2015

Confidential

Hi Ron,

I have reviewed the attached letter. Would you like to meet to discuss? If so, I can arrange a time for us to meet. Also, I am curious as to what Jennifer's response was. Did she respond by way of written communication? If so, can you please provide it to me.

Thank you,

Jennifer

Jennifer Walker | Advisor, Harassment and Discrimination

T [604.432.8409](tel:604.432.8409) | **F** [604.432.7848](tel:604.432.7848) | **E** jennifer_walker@bcit.ca | **W** bcit.ca/harassment/

June 1, 2015

Jennifer,

Certainly, we can discuss the issue, as long as nothing is hidden from the Public; I am not comfortable with confidential discussions. Now, I am on my leave, anytime is OK, except Thursday. All the files are attached.

Ron

June 4, 2015

Confidential

Hi Ron,

Thanks for sending me the files. I am happy to have a conversation about this matter and ask that our conversation remain confidential in accordance with BCIT's H&D Policy 7507. This Policy states in part that, "requests to the Advisor for advice or information will be held in strict confidence," and "confidentiality of complaints of bullying and harassment or discrimination shall be respected by all those who re privy to information or in possession of documentation pertaining to matters/incidents relating to a complaint. This shall include refraining from discussions or releasing information in any form, beyond that outlined in this Policy and Procedure or as required by law."

In reviewing the documentation I have a question about your statement that "causing discomfort to a coworker to an extent that necessitates disciplinary action... is an offence called "harassment."

Would you be able to discuss? Please let me know and I am happy to set up a time next week.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Jennifer Walker | Advisor, Harassment and Discrimination

June 5, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Dear Mrs. Walker,

It is not NECESSARY to hide legitimate actions or discussions from the Public. Therefore, if your argument is legitimate and lawful, there is no reason for you to insist on the **confidentiality** of our proposed meeting. A reasonable person, acting in good faith, never hesitates to discuss an issue openly. Therefore, it is inappropriate for me to meet with you and discuss this issue clandestinely; as I mentioned before, I am not **comfortable** with *confidential discussions*.

Nevertheless, if you, as a lawyer, are willing to help me in good faith, you can answer the following questions unequivocally, from the point of substantive LAW:

1. Is it NECESSARY for a **victim of hit and run crime** to bring his offender to justice, in order to prevent crime? Yes....., No.....
2. Is it WRONG for the victim to inform his friends and colleagues where his access to Court Services is obstructed?
Yes....., No.....
3. Is it REASONABLE for a person to complain about being harassed by a colleague who presents him/her a trivial gift certificate and asks to sign a document to prevent hit and run crime, absolutely, WITH NO OBLIGATION? Yes....., No.....

Please, let me know your question about my statement “[causing discomfort to a coworker to an extent that necessitates disciplinary action... is an offence called ‘harassment’.](#)” I will answer it in writing.
Thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

June 9, 2015
Jennifer Walker
to me

Confidential

Hi Ron,

I remain open and willing to discuss your concerns though I appreciate you have concerns about the confidential nature of the discussion. Questions 1 and 2 are outside the scope of what I can provide assistance with. The question relating to item 3 appears to be in relation to your concern that Jennifer Hawkins has falsely accused you of workplace harassment based on the rationale that, "causing discomfort to a coworker to an extent that necessitates disciplinary action or termination of employment is an offence called harassment." I'm curious as to the basis/source of your rationale for this definition of harassment?

Jennifer

Jennifer Walker | Advisor, Harassment and Discrimination

T [604.432.8409](tel:604.432.8409) | **F** [604.432.7848](tel:604.432.7848) | **E** jennifer_walker@bcit.ca | **W** bcit.ca/harassment/

June 9, 2015

Mrs. Walker,

My questions 1 and 2 are relevant to the issue we are discussing; because, those issues are the reason for my communication with my coworkers. The basis/source of my definition of "workplace harassment" is **commonsense**, referring to Mrs. Hawkins' choice of words in her email dated March 25, 2015. Do you have an issue with that definition of workplace harassment? If my definition is **WRONG**, why do you think Mrs. Hawkins intimidated me, with disciplinary action and termination of my employment? Can you think of any tangible reason for it?

Ron Korkut

Ethics First

Jennifer Walker

8:27 AM (42
minutes
ago)

to me

Confidential

Hi Ron,

It appears that the heart of your concern lies with how Labour Relations responded to this matter (ie. your concern that you have been falsely accused of harassment by them). From the correspondence, it appears that Labour Relations says that they did not accuse you of harassment. If you take issue with this (which you appear to), then I would encourage you to follow up with your Union representative (Cory Langford?) if you have not already with respect to exploring any actions you may take to respond to and potentially grieve action taken. In general, I am aware that Labour Relations takes steps from time to time to follow up on concerns raised by individuals about the conduct of other individuals, and

the allegation is not one of harassment. In other words, I think it is possible for Labour Relations to approach employees about concerns expressed by other employees and this does not mean that Labour Relations (or the other employee) is making an accusation of harassment. My understanding of the definition of personal harassment and bullying and harassment is pursuant to BCIT's Policy 7507 and as set out in common and arbitral law. If you still wish to discuss this matter, perhaps it makes sense to include Cory Langford in the discussion so that you can explore all your options?

