

BCIT-BCGEU



BCIT: British Columbia Institute of Technology **BCGEU**: British Columbia Government Employees Union

Prepared by: Ron Korkut BCIT-BCGEU www.ilaw.site www.ethicsfirst.ca www.justsociety.info November 16, 2019

BCIT-BCGEU Slideshare.net

WHISTLE BLOWING

Whistle blowing is the term used for a person who EXPOSES a HARMFUL ACTION to protect the Public.

Harmful actions against the Public are also called "CRIME".

Obviously, if CRIMES are HIDDEN and the criminals are not brought to JUSTICE, it is IMPOSSIBLE to prevent CRIME.

Therefore, whistle blowing is the requirement of the LAW and it is an HONOURABLE commitment.







Nevertheless, in a "*competitive*" society, where the people do not CARE and TRUST each other, whistleblowers are treated like MISFITS.

This presentation is a good **example** of it.





Hit and run CRIME



My name is Ron Korkut, I am a victim of a *potentially* FATAL hit and run CRIME, perpetrated under the liability of ICBC.

It is IMPOSSIBLE not to **suffer** from **a potentially FATAL CRASH**. ICBC **denied** my suffering and **refused** to pay for my **suffering**, even though ICBC assumed the liability of the CRASH.

• Therefore, I was legally OBLIGED to bring my offender, ICBC to JUSTICE.

• It is impossible to prevent CRIME, if the victims fail to sue their offenders.

• SILENCE is tantamount to HIDING the CRIME.



Later, I discovered that:

ICBC INSURES and **PROTECTS**:

- 1. Over-speeding drivers
- **Impaired drivers** 2.
- **Distracted drivers** 3.
- **Reckless drivers** 4
- 5. Hit and run criminals
- As defined in the Criminal Code of Canada:
- **1. HIT AND RUN**, is a criminal offence under S.252 (Failure to stop at the crash location).

2. CRASHES due to over speeding, impaired driving, distracted driving, reckless driving are criminal offences called **CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE**, under S.219.

Criminally negligent drivers and hit an run criminals kill 264, injure and cripple thousands, and cause a damage of 4 billion dollars a year. (See ICBC CRIME at slideshare.net or www.ilaw.site)





IMPAIRED DRIVING **Criminal negligence**

OVER-SPEEDING

Criminal negligence



DISTRACTED DRIVING **Criminal negligence**





RECKLESS DRIVING **Criminal negligence**

HIT and RUN

CRIME

No reasonable person can ignore such an extensive HARM, ICBC inflicts on the PUBLIC. Therefore, **BRINGING ICBC TO JUSTICE WAS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY.** As a VICTIM of ICBC, it was my DUTY to bring ICBC to JUSTICE.

I have struggled to discharge my DUTY to bring my OFFENDER, ICBC to JUSTICE for six years.

I was not allowed to file a criminal case against ICBC. All the lawyers I approached, REFUSED to provide me with LEGAL SERVICE I needed desperately.



After filing three civil cases:

The Honourable Chief Justice, **Christopher E. Hinkson** declared me "*vexatious litigant*" and **obstructed** my access to **JUSTICE** Services. **S155390**, July 13, 2015. Dismissing the legal action of a VICTIM of CRIME, is tantamount to PROTECTING the CRIMINAL.

Get the hell out of here vexatious litigant! You cannot sue ICBC.. ICBC insures CRIMINALLY negligent drivers. It is a PUBLIC SERVICE.

This is the ORDER allegedly signed by the Chief Justice Hinkson.

VANCOUVER REGISTRY JUL 1 3 2015 No. S155390 Vancouver Registry ENTERED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA Between: RON KORKUT PLAINTIFF And: **JANICE R. DILLON** DEFENDANTS ORDER THE HONOURABLE BEFORE CHIEF JUSTICE HINKSON) 13 July 2015

THIS COURT, on its own motion and without a hearing, at Vancouver, British Columbia, on Monday, July 13, 2015 **ORDERS AND DECLARES THAT:**

- 1. The Notice of Civil Claim filed by Ron Korkut in Vancouver on July 2, 2015 in Supreme Court file No. <u>S155390 Vancouver Registry is a nullity</u> and is set aside as being filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 in Supreme Court file No.S150231 Vancouver Registry.
- No person is oblided to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim described in paragraph 1, nor to any other process or document filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 that a court registry may have inadvertently filed or received.

Signature without name

SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Registrar

Court Order is a SIGNIFICANT LEGAL DOCUMENT. *Therefore*, it must be signed in compliance with the procedural norms. *Also*, it must be issued according to the LAW and the FACTS established at the hearing.

