

Legal Ethics



**The HONOUR of
Legal Profession
must be protected**

Prepared by:
Ron Korkut
ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Slideshare.net
Legal Ethics

www.ilaw.site
www.ethicsfirst.ca

November 16, 2019



OBJECTIVE

This presentation is a PUBLIC COMPLAINT about six LAWYERS to PROVE that the Law Society of British Columbia is an association of HONOURABLE LAWYERS; NOT a GANG OF CROOKS.

THE HONOUR OF LEGAL PROFESSION

- The **LAW PROTECTS NATURAL RIGHTS** and **Human DIGNITY**.
- *Therefore*, the **LAW** is **absolute NECESSITY**, like the **air** we breathe every minute. *Everyone* has a **DUTY** to **know** and **PROTECT** the **LAW**.
- Since, the **LAWYERS** are the **responsible professionals** for the **application** of the **LAW** and serving **JUSTICE**, they are **vitally IMPORTANT** for the **protection** of the **PUBLIC**.
- *Therefore*, the **PUBLIC TRUSTS** the **lawyers** and **respects** the **HONOUR** of **LEGAL PROFESSION**.

Canons of Legal ethics:

2.1 A lawyer is a minister of justice, an officer of the courts and a member of an ancient and honourable profession.



HONOURABLE and CROOKED lawyers

*Nevertheless, we are not living in a **PERFECT** society.*

*Therefore, besides the Honourable Lawyers, there are a few **crooked ones**, as well. Most of the time, they are referred as "**CROOKS**".*



- *By definition, a **CROOK** is a lawyer who is **NOT BOUND** with the rules of **LEGAL ETHICS**.*

*It is possible to **make more MONEY** by **exonerating CRIMINALS**, than **protecting the VICTIMS**.*



***CROOKS** are motivated by **MONEY**; therefore, they do not hesitate to **OBSTRUCT JUSTICE** to the victims of **CRIME** and *pervert the established **FACTS** and the applicable **LAW**, for their own and clients' benefits.**



Identifying the **CROOKS** is **NECESSARY** for the **protection** of the **HONOUR** of legal profession and the Public.

“A **BAD** apple spoils the bunch.”

CAUTION!

*Even though, it is absolutely **NECESSARY** to identify **CROOKS** for the protection of the Honourable Lawyers and the **PUBLIC**, making a **WRONG** determination may amount to “**defamation**” and have *serious* legal consequences.*

*Therefore, we must follow the **RULES** of **CONCLUSIVE DECISION** to avoid the possibility of making a **MISTAKE**.*

DUTY TO PROTECT **the HONOUR of LEGAL Profession**

- *First*, it is a **LAWYER's DUTY** to maintain the **HONOUR OF LEGAL PROFESSION**; *otherwise*, no one can TRUST and seek **legal service** from the lawyers.
- *Second*, if a lawyer is implicated with any **dishonourable** conduct, it is the DUTY of the **Law Society** to **protect** the HONOUR of legal profession.
- *Third*, if the Law Society **refuses** to investigate any **dishonourable** conduct performed by the members; then it is the DUTY of the **VICTIMS** to expose the **CROOKS** to **protect** the **PUBLIC** and the **Honour of Legal Profession**.
- *Since*, **CROOKS may become more dangerous OFFENDERS than the ordinary CRIMINALS**, *the victims of the CROOKS must INFORM* the **PUBLIC**.

HOW TO DETERMINE IF A LAWYER IS A CROOK?


PROCEDURE

To make a **FIRM** and **CONCLUSIVE DECISION** on a lawyer's conduct, two things are **NECESSARY**:

1. A **RULE** of LEGAL ETHICS.
2. A **TRUTH** about the lawyer's conduct that is *inconsistent* with the **RULE**.

The **DECISION** is made by comparing the **RULE** with the **TRUTH**.

Finally, the **DECISION** must be **VERIFIED** for the sake of prudence.



JUDGMENT

JUDGMENT is a firm and conclusive decision that is necessary for **SERVING NATURAL JUSTICE**. There are three **ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENTS**:

1. Firm and unequivocal **RULE of LAW**.
2. Established **FACTS** – *about the violation of the LAW* - beyond any reasonable doubt.
3. A **Judge** who is **independent, impartial** bound with judicial **ETHICS** to confirm the **FACTS** and apply the **LAW**.

In **CIVIL COURTS**, it is **FREE** to argue **applicable LAW**, **established FACTS** and **dismiss** any case against the interests of influential persons.



