

COURT OF APPEAL OF ALBERTA

Form 49
[Rule 13.19(1)]

COURT OF APPEAL FILE NUMBER: 1703 0252AC

TRIAL COURT FILE NUMBER: 1103 14112

REGISTRY OFFICE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE
ACT, RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED
IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE
BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT
CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK
TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN
BAND, NO 19 now known as SAWRIDGE
FIRST NATION ON APRIL 15, 1985 (the
"1985 Sawridge Trust")



APPLICANTS:

**MAURICE FELIX STONEY and HIS
BROTHERS AND SISTERS**

STATUS ON APPEAL

Not a party to the Appeal

RESPONDENTS (ORIGINAL
APPLICANTS):

**ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust
(the "Trustees")**

STATUS ON APPEAL

Respondents

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Applicants

INTERVENOR

THE SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Respondents

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Interested Party

RESPONDENT:

PUBLIC TRUSTEE OF ALBERTA ("OPGT")

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Not a party to the Appeal

STATUS UNKNOWN:

PRISCILLA KENNEDY

STATUS ON APPEAL

Appellant

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Respondent

DOCUMENT:

**AFFIDAVIT OF SUSAN HAGERMAN IN SUPPORT
OF APPLICATION**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT:

Doris Bonora / Anna Loparco
Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place
10180 – 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5
Phone No. 780-423-7100
Fax No. 780-423-7276
File No. 551860-1/DCEB

CONTACT INFORMATION OF
APPELLANT:

Field LLP
2500, 10175-101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Attention: P. Jonathan Faulds, QC
Phone: 780-423-7625
Fax: 780-429-9329
Email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
File 65063-1

CONTACT INFORMATION OF ALL
OTHER PARTIES:

PARLEE MCLAWS LLP
1700 Enbridge Centre
10175 – 101 Street NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3
Attention: Edward Molstad, Q.C. & Ellery Sopko
Phone: 780 423 8500
Fax: 780 423 2870
Email: emolstad@parlee.com
Counsel for The Sawridge Band

COURT OF APPEAL OF ALBERTA

Form 49
[Rule 13.19(1)]

COURT OF APPEAL FILE NUMBER: 1703 0252AC

TRIAL COURT FILE NUMBER: 1103 14112

REGISTRY OFFICE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT, RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED
IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT
CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO 19 now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION ON APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")



APPLICANTS:

MAURICE FELIX STONEY and HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS

STATUS ON APPEAL

Not a party to the Appeal

RESPONDENTS (ORIGINAL APPLICANTS):

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN, WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the "Trustees")

STATUS ON APPEAL

Respondents

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Applicants

INTERVENOR

THE SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Respondents

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Interested Party

RESPONDENT:

PUBLIC TRUSTEE OF ALBERTA ("OPGT")

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Not a party to the Appeal

STATUS UNKNOWN:

PRISCILLA KENNEDY

STATUS ON APPEAL

Appellant

STATUS ON APPLICATION

Respondent

DOCUMENT:

AFFIDAVIT OF SUSAN HAGERMAN IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT:

Doris Bonora / Anna Loparco
Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place
10180 – 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5
Phone No. 780-423-7100
Fax No. 780-423-7276
File No. 551860-1/DCEB

CONTACT INFORMATION OF
APPELLANT:

Field LLP
2500, 10175-101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Attention: P. Jonathan Faulds, QC
Phone: 780-423-7625
Fax: 780-429-9329
Email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
File 65063-1

CONTACT INFORMATION OF ALL
OTHER PARTIES:

PARLEE MCLAWS LLP
1700 Enbridge Centre
10175 – 101 Street NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3
Attention: Edward Molstad, Q.C. & Ellery Sopko
Phone: 780 423 8500
Fax: 780 423 2870
Email: emolstad@parlee.com
Counsel for The Sawridge Band

Sworn on November 23, 2017


I, SUSAN HAGERMAN, of the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta, MAKE OATH AND SAY THAT:

1. I am a Legal Assistant employed by the law firm of Dentons Canada LLP ("Dentons"), solicitors for the Original Applicants, Trustees of The 1985 Sawridge Trust, and as such have personal knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to, except where stated to be based upon information and belief, and where so stated I do verily believe those matters to be true.
2. I am advised by Doris Bonora, Barrister and Solicitor and Partner at Dentons, and it is my belief that effective September 12, 2017, by Order of the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas ("Justice Thomas"), Maurice Felix Stoney was deemed a vexatious litigant with restricted access to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Provincial Court of Alberta. Attached hereto and

marked as Exhibit "A" is a copy of the Case Management Decision (the "Decision") of Justice Thomas, *1985 Sawridge Trust v Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 548, dated the 12th day of September, 2017 in the Court of Queen's Bench Action Number 1103 14112 (the "Sawridge #8 Action").


- 3. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "B" is a copy of the Court Access Control Order for Maurice Felix Stoney granted by Justice Thomas filed September 12, 2017 in the Action and referred to in the Decision.
- 4. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "C" is a letter with enclosures dated October 23, 2017 (the "October 23 Letter") from Edward H. Molstad, Q.C. of Parlee McLaws LLP, counsel for the Sawridge Band, delivered to the attention of Justice Thomas, describing disagreement amongst counsel involved in the Sawridge #8 Action concerning the terms of the Order.
- 5. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "D" is a copy of correspondence from Jonathan Faulds, Q.C. of Field Law to Mr. Molstad and Denise Sutton, Assistant to Justice Thomas, regarding Mr. Faulds' comments on the proposed Order.
- 6. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "E" is a letter dated November 10, 2017 from Justice Thomas to Mr. Molstad and copied to all counsel involved stating that "a further Order in relation to Sawridge #8 is not necessary".
- 7. I make this Affidavit solely for the purpose of putting the attached documents before this Honourable Court.