Thanks,
Jennifer

From: Ron Korkut [mailto:ronkor51@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2015 9:12 PM

June10, 2015

Mrs. Walker,

Please, try to understand that the MAIN ISSUE is:

I am a victim of potentially fatal HIT AND RUN CRIME. I have been struggling to bring my offender to JUSTICE for over six years. Madam Justice Dillon declared me "vexatious litigant", and obstructed my access to Court Services. In the last six years, as a result of the OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE, my offender-in-law, assumed the liability of 294,000 hit and run crimes that killed 48, injured and crippled 13,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, including the cases where criminals are identified.

Are you comfortable with that?

If NOT, please remind Jennifer Hawkins that:

Where there is NO complainant, accusing an employee of "workplace harassment", is not consistent with professional ethics. If she fails to correct her wrong, her name will be implicated with the above issue.

Thanks for your help.

Ron Korkut

Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

June 6, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Dear Mrs. Walker,

It is not NECESSARY to hide legitimate actions or discussions from the Public. Therefore, if your argument is legitimate and lawful, there is no reason for you to insist on the confidentiality of our proposed meeting. A reasonable person, acting in good faith, never hesitates to discuss an issue publicly. Naturally, I am not comfortable with confidential discussions, therefore, it is inappropriate for me to meet with you and discuss this issue clandestinely.

Nevertheless, if you, as a lawyer, are willing to help in good faith, you can answer the following questions unequivocally, from the point of substantive LAW:

1. Is it necessary for a **victim of hit and run crime** to bring his offender to justice, in order to prevent crime?
2. Is it necessary for the victim to inform his colleagues where his access to Court Services is obstructed?
3. Is it reasonable for person to complain about being harassed by a colleague who presents him/her a trivial gift certificate and asks to sign a document to prevent hit and run crime, absolutely, WITH NO OBLIGATION?

Thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

From: James Cai
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>
Cc: Ted Simmons <Ted_Simmons@bcit.ca>
Subject: Student Complaint

Dear Ron,

Thank you for meeting with myself and Ted Simmons on March 31, 2016 to discuss the Student Complaint dated March 14, 2016. I suggest we follow with our plan for review students' survey result in May from your current class (which commenced in March 2016).

I want you to be successful in your position and I am willing to support you to achieve this goal. As a follow up to our meetings, I am taking this opportunity to reiterate/clarify some important expectations regarding your employment at BCIT. Amongst other things, BCIT expects Vocational Instructors to:

1. Adhere to safety-sensitive best practices in teaching and supervising students. The Institute must be able to trust employees to make health and safety of fellow employees and students a top priority. This is particularly true in safety-sensitive instructional areas, such as Electrical labs, to provide guidance to students.
2. Provide appropriate directions and explanations to students that are consistent with the specified learning objectives for the course;
3. Ensure that students receive appropriate answers and feedback on their questions.

During our meeting, you confirmed you will provide guidance and demonstrate lab safety procedures with your class. You also informed me you are comfortable with an Instructional Development Consultant (IDC) from BCIT Learning Teaching Centre to provide feedback for you based on her/his observation either in your lecture or lab time. I will make arrangement for you in coming weeks.

If you feel that you require any additional resources in order for you to meet our expectations, please approach me to discuss any training or resources that may be required.

I trust these expectations are clear. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns about this matter.

Regards,

James

James Cai, MBA, P.Eng. | Associate Dean | BCIT School of Construction and the Environment
T [604.451.6944](tel:604.451.6944) | **F** [604.435.4219](tel:604.435.4219) | **E** James_Cai@bcit.ca | **W** bcit.ca/construction

Sandy Caktas | Administrative Assistant | **T** [604.412.7565](tel:604.412.7565) | **E** Sandra_Caktas@bcit.ca

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

April 6, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

James Cai, Associate Dean
BCIT School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Cai,

On March 23, 2015, you called a meeting and you **accused** me of **harassing my coworkers** by asking help for my lawsuit regarding ICBC, based on an **anonymous** complaint from one of my coworkers. I asked for the name of the complainant, for the purpose of offering my apology and correcting my wrong; nevertheless, you failed to disclose the name of my victim. Obviously, such a conduct is not expected from a person who serves as an Associate Dean at BCIT.

On March 31, 2016, in our meeting, you alleged that I AM NOT:

- 1. Following the safety rules in the lab,**
- 2. Explaining the course material properly,**
- 3. Providing appropriate answers to my students' questions.**

Now, you are **accusing** me of not doing my job properly, relying on **anonymous** student surveys.