**Rule of
LAW**

**Established
FACTS**

**Cause of
ACTION**

**Verification
TRIAL**

JUDGMENT

Fundamentals of LEGAL ETHICS

Legal ethics is NOT a different ETHICS than what we learn in the first years of our lives.

1. **Tell the truth.**
2. **Be responsible.**
3. **Do not HARM.**

The **CANONS** of LEGAL ETHICS, are the same as **SOCIAL ETHICS**, but more **SPECIFIC** and more **STRICT**.

- 2 2.1 A lawyer's DUTY is to **serve the cause of JUSTICE** and maintain the **DIGNITY** of the Courts.
- 1 2.1-2(c) A lawyer should not attempt to **deceive a court or tribunal** by offering false evidence or by **misstating facts or law** ..
- 3 2.1-2(d) A lawyer should never seek **privately to influence a court or tribunal**, in the lawyer's or a client's favour. (See the Code of Professional conduct for BC, at lawsociety.bc.ca)
- 2 2.1-3(a) A lawyer should obtain sufficient **knowledge** of the **relevant facts** and give adequate consideration to the **applicable law**...
- 2,3 2.1-3(j) A lawyer should always bear in mind that the profession is branch of the **administration of justice** and **not a mere money-making business**.
- 2 2.1-5(a,c) A lawyer should assist in **maintaining the honour** and integrity of the **legal profession**,.... make **legal services available to the public** ...

HOW TO DETERMINE IF A LAWYER IS A CROOK?

EXAMPLES

In the next pages, - I will introduce six members of the Law Society and guide you to make conclusive DECISIONS about their professional conduct.

If you happened to have any reasonable concerns about this presentation please, let me know. ron@ethicsfirst.ca

The OBJECTIVE of this presentation is NOT to harm the credibility of any person, but to **PROTECT** the PUBLIC and the Honour of Legal Profession.

Michael G. Armstrong
John D. Waddell
Anthony Leoni
Oliver Demuth
Jitesh Mistry
Thomas Yachnin

Is Michael G. Armstrong a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



CASE:

1. I am a victim of a potentially FATAL hit and run **CRIME perpetrated under the liability of ICBC**. Since ICBC refused to pay my pain and suffering, I had a DUTY to bring ICBC to JUSTICE; *otherwise*, it is impossible to prevent CRIME.
2. *Furthermore*, ICBC INSURES and protects hit and run CRIMINALS and CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT drivers who **kill 264** peoples each year and **injure thousands**. ICBC FORCES the responsible drivers to pay the **criminal damages of 4 billion dollars**.
3. I was NOT able to file a legal action against ICBC; *because*, all the lawyers REFUSED to **provide me with legal service**. I reported the issue to the Law Society. The Law Society CEO, Timothy E. McGee refused to investigate the issue stating that “*the lawyers do not have professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of CRIME*”, despite it is a REQUIREMENT of the Canons of Legal Ethics. [2.1-5(c)] “**A lawyer should make legal services available to the public in an efficient and convenient manner ..**”
(See “REPORT” at my websites.)
4. Since a person who denies the legal obligations of the lawyers **cannot be TRUSTED** with representing the Law Society, I filed a legal action against Timothy E. McGee.

Is Michael G. Armstrong a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



1. A **RULE** of LEGAL ETHICS, (2.1).

“It is a lawyer’s duty to serve the cause of justice”.

2. A **TRUTH** about the lawyer’s conduct *inconsistent* with the RULE.

FACT: “Lawyer Michael G. Armstrong, aborted my legal action against Timothy E. McGee, knowing that I was a victim of hit and run crime and it was my DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE.”

PROOF: SCBC, S132382, Notice of Application, filed by Michael G. Armstrong, to **ABORT** my case, on June 27, 2013, Justice Nathan Smith’s order filed *without signature*, on December 6, 2013. (Next pages)

