

JUL 02 2015

No. S-155390
VANCOUVER REGISTRY



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Between **Ron Korkut**

, Plaintiff

And **Janice R. Dillon**

, Defendant

NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM

This action has been started by the Plaintiff for the relief set out in Part 3 below. If

you intend to respond to this action, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim on the Plaintiff. If

you intend to make a counterclaim, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 and a counterclaim in Form 3 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim and counterclaim on the Plaintiff and on any new parties named in the counterclaim.

JUDGEMENT MAY BE PRONOUNCED AGAINST YOU IF YOU FAIL to file the response to civil claim within the time for response to civil claim described below.

Time for response to civil claim

A response to civil claim must be filed and served on the plaintiff,

- (a) if you reside anywhere in Canada, within 21 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (b) if you reside in the United States of America, within 35 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (c) if you reside elsewhere, within 49 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you, or
- (d) if the time for response to civil claim has been set by order of the court, within that time.

CLAIM OF THE PLAINTIFF

Part 1: STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. THE ORIGIN OF THE CASE: On March 31, 2009, Stewart Taylor hit the Plaintiff's car and ran away, on the Pattullo Bridge. The Plaintiff's car was totally destroyed, but he survived the collision. Stewart Taylor was caught; nevertheless, he was not arrested or prosecuted; because, **ICBC assumed the liability of the HIT and RUN CRIME Stewart Taylor committed.** Even though ICBC was 100% liable for the incident, ICBC representative, **Jason Gray** refused to pay non-pecuniary damages of the Plaintiff. Later on, the Plaintiff found out that, **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and maim 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year.** (ICBC quick-statistics). Therefore, the Plaintiff's case is not an isolated case. This case is an extremely sensitive issue, due to the extend of the harm inflicted on the PUBLIC. This case is the incontrovertible evidence of the fact that: **ICBC providing financial benefits to hit and run criminals under the name of "accident insurance benefits", where criminal offenders are identified.**

2. THE PLAINTIFF'S DUTY TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST CRIME: As a surviving **victim of hit and run crime**, the Plaintiff has a legal obligation to take legal action against his offender-in-law, ICBC; because, it is impossible to prevent crime, if victims fail **to take legal action** against their offenders or their sponsors.

3. LAWYERS OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE: In order to file his case, the Plaintiff consulted with 10 lawyers referred by the Lawyer Referral Service. All of the ten lawyers were declined to provide legal advice or service to file his case, despite the Plaintiff was willing to pay for their services. Lawyers' refusing to provide legal service to a member of public is tantamount to **obstruction of justice**; because, the lawyers are the only professionals who are knowledgeable and qualified to provide legal service to the public. The lawyers' professional-obligation is also clearly stated in the Canons of Legal Ethics. **"A lawyer should make legal services available to the public** in an efficient and convenient manner that will command respect and confidence.."

4. LAW SOCIETY STATED THAT LAWYERS HAVE NO OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC: In order to resolve this issue, the Plaintiff got in touch with the Law Society of British Columbia. After seven months of communication, the Law Society Executive Director, **Timothy E. McGee** confirmed that the lawyers of British Columbia

have **no obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime**, in his letter dated January 8, 2013. The Plaintiff asked him who had that obligation; but, he failed to respond.

5. LEGAL ACTION AGAINST McGEE: To find out **who has legal obligation to provide legal service to the public**, the Plaintiff filed a legal action against Timothy E. McGee, Executive Director of the Law Society. Nevertheless, legal representative of McGee, **Michael Armstrong** filed a court application and **Justice Nathan Smith** dismissed the Plaintiff's case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013, without answering the Plaintiff's question and without referring to any authority that relaxes lawyers' obligation to provide legal service to the public. At the hearing, the Plaintiff asked to Michael Armstrong the following question. He was silent; instead, Justice Nathan Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

7. DISMISSAL OF LEGAL ACTION WITHOUT AN APPLICABLE AUTHORITY:

Justice Nathan Smith concurred with Michael Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in C.231 of the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, **it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offender be free**, as long as the Law is enforced effectively. Therefore, **Justice Nathan Smith refused to sign his dismissal order.**