I believe, I am doing my job to serve the best interest of my students and BCIT within due diligence. Therefore, I have not received any **legitimate complaints** from my students in ten years of service.

Under the circumstances, it is NOT appropriate for me to work under your supervision. Please, **substantiate your allegations** and terminate my employment, for the best interest of both of us.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

CC. Cory Langford, M. Ed. M. Sc. Bargaining Unit Chair, Vocational Faculty, BCIT



Ron Korkut Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca via bcit4.onmicrosoft.com

9:16 AM
(8 hours ago)

to ron

From: James Cai
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 2:45 PM
To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>
Cc: Cory Langford <Cory_Langford@bcit.ca>
Subject: Your letter dated on April 6

Hi Ron,

I received your April 6th letter. I continue to be your Associate Dean. I consider the matter that we met on March 23th to be closed. You are an important member of our team. Going forward, I will work with you to address any issues that may arise.

Regards,
James

James Cai, MBA, P.Eng. | Associate Dean | BCIT School of Construction and the Environment
T [604.451.6944](tel:604.451.6944) | **F** [604.435.4219](tel:604.435.4219) | **E** James_Cai@bcit.ca | **W** bcit.ca/construction

Sandy Caktas | Administrative Assistant | **T** [604.412.7565](tel:604.412.7565) | **E** Sandra_Caktas@bcit.ca

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

April 29, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

James Cai, Associate Dean
BCIT School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Cai,

Re. Your email dated April 25, 2016.

I am glad to hear that I am an important member of your team. I will consider your comment as a repeal of your previous accusations of **workplace harassment** and **incompetent work**.

As I mentioned in our meeting, I am a **victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime**. Therefore, I have a DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE. Nevertheless, due to the **corruption** in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, my access to the Court Services has been obstructed.

Since the PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC is THE REQUIREMENT OF THE LAW, under the circumstances, I am **obliged to inform the Public**; so that they should refrain from using the corrupt Court Services and **protect** themselves against the **dishonourable** Lawyers and the members of the Judiciary.

Naturally, I am more concerned about the protection of my friends and co-workers; therefore, I would like to notify them, FIRST. Since you are one of my co-workers, I would like to present you a copy of "**the report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**" so that you can make the **right** decision regarding using Court Services.

Thanks for your positive comments regarding my work.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Attd. The report of corruption, Index, legal documents on CD.

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

May 5, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

James Cai, Associate Dean
BCIT School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Cai,

Ref. Your email dated May 3, 2016

In my letter dated April 29, 2016, I clearly stated the reason for informing my colleagues regarding the ongoing **corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. Again, I will reiterate it: As a member of the Public and a **victim of CRIME**, I have a **DUTY to notify the people** who are likely to suffer from the same **CRIMINAL ACTIONS** I suffered from; so that they can **PROTECT** themselves. Certainly, unlawful activities in the Court Services is a serious issue and can cause **tremendous harm** to the Public, due to the fact that **the officers of the Courts who protect criminals are more dangerous offenders than ordinary criminals**. Therefore, I have to inform my friends and colleagues, so that they stay away from the **dishonourable lawyers and judiciary**.

Despite, you knew the reason why I had to communicate with my colleagues, you restricted my communication with them by stating that "... **do not deliver the Report of Corruption ...**". You must understand that, if one of my colleagues is **harmed** by the corrupt Court Services, from now on, **you may be liable for their damages and suffering**. Therefore, if you are willing to accept the liability, please send me the **signed copy** of your email.

You also attempted to **discourage** me from publicizing **the Report of Corruption**, beyond the campus, by implying **defamation suits**. Since my intention is strictly to **PROTECT THE PUBLIC, NOT to defame legal authorities**, I have given sufficient notice to all the persons who are involved in this legal chicanery. Therefore, there is **no reason** for you to be concerned about "**the risk of potential legal action**". Besides, there is **NO "RISK"** for a person who acting in line with the Law, as far as legal actions are concerned.

Additionally, I assure you that my off-duty conduct cannot harm the credibility of the BCIT. On contrary, if the Public finds out that **BCIT administration - without Court Order -garnishes the wages of an employee who is trying to protect the PUBLIC, falsely accuse him of workplace harassment and bans the publication of the Report of Corruption** in BCIT premises; that may cause **serious harm to the Business of BCIT**.

Furthermore, in the staff meeting, **you have not allowed me to speak** regarding the pepper-spray incident. I would like to tell you now: Pepper-spraying another person, without any tangible reason, is a **criminal offence**. **It is impossible to prevent crime where DISHONOURABLE lawyers and judges dismiss the legal actions of the victims of CRIME, for protecting the criminal offenders.** This is the REASON of my publicity campaign.