APR - 4 2013

S-132382

No. _____
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

PROOF of the FACTS

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Between  **Ron Korkut**

, Plaintiff

And

Timothy E. McGee, Executive Director of the Law Society of British Columbia

, Defendant

NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM

CLAIM OF THE PLAINTIFF

*Plaintiff is a
victim of HIT
and RUN
CRIME as
stated clearly
in the CLAIM.*

Part 1: STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. INCIDENT: On March 31, 2009, while driving his work-van erratically and speeding on Pattullo Bridge, Stewart Taylor hit the Plaintiff's car and ran away. The Plaintiff lost control of his car that was totally destroyed after three impacts. Fortunately, he survived, because his car did not skid into the oncoming traffic. Stewart Taylor was caught, but not arrested or prosecuted. Instead, ICBC assumed the liability of the HIT and RUN CRIME Stewart Taylor committed and rewarded him by paying the cost of the car he destroyed, as if it was an ordinary accident. Worst of all, this is not an isolated case; because, according to ICBC quick-statistics, every year, ICBC assumes the liability of 49000 hit and run crashes that injure 2200 and kill 10 innocent citizens of British Columbia. Hit and run crash is criminal offence under the section 252 of Canadian Criminal Code.



NO. S-132382
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

TIMOTHY E. MCGEE, Executive Director of the Law Society of British Columbia

DEFENDANT

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

Notice of Application filed by Michael G. Armstrong to dismiss my claim against Timothy E. McGee, knowing that I was a VICTIM OF CRIME and "the lawyers had an obligation to provide legal service to me".

The REASON for DISMISSAL

Michael G. Armstrong's REASON for getting my case DISMISSED.


Part 3: LEGAL BASIS

1. The Defendant asserts that the Notice of Civil Claim:

- (a) discloses no reasonable claim;
- (b) is unnecessary, scandalous, frivolous and vexatious;
- (c) is otherwise an abuse of the process of this Court

and should be struck out pursuant to Rules 9-5(1)(a), (b) and (d) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules.

An Honourable lawyer NEVER makes a solemn DECLARATION before the Court to the effect that: "Victims of crime ABUSE the Court process", because, it is a PURJURY. It is a CRIME.



NO. S-132382
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

TIMOTHY E. MCGEE, Executive Director of the
Law Society of British Columbia

DEFENDANT

ORDER MADE AFTER APPLICATION

BEFORE

THE HONOURABLE) 02 / AUGUST / 2013
MR. JUSTICE NATHAN SMITH)

PROOF of the FACTS

2. The plaintiff shall pay ordinary costs of this action to the defendant.

THE FOLLOWING PARTIES APPROVE THE FORM OF THIS ORDER:

Signature of Michael G. Armstrong, Q.C.,
lawyer for the defendant, Timothy E. McGee,
Executive Director of the Law Society of British Columbia

Signature of Ron Korkut, the plaintiff

*Court order
filed
without
signature!*

By the Court

Registrar

*Settled in these terms
this 6th day of Dec 2013
DW [Signature]*

***FILING a Court Order without
SIGNATURE is a perfect example
of LEGAL CHICANERY!***

Is Michael G. Armstrong a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

DECISION is made by comparing the **RULE** with the **TRUTH**.

1. If aborting the legal action of a VICTIM OF CRIME, arguing that he has no cause of ACTION, is “an act of SERVING JUSTICE”, then Michael G. Armstrong is an Honourable Lawyer.

2. If it is “an act of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE”, then Michael G. Armstrong is a CROOK.



VERIFICATION: Share your decision with your friends, if they have *no reason* to **REJECT** your decision, then your decision is **VALID**.

ACTIONS NECESSARY, if Michael G. Armstrong is a CROOK:

- *The members of the PUBLIC* must **INFORM** and protect each other.
- *The members of the Law Society* must **TAKE** necessary **ACTIONS** to protect the Honour of Legal profession, as well.





A CROOK who dares *to ABORT* the legal actions of the *VICTIMS OF CRIME* is more **DANGEROUS OFFENDER** than the **actual CRIMINALS**.

CROOKS are the cancerous cells of a **SICK SOCIETY**.

Is John D. Waddell a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



1. **RULE:** “It is a lawyer’s duty to serve the cause of justice” (2.1).

2. **FACT:** Like Michael G. Armstrong, **John D. Waddell** filed an application dated May 30, 2014 to **abort** my legal action S143080, knowing that I was a VICTIM of a potentially FATAL **hit and run CRIME** and I was legally **obliged to bring my offender to JUSTICE**.

PROOF: Notice of Application entered by **John D. Waddell** on May 30, 2014, S143080. Order Made After Application, filed **without signature**, on July 25, 2014. Those documents are accessible for the Public at Vancouver court registry. The copies are available at my websites.