This Court order is **NOT a VALID Court Order**, because:

- 1. NO HEARING,
- 2. No FACT is cited,
- 3. No authority/LAW is cited,
- 4. Not properly signed.

Obviously, a person who PROTECTS criminals by obstructing the VICTIMS' access to JUSTICE is more **DANGEROUS OFFENDER** than the actual CRIMINALS.

- It is the DUTY of the VICTIM to expose a JUDGE who denies NATURAL JUSTICE and it is ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY for the PROTECTION of the PUBLIC.
- Therefore, it is the REQUIREMENT of the LAW.

Since it was IMPOSSIBLE for me to ignore the REQUIREMENTS OF the LAW, my next DUTY was to INFORM the Public, about the CORRUPTION in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Obviously, I had to INFORM the people I knew, *first*.

Therefore, I attempted to inform my co-workers at BCIT.





Nevertheless, Wayne Hand, Dean of School of Construction, restricted my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers, by sending an email dated, October 14, 2016. 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

October 14, 2016

Wayne Hand P.E ng, MBA

 Dean , School of C on struction and the $\mathsf{E}\operatorname{nvironment}$

British Columbia Institute of Technology | bcit.ca

T: 604.432.8501 | C: 778.928.2632 | E whand@bcit.ca



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,

 To confirm his seriousness about his directive, I asked him to sign it.

- Wayne Hand <u>failed</u>
 <u>to sign</u> his directive;
 because, he was
 aware of his
 WRONG.
- An honourable person never hesitates to sign his own decision.

RESTRICTION OF THE RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH AT A WORK PLACE



After I complained to the Vice President, Wayne Hand asked me to attend a meeting to **discuss my RIGHT and DUTY to** inform my co-workers regarding the perils of the CORRUPTION in the **Supreme Court of British** Columbia.

I declined to attend the meeting; *because*, it would be inappropriate for me to have a meeting with a person who restricted my **RIGHT to free speech** and **refused** to **SIGN** his directive.

No one has a RIGHT to argue or negotiate the NATURAL RIGHTS of another person.

To **FORCE me to the meeting**, Wayne Hand **suspended** my **work** *twice*. For the same reason, I **declined** to attend the meetings.

To demonstrate his POWER OF AUTHORITY, Wayne Hand terminated my employment on February 8, 2017, on the grounds of *"insubordination"*.

I ORDERED you to sit down with me and listen to my preach regarding your communication with your friends. You did not OBEY. Who do you thing you are? You are INSUBORDINATE. You are FIRED! In FACT, Wayne Hand was not my supervisor. I met him, the first time when he delivered the termination notice, on February 8, 2017.

My supervisor was **Ted Simmons**. He hired me and I have worked for 10 years under his supervision, without any problem of *INSUBORDINATION*.



Kathy Kinloch President of BCIT, I complained to the **President of BCIT, Kathy Kinloch about Wayne** Hands conduct. Nevertheless, she did not respond to my complaint. I sought help from my union, BCGEU.



- I filed a grievance with the Government Employees Union, BCGEU on the grounds of wrongful dismissal.
- The union lawyer, Oliver Demuth DRAGGED the issue on for months. I specifically asked him to get in touch with Wayne Hand; because, Wayne Hand signed the dismissal notice.
- Oliver Demuth's DUTY was to verify with my supervisor, Ted Simmons and Wayne Hand that:
- 1. There was NO ISSUE of "disobedience" or "subordination".
- 2. There was no reason for the termination of my work other than my communication with my co-workers, regarding the corruption in the Courts.



Oliver Demuth refused to communicate with Wayne Hand to determine the FACTS on my side and dismissed my GRIEVANCE, on April 19, 2017.

As a lawyer, he was perfectly aware of the IMPOSSIBILITY of resolving a labour conflict based on the single sided FACTS.

Dear Ron

Re Your Suspension and Dismissal Grievances BCGEU Grievance Form No.226535 & 226536 The PROOF of Oliver Demuth refused to communicate with Wayne Hand. Signed letter, April 4, 2017.

Regarding your letter of April 3, 2017, the Union will not be communicating directly with Wayne Hand, nor does the Union intend to launch an action against him outside of the grievance procedure.

Dear Brother Korkut.

Email, April 19, 2017, CONFIRMING that Oliver Demuth did not communicate with Wayne Hand.

In response to your letter of April 6, 2017 (attached), I have not communicated with Wayne Hand regarding the discipline you received or your grievances because he is not the representative designated by the Employer to discuss those matters on its behalf. My authority to determine who is the appropriate representative of the Employer to discuss your discipline and grievances with is grounded in the *Labour Relations Code* of BC.

Canons of Legal Ethics 2.1-3 9(a)



A lawyer should obtain sufficient knowledge of the facts and give adequate consideration to the applicable law Audi alteram partem (hear the other side) is a safe rule to follow.