8. ATTEMPTING TO EXACT MONEY BY USING UNSIGNED COURT ORDER:

The Plaintiff filed an appeal for Justice Nathan Smith's decision with the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, the Plaintiff was not able to proceed with his appeal; because, Justice Nathan Smith **did not sign his order**. Instead, Michael Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Justice Nathan Smith and asked the Plaintiff to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean "**acceptance**", in legal documents. Michael Armstrong, attempted to exact \$6165.77, from the Plaintiff, relying on the court order that was not signed by Justice Nathan Smith. Furthermore, he

demanded \$5,000 under the name of “*security deposit*” for appeal court costs, assuming he would abort the Plaintiff’s appeal, as well.

9. COMPLAINT TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE: Since the Plaintiff was not able to proceed with his appeal in the Court of Appeal, he had no choice, other than reporting this issue to the Chief Justice, **Christopher E. Hinkson** and seeking help. He wrote four letters dated: Nov. 25, 2013, Jan. 13, 2014, Mar. 5, 2014 and Mar. 25, 2014. The Plaintiff raised the following issues to the attention of the Chief Justice:

1. Michael Armstrong filed an application to abort the Plaintiff’s legal action prematurely, **without citing any authority** to justify that *the lawyers have no obligation to provide legal service to the public.*
2. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed the Plaintiff’s legal action **without answering the question before the Court and declined to sign his order.**
3. Michael Armstrong, by using his professional influence, attempted to mislead the Plaintiff to believe that **signing a legal document does not mean acceptance** and asked the Plaintiff to sign the order he drafted on behalf of Justice Nathan Smith. He attempted to exact \$6165.77, from the Plaintiff, relying on the court order that was not signed by Justice Nathan Smith.
4. Master Dennis Tokarek signed a “Certificate of Costs” **without printing his name** on the legal document. The Plaintiff attempted to confirm the signature, but Master Tokarek failed to confirm his signature, in writing.

10. THE CHIEF JUSTICE DISREGARDED THE PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT: As we all know, the Chief Justice is responsible for supervising the court services and ensure that court services are provided to the public within reason. Nevertheless, he failed to respond to the Plaintiff’s complaint. Instead, **K. Jill Leacock** wrote a letter to the Plaintiff, dated January, 15, 2014. She interpreted the Plaintiff’s complaint as a “*request of legal advice*” and she stated that: “*Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice. will not respond further to your inquiry.*” Therefore, the Plaintiff filed a legal action against the Chief Justice, on the grounds of **breach of duty.**

11. JOHN D. WADDELL PROCURED THE ABORTION OF THE PLAINTIFF'S LEGAL ACTION AGAINST THE CHIEF JUSTICE: **John D. Waddell** filed an application and procured the dismissal of the Plaintiff's legal action without citing any **authority** that relaxes the Chief Justice's duty to pay attention to improper court procedures; such as, *failure to sign court orders* and *exacting money* from plaintiffs, by using unsigned court orders.

12. JUSTICE AUSTIN F. CULLEN DISMISSED THE PLAINTIFF'S LEGAL ACTION AGAINST THE CHIEF JUSTICE WITH COURT COSTS: Like, Justice Nathan Smith, Justice Austin Cullen **failed to sign his dismissal order**; because, the dismissal of the case was tantamount to declaring that: "*the Chief Justice had NO obligation to supervise court services*". Obviously, an Honourable person who acts in good faith, never hesitates to sign his own decision and confirm it. John Waddell attempted to exact court costs from the Plaintiff, by diluting him to believe that the *unsigned court order was a valid legal document*.

13. Therefore, THE PLAINTIFF WAS OBLIGED TO FILE ANOTHER CIVIL CLAIM AGAINST, **Austin F. Cullen, John D. Waddell and K. Jill Leacock** and sought an order for the trial of the case, to **bring his offenders to justice** and prevent ICBC aiding hit and run crime by providing financial benefits to offenders under the name of "*accident insurance benefits*".