Vancouver
30-May-14
REGISTRY

No. 8-143080
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT
PLAINTIFF/RESPONDENT


AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON
DEFENDANT/APPLICANT

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

- (c) serve on the applicant 2 copies of the following, and on every other party of record one copy of the following:
- (i) a copy of the filed application response;
 - (ii) a copy of each of the filed affidavits and other documents that you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application and that has not already been served on that person;
 - (iii) if this application is brought under Rule 9.7, any notice that you are required to give under Rule 9-7(9).

Dated: May 30, 2014


Signature of
 applicant lawyer for applicant
John D. Waddell, Q.C.

Is John D. Waddell a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

DECISION:


**1. If aborting the legal action of a VICTIM OF CRIME, arguing that he has no cause of ACTION, is “an act of SERVING JUSTICE”, then:
John D. Waddell is an Honourable Lawyer.**

**2. If it is “an act of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE”, then:
John D. Waddell is a CROOK.**

VERIFICATION: Share your decision with your friends, if they have no reason to REJECT your decision, then your decision is VALID.

NECESSARY ACTIONS, if John D. Waddell is a CROOK:

- 1. If you are a lawyer, you must take action to protect the Honour of Legal profession.**
- 2. If you are member of the PUBLIC, you must SHARE and report the issue to the MEDIA, to protect the PUBLIC.**



No. S-143080
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON

DEFENDANT

ORDER MADE AFTER APPLICATION


BEFORE) THE HONOURABLE ASSOCIATE)
) CHIEF JUSTICE CULLEN) June 24, 2014
))

ON THE APPLICATION of the Defendant Christopher E. Hinkson coming on for hearing at 800 Smithe Street, Vancouver, British Columbia on June 24, 2014 and on hearing John D. Waddell; Q.C. on behalf of the Defendant, and no one appearing for the Plaintiff on the Application although duly served.

THIS COURT ORDERS that:

1. The Plaintiff's action be dismissed;
2. The Plaintiff pay the Defendant his costs of the action and of this application;
3. The approval of the form of this Order by the Plaintiff is dispensed with.

THE FOLLOWING PARTIES APPROVE THE FORM OF THIS ORDER:


Signature of lawyer for the Defendant
John D. Waddell, Q.C.

NO signature

By the Court,
Digitally signed by
Berg, Mellani
Registrar

Is Anthony Leoni a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



No. S150231
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

1. **RULE:** “It is a lawyer’s duty to serve the cause of justice” (2.1).

2. **FACT:** Like John D. Waddell, Anthony Leoni filed an application to **abort** my legal action S150231. He was aware of the **FACT** that I was a **victim** of a potentially **FATAL** hit and run **CRIME** and I was legally **obliged** to bring my offender to **JUSTICE**.

PROOF: Notice of Application entered by Anthony Leoni on, Feb. 2, 2015, S150231. Order made after Application, filed **without proper signature**, on April 16, 2015 . Those documents are accessible for the Public at the Vancouver court registry. Copies are available at my websites.

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

JOHN D. WADDELL, AUSTIN F. CULLEN, K. JILL LEACOCK

DEFENDANTS

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

This is the application filed by Anthony Leoni

(b) at least 2 days before the date set for the hearing of the application, serve on the applicant 2 copies, and on every other party one copy, of a filed copy of the application response and the other documents referred to in Rule 9-7 (12) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules.

Date: January 30, 2015

Signature of
[X] lawyer for applicant(s)
Anthony Leoni

Is Anthony Leoni a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



No. S150231
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RONKORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

JOHN D. WADDELL, AUSTIN F. CULLEN, K. JILL LEACOCK

DEFENDANTS

ORDER MADE AFTER APPLICATION

The order allegedly made by Madam Justice Dillon declared me "vexatious litigant" knowing that I am victim of CRIME and I had legal obligation to bring my offender to JUSTICE.

THE FOLLOWING PARTY APPROVES THE FORM OF THIS ORDER AND CONSENTS TO EACH OF THE ORDERS, IF ANY, THAT ARE INDICATED ABOVE AS BEING BY CONSENT.

Signature of
[] party [X] counsel for the Defendant, John D. Waddell
Anthony Leoni

Signature of
[] party [X] counsel for the Defendants, Austin F. Cullen and K. Jill Leacock
Richard Margetts, Q.C.

The name of the person who signed is missing.