Finally, I would like to remind you that when it comes to THE LAW, YOU and I HAVE A CHOICE. I recommend that considering the REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW and the rules of PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, please, **review your decision, or sign it.**

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

CC. Cory Langford, M. Ed. M. Sc. Bargaining Unit Chair, Vocational Faculty, BCIT

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

June 20, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Wayne Hand
Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Hand,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my DUTY by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a criminal offence** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The DUTY of a Justice is to adjudicate the issue before the Court according to the Law of the Land, based on the substantiated FACTS. Otherwise, it is impossible to serve JUSTICE in the Courts of LAW.
5. Court order is significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

*Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a **perfect example of CORRUPTION**. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, I have to notify my colleagues, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, **James Cai** restricted my right to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to prevent harm to them. Therefore, he failed to sign under his decision.*

Please, let me know if you **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. Please, respond in writing, considering the significance of the issue.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

July 17, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Wayne Hand
Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Hand,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my DUTY by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The DUTY of a Justice is to adjudicate the issue before the Court according to the Law of the Land, based on the substantiated FACTS. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of LAW.
5. Court order is significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

*Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a **perfect example of CORRUPTION**. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, **I have to notify my colleagues**, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, **James Cai** restricted my right to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to **prevent harm** to them. Therefore, **he failed to sign** under his decision.*

In my letter dated June 20, 2016, I asked you, *-specifically - “in writing”*, if you **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. You responded with an email dated July 15, 2016. Your email may not be considered an authorized answer to my question, since it was not signed. Therefore, please, sign the attached copy of your email and send it to me. Thanks, for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

From: Wayne Hand
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>
Cc: James Cai <James_Cai@bcit.ca>
Subject: FW: Re: April 29th letter

Dear Ron

In response to your letter addressed to me, dated June 20, 2016, I am in full agreement with the statements made in James Cai's email to you dated April 3, 2016 (included below) on this matter.

Sincerely

Wayne Hand

Wayne Hand P.Eng. MBA

Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
British Columbia Institute of Technology | bcit.ca

T: [604.432.8501](tel:604.432.8501) | C: [778.928.2632](tel:778.928.2632) | E whand@bcit.ca

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 16, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Final request

Wayne Hand
Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Hand,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my DUTY by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The DUTY of a Justice is to adjudicate the issue before the Court according to the Law of the Land, based on the substantiated FACTS. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of LAW.
5. Court order is significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

*Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a **perfect example of CORRUPTION**. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, **I have to notify my colleagues**, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, **James Cai** restricted my right to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to **prevent harm** to them. Therefore, **he failed to sign** under his decision.*

In my letters dated June 20 and July 17, 2016, I asked you, *-specifically - “in writing”*, if you **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. You responded with an email dated July 15, 2016. Your email may not be considered an authorized answer to my question, since it was not signed. Therefore, please, sign the attached copy of your email and send it to me. Thanks, for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

From: Wayne Hand
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>
Cc: James Cai <James_Cai@bcit.ca>
Subject: FW: Re: April 29th letter

Dear Ron

In response to your letter addressed to me, dated June 20, 2016, I am in full agreement with the statements made in James Cai's email to you dated April 3, 2016 (included below) on this matter.

Sincerely

Wayne Hand

Wayne Hand P.Eng. MBA

Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
British Columbia Institute of Technology | bcit.ca

T: [604.432.8501](tel:604.432.8501) | C: [778.928.2632](tel:778.928.2632) | E whand@bcit.ca

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 22, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Ana Lopez
Vice President, Human Resources
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mrs. Lopez,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a **RIGHT** and **DUTY** to bring my offender to **JUSTICE**. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my **DUTY** by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender in Law, ICBC. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The **DUTY** of a Justice is to **adjudicate** – NOT TO DISMISS - the issue before the Court according to the **Law of the Land**, based on the substantiated **FACTS**. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of **LAW**.
5. Court order is a significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a perfect example of CORRUPTION. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, I have to notify my colleagues, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, James Cai, Associate Dean, School of Construction and the Environment, restricted my right to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to prevent harm to them. Therefore, he failed to sign under his decision.

I raised the issue to the attention of **Wayne Hand**, Dean, School of Construction and the Environment. He responded with an email dated July 15, 2016. In my letters dated June 20, July 17 and August 16, 2016, I asked him, *-specifically -* “**in writing**”, if he **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my right and DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. He failed to approve James Cai’s decision in compliance with the procedural norms.

Please, read the attached “**The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**”, investigate the relevant documents and let me know, if I am permitted to inform my colleagues so that they can protect themselves against the unusual practice of LAW in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Since this is a **vitally significant legal issue**, please respond in writing. For your convenience, I have attached a form letter to elicit your authorized decision.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Index of Evidentiary documents, Legal Documents – CD.