14. ANTHONY LEONI AND RICHARD MARGETS ABORTED THE CASE. **Anthony Leoni** acting on behalf of John D. Waddell, and **Richard S. Margetts**, acting on behalf of Austin F. Cullen and K. Jill Leacock, filed an application, scheduled on March 19, 2015. The Plaintiff did not attend the hearing of the application due to the legal chicanery perpetrated in the Supreme Court of British Columbia; because, it is impossible to serve justice in a Court of Law where:

1. Judges **disregard the substantiated facts** and **the applicable law**, invoked by the victim; specifically, Criminal Code of Canada Section 252.
2. Judges **fail to sign their decisions** according to established rules of Law.
3. Lawyers attempt to exact court costs from the victims relying on **unauthorized court orders**.

15. JUSTICE JANICE DILLON DECLARED THE PLAINTIFF "VEXATIOUS LITIGANT". On April 16, 2015, Anthony Leoni, sent me a court order, allegedly issued by **Justice Janice R. Dillon**. The order was not signed according to the established rules of Law. The order declared the Plaintiff "VEXATIOUS LITIGANT" and he was enjoined from instituting any legal proceeding, except the leave of the court.

16. JUSTICE JANICE DILLON REFUSED TO CONFIRM THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE ORDER SENT BY ANTHONY LEONI. Since the Plaintiff was not sure that the order was signed by Justice Janice Dillon, due to the fact that **her full name was not printed above the signature**, he decided to confirm the authenticity of the order by writing to Justice Janice Dillon. Nevertheless, Justice Janice Dillon refused to confirm the authenticity of the order by failing to respond to the Plaintiff's letters dated April 24, May 16, and June 9, 2015. Obviously, an Honourable person who presides in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, never hesitates to confirm the validity of the order she made in good faith. Therefore, the Plaintiff was obliged to file this Civil Claim against Justice Janice Dillon, because, the order was **overriding the Plaintiff's right and duty to bring his offender to justice**, and the order was **not signed properly**.

17. HARM INFLICTED ON THE PUBLIC: Within the last six years, **due to the legal chicanery perpetrated in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**, the Plaintiff's offender-in-law, ICBC assumed the liability of **294,000 counts of hit and run crime that killed 48, injured and crippled 13,200** innocent citizens of British Columbia. (ICBC quick statistics)

Part 2: JUDGMENT REQUESTED

18. APPLICABLE LAW:

1. Justice Janice Dillon has **no authority override the Plaintiff's right and obstruct his duty to bring his offender to justice**, by declaring him "vexatious litigant".
2. Justice Janice Dillon has a **duty to sign her order** according to the established rules of Law. Court order is a significant legal document, therefore, it must be validated by the person who is authorized to issue the order by signing under his/her full name printed on the order. Simply, a court order is NOT VALID legal document, if it is NOT properly signed by the judge.

19. ESTABLISHED FACTS:

1. The order, allegedly issued by Justice Janice Dillon does not have the full name of **Justice Janice R. Dillon** above the signature. Therefore, **the person who signed the order is not identified**. Exhibit 1, is the proof of the fact that Justice Janice Dillon's full name was not printed on the court order.

2. Therefore, the Plaintiff attempted three times, in writing to verify the validity of the order; Justice Janice Dillon failed to verify the validity of her order. Exhibits 2, 3, 4. An Honourable Justice who makes a decision in good faith, never hesitates to validate her own decision.

3. In the order, Justice Janice Dillon declared the Plaintiff “*vexatious litigant*” knowing that the Plaintiff was a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and he had been struggling to bring his offender to justice for six years. An Honourable Justice never declares a victim of a crime “*vexatious litigant*” and obstruct his duty to bring his offender to justice; because such an action defeats the cause of justice.

20. JUDGMENT: **Is it LAWFUL for Justice Janice R. Dillon to override the Plaintiff’s right and duty to bring his offender to justice, by the way of declaring him “vexatious litigant”, knowing that he is a victim of hit and run crime and the legal actions he has filed were ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY in order to bring his offender to justice?**

Part 3. RELIEF SOUGHT

21. If Justice Janice Dillon, has **NO authority to override the Plaintiff’s right** and duty to bring his offender to justice, the Plaintiff seeks an order to prohibit her from sitting in the Supreme Court of British Columbia for the protection of the public.

22. If the Plaintiff, being a **victim of crime**, has a right to bring his offender to justice, he seeks the leave of the Court, so that he can file a **criminal legal action** against his offender-in-law, ICBC, considering the extent of the human suffering and financial loss inflicted on the Public, stated in paragraph 17.