By the Court

Registrar

DECISION:

**1. If aborting the legal action of a VICTIM OF CRIME, arguing that he has no cause of ACTION, is "an act of SERVING JUSTICE", then:
Anthony Leoni is an Honourable Lawyer.**

**2. If it is "and act of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE", then:
Anthony Leoni is a CROOK.**

VERIFICATION: Share your decision with your friends, if they have no reason to REJECT your decision, then your decision is VALID.

NECESSARY ACTIONS, if Anthony Leoni is a CROOK:

- If you are a lawyer, you must take action to protect the Honour of Legal profession.*
- If you are member of the PUBLIC, you must SHARE this information, to protect the PUBLIC.*

Is Oliver Demuth a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?



CASE:

1. *After ten years of service, Wayne Hand terminated my employment* with BCIT, on the pretext of DISOBEDIENCE; under the following circumstances:
 - a. He was NOT my **supervisor**; *therefore*, he had no reason or authority to accuse me of “DISOBEDIENCE”. My supervisor was Ted Simmons.
 - b. He restricted my **RIGHT and DUTY to inform** my co-workers and **refused to sign** his order.
 - c. *Absolutely*, there was **NO ISSUE** of work performance or any other misconduct on my part, other than **INFORMING** my co-workers about the *perils of the corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia*.
2. *Since*, it was a WRONGFUL DISMISSAL, I filed a **grievance** with BCGEU. The union lawyer, **Oliver Demuth** was in charge of resolving the **labour conflict between Wayne Hand and me**.
3. Oliver Demuth was my **legal representative**, his DUTY was to **protect** my employment benefits/rights.
4. I *specifically requested* Oliver Demuth to communicate with Wayne Hand to find out the **actual reason** for the termination of my employment.

Is Oliver Demuth a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

1. RULES of LEGAL ETHICS.

a. A lawyer is a **client's advocate** (2.1) .

b. A lawyer should endeavour by all fair and honourable means to obtain for a **client** the benefit of any and every **remedy and defence** that is authorized by law. [2.1-3(e)]

c. “A lawyer should obtain sufficient knowledge of the **relevant facts** and give adequate consideration to the applicable law before advising a client... **Hear the other side** is a safe rule to follow” [(2.1-3(a))].

2. **FACT:** Oliver Demuth refused to communicate with Wayne Hand and dismissed my grievance **based on the single sided FACTS.**

PROOF: Oliver Demuth's letter dated April 4, 2017 and email dated April 19, 2017.
(Next page)

Dear Ron

Re **Your Suspension and Dismissal Grievances**
BCGEU Grievance Form No.226535 & 226536

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.

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.

The PROOF of Oliver Demuth refused to communicate with Wayne Hand. Signed letter, April 4, 2017.



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

Is Oliver Demuth a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

DECISION:

1. If REFUSING a client's request to find the **FACTS** from the adversary, is consistent with the requirements of the **LEGAL ETHICS** *then:*

Oliver Demuth is an Honourable Lawyer.

2. If it is contradicting with the requirements of the LEGAL ETHICS then, Oliver Demuth is a CROOK.

VERIFICATION: Share your decision with your friends, if they have no reason to **REJECT** your decision, then your decision is **VALID**.

NECESSARY ACTIONS, if Oliver Demuth is a CROOK:

- 1. If you are a lawyer, you must take action to protect the Honour of Legal profession.*
- 2. If you are member of the PUBLIC, you must SHARE and report the issue to the MEDIA, to protect the PUBLIC.*

Is Jitesh Mistry a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

1. RULES:

- a. A lawyer is a **client's advocate** (2.1) .
- b. A lawyer should **endeavour** by all fair and honourable means to obtain for a client the benefit of any and **every remedy and defence** that is authorized by law. [2.1-3(e)]
- c. Criminal Code of Canada, PERJURY, S.131.

2. FACT:

Jitesh Mistry a lawyer employed by BCGEU. *Therefore*, his DUTY was to **protect** my employment RIGHTS, since I was a member of the union. He is supposed to **advise** Oliver Demuth that *dismissing a grievance based on the **single sided FACTS*** was WRONG. *Instead*, he **accused** me of **HARASSMENT** for **requesting an authorized decision from Stephanie Smith**, President, and **threatened** me with police intervention.

PROOF: Jitesh Mistry's letter dated October 16, 2017.

October 16, 2017

VIA COURIER WITH SIGNATURE
VIA EMAIL: (ron@ethicsfirst.ca)

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut

Re: Your letter of October 10, 2017

I am a lawyer and General Counsel to the BOGEU.