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources, BCIT
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION

I, **Ana Lopez**, Vice President, Human Resources at British Columbia Institute of Technology, read **the report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia** and concur with the decision of **James Cai** that **Ron Korkut** is not allowed to share “the report of Corruption” with his colleagues, even though his intention is to protect his colleagues against the unusual practice of Law in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources

Date: _____

Signature

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

September 26, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Second request

Ana Lopez
Vice President, Human Resources
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mrs. Lopez,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a **RIGHT** and **DUTY** to bring my offender to **JUSTICE**. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my **DUTY** by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender in Law, ICBC. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The **DUTY** of a Justice is to **adjudicate** – NOT TO DISMISS - the issue before the Court according to the **Law of the Land**, based on the substantiated **FACTS**. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of **LAW**.
5. Court order is a significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a perfect example of CORRUPTION. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, I have to notify my colleagues, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, James Cai, Associate Dean, School of Construction and the Environment, restricted my right to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to prevent harm to them. Therefore, he failed to sign under his decision.

I raised the issue to the attention of **Wayne Hand**, Dean, School of Construction and the Environment. He responded with an email dated July 15, 2016. In my letters dated June 20, July 17 and August 16, 2016, I asked him, *-specifically -* “**in writing**”, if he **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my right and DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. He failed to approve James Cai’s decision in compliance with the procedural norms.

Please, read the attached “**The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**”, investigate the relevant documents and let me know, if I am permitted to inform my colleagues so that they can protect themselves against the unusual practice of LAW in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Since this is a **vitally significant legal issue**, PLEASE respond in writing. For your convenience, I have attached a form letter to elicit your authorized decision.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, CD (Evidentiary documents, Legal Documents)

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources, BCIT
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION

I, **Ana Lopez**, Vice President, Human Resources at British Columbia Institute of Technology, read **the report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia** and concur with the decision of **James Cai** that **Ron Korkut** is not allowed to share “the report of Corruption” with his colleagues, even though his intention is to protect his colleagues against the unusual practice of Law in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources

Date: _____

Signature

From: Wayne Hand
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>
Cc: Cory Langford <Cory_Langford@bcit.ca>; James Cai <James_Cai@bcit.ca>
Subject: Communication of your document at BCIT

Hello Ron,

I understand that on two recent occasions, you sent a document entitled "Ref. Restriction of communication" and an attachment entitled, "The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia", to Ana Lopez, Vice President of Human Resources. From what I understand, the attachment appears to be similar to the document you previously sent me, and to the document you previously sent to James Cai.

I am writing to remind you of James Cai's May 3, 2016 email to you, in which James wrote (in part) as follows:

While I have no doubt that you are passionate in respect to the issues set out in your Report, please do not deliver this Report to your work colleagues or other employees at BCIT while you are on BCIT-time working or on [sic] while you are on BCIT premises. This Report is your own document, and it does not relate to your employment with BCIT. In addition, the Report is very formal, and with you being our instructor, I have concern that this may be interpreted as a BCIT document. Finally, while I don't profess to have a legal background, and I obviously can't provide you with legal advice, I'm concerned that the Report may create at least the risk of potential legal action (i.e., defamation suits).

Additionally, please be aware that whatever you do on your own time is primarily your own concern. However, off-duty conduct that harms your employer's reputation or adversely impacts your employer's business could create a cause for concern for BCIT. As such, I'm asking you to please consider what you will be doing with respect to this Report. You have an excellent union that can give advice on these sorts of matters. Please don't hesitate to contact it if you would like to.

BCIT expects that you will not deliver your "Ref. Restriction of communication" and/or "The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia", or similar-themed personal documents, to your work colleagues or other employees at BCIT while you are on BCIT-time working or while you are on BCIT premises. Further, BCIT expects that you will not use BCIT resources to distribute these personal documents.

If you have any questions or require any additional clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Wayne Hand

Wayne Hand P.Eng. MBA

Dean, School of Construction and the Environment

British Columbia Institute of Technology | bcit.ca

T: [604.432.8501](tel:604.432.8501) | C: [778.928.2632](tel:778.928.2632) | E whand@bcit.ca

Ron Korkut <ronkor51@gmail.com>

11:31 AM
(9 hours
ago)

to Ron

Mr. Hand,

Considering the significance of the issue, from the point of protection of the PUBLIC, including the employees of BCIT, would you PLEASE, send me a copy of your email signed in compliance with the procedural norms.

Ron Korkut

Ethics First

On Thu, Oct 20, 2016 at 9:02 AM, Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca> wrote:

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

October 24, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Wayne Hand
Dean, School of Construction and the Environment
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Hand,

Ref. Your email dated, October 14, 2016, regarding restriction of communication

Considering the significance of the issue, from the point of protection of the PUBLIC, *including the employees of BCIT*, would you PLEASE, sign the copy of your email referred above, that is attached for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



October 14, 2016

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1

Hello Ron,

I understand that on two recent occasions, you sent a document entitled “Ref. Restriction of communication” and an attachment entitled, “The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia”, to Ana Lopez, Vice President of Human Resources. From what I understand, the attachment appears to be similar to the document you previously sent me, and to the document you previously sent to James Cai.