Part 4: LEGAL BASIS

The Plaintiff relies on the following PRINCIPLES OF LAW:

1. Hit and run incident is **NOT** an **ACCIDENT**; it is a **CRIME**, under the section 252 of the **Criminal Code of Canada**.
2. A victim of crime has a **DUTY** to bring his/her offender to justice.

3. Assuming the liability of CRIMINAL action is the same as committing the offence.
4. Judgment must be based on the **substantiated facts and the applicable Law**.
5. It is improper to argue **irrelevant issues** and refer to irrelevant authorities in the Court of Law.
6. ABORTING a legal action without making the judgment requested by plaintiff and refusing to sign dismissal order is tantamount to **obstruction of justice**.
7. A supervisor is RESPONSIBLE for the wrong actions of the personnel works under his/her supervision.
8. A document that is NOT SIGNED by the person who is authorized to issue it, is NOT a **valid** legal document.
9. A lawyer is a minister of justice and an officer of the courts. Lawyers' **duty** is to **serve the cause of justice**. Therefore, it is improper for the lawyers to attempt to abort a victim's legal action prematurely to **prevent fair trial of a criminal case** and demand court costs referring to an unsigned dismissal order.
10. **Judicial immunity** cannot be extended to a level where justices refuse to receive substantiated facts, disregard the principles of substantive Law and fail to sign their orders.
11. **The Officers of the Courts who disregard the Law and obstruct justice to the Public, are the most DANGEROUS OFFENDERS.**

Plaintiff's address for service: Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1

E-mail address for service: ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Place of trial: Vancouver, British Columbia

The address of the registry is: 800 Smithe Street
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2E1

Date: July 2, 2015



Ron Korkut

Rule 7-1 (1) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules states:

- (1) Unless all parties of record consent or the court otherwise orders, each party of record to an action must, within 35 days after the end of the pleading period,
 - (a) prepare a list of documents in Form 22 that lists
 - (i) all documents that are or have been in the party's possession or control and that could, if available, be used by any party at trial or prove or disprove a material fact, and
 - (ii) all other documents to which the party intends to refer at trial, and
 - (b) serve the list on all parties of record.

APPENDIX

Part 1: CONCISE SUMMARY NATURE OF CLAIM:

Assuming the liability of hit and run crimes and obstruction of justice.

Part 2: THIS CLAIM ARISES FROM THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

1. **ICBC assumed the liability of hit and run crime and let the offender be free.**
2. The Law Society Executive Director, TIMOTHY E. McGEE stated that the lawyers have **no obligation to provide legal service** to a victim or crime who is trying to bring his offender to justice.
3. MICHAEL ARMSTRONG procured the abortion of the Plaintiff's legal action **without** citing any **authority** to demonstrate that lawyers have no obligation to provide legal service to the public. He attempted to swindle money from the Plaintiff by using **unsigned court order**.
3. Justice NATHAN SMITH dismissed the Plaintiff's case against TIMOTHY McGEE **without answering** the question before the Court and **declined to sign his order**.
4. Master DENNIS TOKAREK signed a "certificate of costs", without printing his name and declined to verify his name.
5. CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON, Chief Justice, disregarded the Plaintiff's complaint about the judges issuing **unsigned court orders** and lawyers swindling money, by using unsigned court orders.
6. JOHN WADDELL procured the abortion the Plaintiff's legal action against the Chief Justice **without** citing any **authority** that relaxes the Chief Justice's duty to invigilate court services and attempted to swindle money from the Plaintiff by using an unsigned court order.
7. AUSTIN CULLEN dismissed the Plaintiff's legal action against the Chief Justice **without** referring to any **authority** and did not sign his dismissal order.
8. K. JILL LEACOCK attempted to **mislead** the Plaintiff to believe that unsigned court order was a valid and enforceable court order.
9. Justice JANICE R. DILLON cooperating with ANTHONY LEONI and RICHARD S. MARGETTS, declared the Plaintiff "vexatious litigant" and **obstructed his access to Court Services**.

Part 3:

Occupiers Liability Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 337