The Rule of Legal Ethics is very clear that it is **NECESSARY** to get the FACTS on both sides. That means:

It is IMPOSSIBLE to resolve a conflict based on the single sided FACTS.

Oliver Demuth's decision, dated April 19, 2017.

After your dismissal, Brian Campbell and I corresponded with the Employer and I asked that you be reinstated. The Employer has refused to reinstate you and has made no other offer to resolve the grievances filed on your behalf.

Oliver Demuth was supposed to communicate with Wayne Hand; because, he signed the dismissal order. Oliver Demuth admitted that he did not communicate with Wayne Hand in his letter and email dated Apr. 4 and 19, 2017, as shown previously. This is a blatant misstatement of the TRUTH.

For all the foregoing reasons, in my opinion, the suspension and dismissal grievances filed on your behalf will not succeed at arbitration and, therefore, I intend to withdraw them, subject to your right to appeal.

"the foregoing reasons" Oliver Demuth referred was NOTHING, but my NOT attending Wayne Hand's call of meetings, to negotiate my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers. This paragraph clearly states that his decision was based on HIS OPINION; NOT the proven facts.

APPEAL from Oliver Demuth's decision.

- On July 11, 2017, I had an appeal hearing by **Frank Anderson**.
- The REASON for my appeal was the FACT that Oliver Demuth did not communicate with Wayne Hand to verify the FACTS relevant to the termination of my employment.
- Nevertheless, Frank Anderson REFUSED to accept the FACT that Oliver Demuth did not communicate with Wayne Hand. He did not even mention it, in his decision. He dismissed my appeal; because, I did not attend Wayne Hand's meeting to negotiate my RIGHT and DUTY to inform my co-workers.
- Frank Anderson upheld Oliver Demuth's decision based on the single sided FACTS, as stated by Wayne Hand.

DENIAL OF UNION DUTY

- Frank Anderson referred me to Doug Dykens. Doug Dykens referred me to Provincial Executive Grievance Appeal Committee. First of all, I was not an Executive, second, such a committee did NOT EXIST, based on my online search. It was a HOAX.
- I raised the issue to the attention of the Union President
 Stephanie Smith. She approved Oliver Demuth's decision, but denied my FACTS. I asked which facts were not acceptable for her. She failed to respond.
- I kept writing to Stephanie Smith; because, I was entitled to get an authorized decision on my grievance that has been dragging on for nine months without any income.

CALLING POLICE on a member who asks for an authorized DECISION

STOP, you cannot get an authorized decision from Stephanie Smith. If you attempt to communicate with her, I will ARREST you.

 Union lawyers Jitesh Mistry and Thomas Yachnin interpreted my request of authorized DECISION from Stephanie Smith, as an act of "HARASSMENT". They attempted to intimidate me by sending an RCMP officer to my home, on November 20, 2017.

POLICE

- I filed a complaint about Thomas Yachnin's conduct with the Law Society. Obviously, calling the police on a person who is entitled to get an authorized decision is not consistent with the RULES OF LEGAL ETHICS.
- The Law Society is NOT A GANG OF CROOKS who protect CRIMINALS and each other. Nevertheless, the CEO of the Law Society, Donald J. Avison's failure to investigate my complaint is an indicative of that the LAW SOCIETY is a GANG of dishonourable people who are working against PUBLIC INTEREST.

SUMMARY

I have paid union fees for TEN YEARS, in trust with BCGEU for the protection of my employment RIGHTS. The conflict would have been resolved in TEN MINUTES.

Hi, Wayne Hand, did you have any trouble with Ron Korkut other than his communication with his co-workers, before you terminate his employment with BCIT?

No, but he did not OBEY my request of meetings.

Sorry, Wayne Hand, but the members of BCGEU have a RIGHT to inform each other at a work place, please reinstate his employment.

Union Lawyers Oliver Demuth or Jitesh Mistry or Thomas Yachnin

I am looking for a person/lawyer who can HELP me, by calling Wayne Hand at 604 432-8501.

BREACH OF TRUST/DUTY IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE

The next step is to file a breach of trust/duty case against Stephanie Smith, pursuant to S122 Criminal Code of Canada.

Breach of trust by public officer

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

R.S., c. C-34, s. 111.



It is IMPOSSIBLE to TRUST a Union President who calls the POLICE on a member asking an authorized decision due to a patent misconduct of the union lawyer. *Therefore,* Stephanie Smith must be brought to JUSTICE, pursuant to the Section 122 of Criminal Code of Canada.

As a victim, it is my DUTY to bring Stephanie Smith to JUSTICE, *otherwise* it is IMPOSSIBLE to prevent CRIME.

For more information review