I am writing to remind you of James Cai’s May 3, 2016 email to you, in which James wrote (in part) as follows:

While I have no doubt that you are passionate in respect to the issues set out in your Report, please do not deliver this Report to your work colleagues or other employees at BCIT while you are on BCIT-time working or on [sic] while you are on BCIT premises. This Report is your own document, and it does not relate to your employment with BCIT. In addition, the Report is very formal, and with you being our instructor, I have concern that this may be interpreted as a BCIT document. Finally, while I don’t profess to have a legal background, and I obviously can’t provide you with legal advice, I’m concerned that the Report may create at least the risk of potential legal action (i.e., defamation suits).

Additionally, please be aware that whatever you do on your own time is primarily your own concern. However, off-duty conduct that harms your employer’s reputation or adversely impacts your employer’s business could create a cause for concern for BCIT. As such, I’m asking you to please consider what you will be doing with respect to this Report. You have an excellent union that can give advice on these sorts of matters. Please don’t hesitate to contact it if you would like to.

BCIT expects that you will not deliver your “Ref. Restriction of communication” and/or “The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia”, or similar-themed personal documents, to you work colleagues or other employees at BCIT while you are on BCIT-time working or while you are on BCIT premises. Further, BCIT expects that you will not use BCIT resources to distribute these personal documents.

If you have any questions or require any additional clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Wayne Hand

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 09, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – FINAL request

Ana Lopez
Vice President, Human Resources
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mrs. Lopez,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a **RIGHT** and **DUTY** to bring my offender to **JUSTICE**. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

I have tried to fulfill my **DUTY** by filing four civil litigations; because, I was not allowed to file criminal action against my offender in Law, ICBC. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
2. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under the cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The **DUTY** of a Justice is to **adjudicate** – NOT TO DISMISS - the issue before the Court according to the **Law of the Land**, based on the substantiated **FACTS**. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of **LAW**.
5. Court order is a significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

*Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a **perfect example of CORRUPTION**. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to publicize this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, **I have to notify my colleagues**, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services. Nevertheless, **James Cai**, Associate Dean, School of Construction and the Environment, restricted my **right** to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to **prevent harm** to them. Therefore, **he failed to sign** under his decision.*

I raised the issue to the attention of **Wayne Hand**, Dean, School of Construction and the Environment. He responded with an email dated July 15, 2016. In my letters dated June 20, July 17 and August 16, 2016, I asked him, *-specifically -* “**in writing**”, if he **concur** with James Cai’s decision to restrict my right and DUTY to notify my colleagues regarding the **ongoing corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. He failed to approve James Cai’s decision in compliance with the procedural norms.

Please, read the attached “**The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**”, investigate the relevant documents and let me know, if I am permitted to inform my colleagues so that they can protect themselves against the unusual practice of LAW in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Since this is a **vitally significant legal issue**, PLEASE respond in writing. For your convenience, I have attached a form letter to elicit your authorized decision. If you fail to respond, I will be obliged to report this issue to the Government Employees Union and publicize it using my own resources.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. “Declaration of Indemnity”, Draft response



**BRITISH COLUMBIA
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources, BCIT
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION

I, **Ana Lopez**, Vice President, Human Resources at British Columbia Institute of Technology, read **the report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia** and concur with the decision of **James Cai** that **Ron Korkut** is not allowed to share “the report of Corruption” with his colleagues, even though his intention is to protect his colleagues against the unusual practice of Law in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources

Date: _____

Signature

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 20, 2016

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Jack Davidson, Chair
BCIT Board of Governors
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

Dear Mr. Davidson,

Ref. Restriction of communication

I am a **victim** of a potentially fatal hit and run crime; therefore, I have a **RIGHT** and **DUTY** to bring my offender to **JUSTICE**. Otherwise, it is **impossible to prevent crime**.

The Court did not allow me to file a criminal action against my offender- in-law, ICBC. I have tried to fulfill my **DUTY** by filing four civil litigations. Nevertheless, all my cases were dismissed by Justice **Nathan H. Smith**, Justice **Austin F. Cullen**, Justice **Janice R. Dillon** and the Chief Justice **Christopher E. Hinkson**. And they refused to sign their dismissal orders in compliance with the procedural norms. They were aware of the following facts and the rules of Law, before they **dismissed** my legal actions:

1. **Hit and run is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the Section 252, Criminal Code of Canada.
2. I was a victim of a potentially fatal hit and run crime and I was **obliged** to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC, to Justice.
3. ICBC **assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes**, that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200 people in the province of British Columbia every year. (ICBC quick statistics)
3. ICBC provides **financial benefits to hit and run criminals** under cover of “*accident insurance benefits*”, where offenders are identified, as proven in my case.
4. The **DUTY** of a Justice is to **adjudicate** – NOT TO DISMISS - the issue before the Court according to the **Law of the Land**, based on the substantiated **FACTS**. Otherwise, **it is impossible to serve JUSTICE** in the Courts of **LAW**.
5. A court order is a significant legal document that **must be signed** in compliance with the procedural norms, by the judge who makes the decision.

Dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, is a patent DENIAL OF JUSTICE and a perfect example of CORRUPTION. Therefore, as a victim of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, I have a legal obligation to **publicize** this issue; otherwise, my offenders may harm the other members of the Public. Obviously, **I have to notify my colleagues**, first; so that they can make an informed decision before using the Court Services.

Nevertheless, **James Cai**, Associate Dean, School of Construction and the Environment, restricted my **right** to communicate with my colleagues, knowing that the sole purpose of my communication was to **prevent harm** to them. He was aware of his **WRONG**; therefore, **he failed to sign** under his decision.

I raised the issue to the attention of **Wayne Hand**, Dean, School of Construction and the Environment. He responded with an email, dated July 15, 2016, indicating that he concurred with the decision of James Cai. Nevertheless, he **failed to sign his decision**.

Then, I attempted to resolve this issue by writing three letters to **Ana Lopez**, Vice President. She did not respond to me.

As an employee of BCIT, am entitled to get an **authorized decision** regarding this issue; because, the issue is a concern for 8 human lives, 2200 injuries and half a billion dollars financial loss for the Public. Furthermore, it is vitally important for **preventing the corruption** in the Supreme Court of British Columbia and **protecting the credibility of BCIT**.

Please, read the attached "**The report of corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**", investigate the relevant documents and advise **Ana Lopez** to sign the attached document or correct James Cai's decision.

Since this is a **vitally significant legal issue**, PLEASE respond in person and with a signed letter.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, "Declaration of Indemnity", Draft response to be signed by Ana Lopez, CD (legal documents)

CC. Kathy Kinloch, President, Stephanie Smith, BCGEU President



**BRITISH COLUMBIA
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources, BCIT
3700 Willingdon St.
Burnaby BC V5G 3H2

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION

I, **Ana Lopez**, Vice President, Human Resources at British Columbia Institute of Technology, read **the report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia** and concur with the decision of **James Cai** that **Ron Korkut** is not allowed to share “the report of Corruption” with his colleagues, even though his intention is to protect his colleagues against the unusual practice of Law in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Ana Lopez

Vice President, Human Resources

Date: _____

Signature

Hello Ron,

Recently, Labour Relations has become aware of some concerns regarding personal communications that you have been sending to employees at BCIT. Specifically you have sent a number of letters to Wayne Hand, Ana Lopez and Jack Davidson. We would like to meet with you to further discuss these letters and to provide you with an opportunity to respond to the concerns raised. Accordingly, I have scheduled a meeting for Tuesday, December 6, 2016 from 10:00 am to 11:00 am in Labour Relations' offices (SW01, Room 2310). An Outlook invitation will follow shortly.

In accordance with Article 9.7 of the BCGEU Collective Agreement, you have the right to bring a Shop Steward with you to this meeting. To this end, I have copied Cory Langford, BCGEU Chair and Shop Steward, on this email. Cory is aware of this meeting and I understand that he is available to attend. I encourage you to contact Cory prior to the meeting. He can be reached at 604-456-1162 or via email.

Thank you,

Katie

Katie Cobban

British Columbia Institute of Technology

T: 604.431.4996 | bcit.ca

Dec. 5, 2016

Hello Katie,

As an employee of BCIT I have a RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers regarding THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, in order to prevent HARM to them. Nevertheless, my supervisors James Cai and Wane Hand restricted my RIGHT and DUTY to notify my co-workers sending me an email. I asked them to give me an authorized decision since email is not a LEGAL DOCUMENT. They declined to sign their decisions. Then I reported the issue to Ana Lopez. She failed to respond. I am not interested in meeting with any person who is reluctant to sign his or her decision made in GOOD FAITH. Just let me know if anyone of the above persons will sign the decision regarding the restriction of my RIGHT and DUTY TO INFORM MY CO-WORKERS or NOT. THAT IS ALL. Please, read the attached "The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia" for your own PROTECTION.

Ron Korkut

Ethics First

From: Katie Cobban

Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2016 4:50 PM

To: Ron Korkut <Ron_Korkut@bcit.ca>

Cc: Christie Macdonald <Christie_Macdonald@bcit.ca>; Wayne Hand <Wayne_Hand@bcit.ca>; Cory Langford <Cory_Langford@bcit.ca>

Subject: RE: Meeting request

Hi Ron,

I have re-scheduled a meeting for Friday, December 9, 2016 from 10:00 am to 11:00 am in Labour Relations' offices (SW01, Room 2310). An Outlook invitation will follow shortly. Please be advised that a failure to attend a meeting as directed by your employer may constitute insubordination, and depending upon the facts, could lead to discipline.