I have reviewed your October 10, 2017 letter to BOGEU President Stephanie Smith, as well as much of the prior communication between you and various BOGEU representatives (including elected officers).

It is my considered opinion that your October 10th letter, and certainly the totality of your communications, constitute unlawful harassment and defamation.

You will immediately cease and desist in communicating (in writing, verbally or otherwise) with any BOGEU representatives other than Thom Yachnin. All other BOGEU representatives will be directed not to engage in any communications with you.

You will not attend at any BOGEU buildings or property.

Any failure to adhere to these conditions may be met with formal legal action and/or a request for police intervention, without further notice.

If you have any dispute with this letter or the BOGEU generally, you are encouraged to contact the Labour Relations Board's Information Officer and/or seek independent legal advice.

Yours Truly



Jitesh Mistry
General Counsel
#Attmystwaf
20171016 mR/Karkar

Reply to: Jitesh Mistry, General Counsel
F: 604-298-3962
E: Jitesh.Mistry@bcgeu.ca

This letter is a
"solemn declaration"
signed by Jitesh Mistry.

Is Jitesh Mistry a CROOK or
an Honourable Lawyer?

In legal proceedings, perverting the FACTS
is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE, called "perjury".

Criminal Code of Canada

Misleading Justice

Perjury

131 (1) Subject to subsection (3), every one commits perjury who, with intent to mislead, makes before a person who is authorized by law to permit it to be made before him a false statement under oath or solemn affirmation, by affidavit, solemn declaration or deposition or orally, knowing that the statement is false.

For a reasonable person, a LAWYER who
perverts the FACTS against the interests of
his client, is a perfect example of a CROOK.

Is Jitesh Mistry a CROOK or an Honourable Lawyer?

DECISION:

1. If accusing a client of “HARRASMENT” and **threatening** with **police intervention**, - *where the client is entitled to get an authorized decision* - is “**an act of serving the interest of a client**”, then,
Jitesh Mistry is an Honourable Lawyer.
2. If it is contradicting with the requirements of the **LEGAL ETHICS**,
then:
Jitesh Mistry is a **CROOK**.

VERIFICATION: Share your decision with your friends, if they have no reason to **REJECT** your decision, then your decision is **VALID**.

NECESSARY ACTIONS, if Jitesh Mistry is a CROOK:

1. *If you are a lawyer*, you must take action to protect the Honour of Legal profession.
2. *If you are member of the PUBLIC*, you must **SHARE** and report the issue to the **MEDIA**, to protect the **PUBLIC**.

Is Thomas Yachnin a **CROOK** or an Honourable Lawyer?



Thomas Yachnin is another **lawyer employed by BCGEU**. *Therefore, from the point of LAW, I am his **client** and he is my **advocate**.*

*Nevertheless, like Jitesh Mistry, instead of protecting my RIGHTS, he **accused** me of **HARASSMENT** and **called the police on me, for requesting an authorized decision from Stephanie Smith**, on Nov. 20, 2017 (recorded call).*

I filed a **complaint** with the Law Society on Nov. 21, 2017. The Law Society under the supervision of Donald Avison refused to investigate. That is an indicative that **LAW SOCIETY is NOT CONCERNED** with the **HONOUR** of Legal Profession and the **DIGNITY** of the **COURTS**.

Law Society of British Columbia



DUTIES OF THE LAW SOCIETY

The following are the statements publicized at www.lawsociety.bc.ca to describe the DUTIES of the Law Society.

- The Law Society of British Columbia **ensures the public is well served** by legal professionals who are **honourable and competent**.
- We regulate the legal profession in BC, **protecting the public interest** in the administration of justice by setting and **enforcing standards of professional conduct** for lawyers. We also bring a voice to issues affecting the justice system and the delivery of legal services.

MISLEADING THE PUBLIC IS A CRIME AGAINST THE PUBLIC.

Law Society of British Columbia

If the Law Society tolerates the LAWYERS who:

- 1. Refuse** to provide legal service to the PUBLIC,
- 2. Abort** the legal actions of the victims of CRIME,
- 3. Resolve** conflicts based on *single sided FACTS*,
- 4. Call** the police on clients who request an authorized decision.

Obviously,

The LAW SOCIETY is NOT an association of HONOURABLE LAWYERS.


CEO of the Law Society must be brought to JUSTICE on the grounds of BREACH OF TRUST. S.122 CCC.



Test CASE



ENLIGHTENMENT of LAW



The END of CORRUPTION