As previously noted, the purpose of the meeting is to discuss concerns regarding personal communications that you have been sending to employees at BCIT. Specifically you have sent a number of letters to Wayne Hand, Ana Lopez and Jack Davidson.

In accordance with Article 9.7 of the BCGEU Collective Agreement, you have the right to bring a Shop Steward with you to this meeting. To this end, I have copied Cory Langford, BCGEU Chair and Shop Steward, on this email. Cory is aware of this meeting and I understand that he is available to attend. I encourage you to contact Cory prior to the meeting. He can be reached at 604-456-1162 or via email.

Thanks,

Katie

Hi Katie,

I have to repeat the FACTS: As an employee of BCIT I have a RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers regarding THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, in order to prevent HARM to them. Nevertheless, my supervisors James Cai and Wane Hand restricted my RIGHT and DUTY to notify my co-workers sending me an email. I asked them to give me an authorized decision since email is not a LEGAL DOCUMENT. They declined to sign their decisions. Then I reported the issue to Ana Lopez. She failed to respond. That is the ISSUE. If you are interested in resolving this issue, please let me know, if one of the above persons will sign the decision on the restriction of my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers. You must understand that I am entitled to have an authorized decision regarding this issue that is extremely sensitive from the PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC.

It is IMPOSSIBLE to argue with a person who is reluctant to sign his or her decision made in GOOD FAITH, therefore, it is not appropriate for me to attend the meeting you requested. If the LAW requires to take disciplinary action against an employee who is trying to NOTIFY HIS CO-WORKERS REGARDING THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, please do not hesitate to proceed. That is final.

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Katie Cobban

Thu 12/8/2016 10:19 AM

To:

Ron Korkut;

Cc:

Christie Macdonald;

Wayne Hand;

Cory Langford;

You replied on 12/8/2016 10:52 AM.

Hi Ron,

The meeting remains scheduled for tomorrow. On behalf of the Institute I am directing you to attend the meeting.

Katie

Sent from my iPhone

Ron Korkut

Thu 12/8/2016 10:52 AM

Sent Items

To:

Katie Cobban;

Hi Katie,

I have to repeat the FACTS: As an employee of BCIT I have a RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers regarding THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, in order to prevent HARM to them. Nevertheless, my supervisors James Cai and Wane Hand restricted my RIGHT and DUTY to notify my co-workers sending me an email. I asked them to give me an authorized decision since email is not a LEGAL DOCUMENT. They declined to sign their decisions. Then I reported the issue to Ana Lopez. She failed to respond. That is the ISSUE. If you are interested in resolving this issue, please let me know, if one of the above persons will sign the decision on the restriction of my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers. You must understand that I am entitled to have an authorized decision regarding this issue that is extremely sensitive from the PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC.

It is IMPOSSIBLE to argue with a person who is reluctant to sign his or her decision made in GOOD FAITH, therefore, it is not appropriate for me to attend the meeting you requested. If the LAW requires to take disciplinary action against an employee who is trying to NOTIFY HIS CO-WORKERS REGARDING THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, please do not hesitate to proceed. That is final.

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Cory Langford

Thu 12/8/2016 2:32 PM

To:

Ron Korkut;

Hi Ron,

It is important that you attend the meeting. We don't have the right to refuse to meet with the employer when they call a meeting and if we do they tend to escalate the issue very quickly. Rather than the issue becoming more serious, I would urge you to attend the meeting and have the discussions with them as that is the best course of action.

Cory

Ron Korkut

Thu 12/8/2016 7:13 PM

Sent Items

To:

Cory Langford;

1 attachment

Hi Cory,

The issue is already very SERIOUS ISSUE. As an employee of BCIT, I have a RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers regarding THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, in order to prevent HARM to them. Nevertheless, my supervisors James Cai and Wane Hand restricted my RIGHT and DUTY to notify my co-workers sending me an email. I asked them to give me an authorized decision since email is not a LEGAL DOCUMENT. They declined to sign their decisions. Then I reported the issue to Ana Lopez. She failed to respond. That is the ISSUE. If you are interested in resolving this issue, please let me know, if one of the above persons will sign the decision on the restriction of my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers. You must understand that I am entitled to have an authorized decision regarding this issue that is extremely sensitive from the PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC.

It is IMPOSSIBLE to argue with a person who is reluctant to sign his or her decision made in GOOD FAITH, therefore, it is NOT APPROPRIATE for me to attend the meeting you are urging me to attend. If the LAW requires to take disciplinary action against an employee who is trying to NOTIFY HIS CO-WORKERS REGARDING THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, BCIT should NOT hesitate to proceed. THAT IS FINAL.

Ron Korkut

Ethics First