SWORN BEFORE ME at Edmonton,
Alberta, this 23 day of November, 2017.



 A Commissioner for Oaths in and for the
 Province of Alberta

J. HEATHER HIEMSTRA
 A Commissioner for Oaths
 in and for Alberta
 My Commission Expires June 15, 2019

)
)
)
)
)
)
)


 SUSAN HAGERMAN

Tab A

2017 ABQB 548
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

1985 Sawridge Trust v. Alberta (Public Trustee)

2017 CarswellAlta 1639, 2017 ABQB 548, [2017] A.W.L.D. 5010, 283 A.C.W.S. (3d) 55

In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended

And In the Matter of the Sawridge Band, Inter Vivos Settlement, created by Chief Walter Patrick Twinn, of the Sawridge Indian Band, No. 19, now known as Sawridge First Nation, on April 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

Maurice Felix Stoney and His Brothers and Sisters (Applicants) and Roland Twinn, Catherine Twinn, Walter Felix Twin, Bertha L'Hirondelle and Clara Midbo, As Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the "1985 Sawridge Trustees" or "Trustees") (Respondents / Original Applicants) and The Sawridge Band (Intervenor)

D.R.G. Thomas J.

Judgment: September 12, 2017

Docket: Edmonton 1103-14112

Counsel: Priscilla Kennedy, for Applicant, Maurice Felix Stoney
Edward H. Molstad, Q.C., for Sawridge Band
D.C. Bonora, for 1985 Sawridge Trustees

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Estates and Trusts; Evidence; Public

Headnote

Civil practice and procedure --- Actions — Suspension of right of action — Plaintiff persistently instituting vexatious proceedings

First Nations trust applied for directions as to distribution of trust — S whose family had formerly been members of First Nation was unsuccessful in attempts to be recognized as member — S continued to bring applications in various courts and before human rights tribunal in search for status — Case management judge put in place interim court order to restrict S from initiating or continuing litigation in Alberta courts, and sought submissions as to whether S should be subject to vexatious litigant order — Order made requiring S to seek leave prior to initiating or continuing litigation in Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Alberta Provincial Court relating to persons and organizations involved with First Nation and S's disputes concerning membership in it — Payment of all outstanding costs awards prerequisite to leave — S's allegations of conspiracy against self and siblings raised concern that S might shift focus from First Nation and Trusts to individuals involved in the prior litigation and First Nation membership-related processes and decisions — S's refusal to accept dismissal of his claim was very strong predictor of future abusive litigation — Order flowed from court's inherent jurisdiction as strict persistence-driven approach in Judicature Act only targets misconduct that has already occurred — S had history of repeated collateral attacks in relation to subject and related parties — Attempts to re-litigate same issues also represented hopeless litigation — S engaged in busybody litigation exposing others to risk of costs consequences — S failed to pay costs and attempted to shift responsibility onto trust, which would have depleted communal property of First Nation — Forum shopping by S implied intent to evade legitimate litigation control processes and legal principles, including res judicata — Unproven allegations of fraud provided insight into S's litigation objectives.

CONSIDERATION by court of vexatious litigant order.

D.R.G. Thomas J.:

I Introduction

This is Exhibit "A" referred to in the Affidavit of

SOSAN HAGERMAN

Sworn before me this 23 day
of NOVEMBER A.D., 20 17

J. HEATHR HIEMSTRA
A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for Alberta
My Commission Expires June 15, 20 19

1 The Action to which this decision ultimately relates was commenced on June 12, 2011 by the 1985 Sawridge Trustees and is sometimes referred to as the "Advice and Direction Application". The 1985 Sawridge Trust applied to this Court for directions on how to distribute the Trust property to its beneficiaries. Members of the Sawridge Band are the beneficiaries of that Trust. The initial application has led to many court case management hearings, applications, decisions, and appeals: *1985 Sawridge Trust (Trustees of) v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2012 ABQB 365, 543 A.R. 90 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #1*"), aff'd 2013 ABCA 226, 553 A.R. 324 (Alta. C.A.) ("*Sawridge #2*"); *1985 Sawridge Trust (Trustees of) v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2015 ABQB 799 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #3*"), time extension denied 2016 ABCA 51, 616 A.R. 176 (Alta. C.A.); *1985 Sawridge Trust (Trustees of) v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 299 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #4*"); *1985 Sawridge Trust v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 377 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #5*"); *1985 Sawridge Trust v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 436 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #6*"); *1985 Sawridge Trust v. Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 530 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sawridge #7*").

2 On July 12, 2017 I rejected an August 12, 2016 application by Maurice Felix Stoney that he and "his brothers and sisters" should be added as beneficiaries to the 1985 Sawridge Trust: *Sawridge #6*. In that decision I concluded that Stoney's application was a collateral attack on previously decided issues, hopeless, without merit, and an abuse of court: paras 34-52. I also concluded that there was no evidence to support that Maurice Stoney's "10 living brothers or sisters" were, in fact, voluntary participants in this application: paras 8-12.

3 I therefore:

1. limited the scope of the August 12, 2016 application to Maurice Stoney;
2. struck out the August 12, 2016 application;
3. ordered solicitor and own client indemnity costs against Maurice Stoney;
4. ordered that Stoney's lawyer, Priscilla Kennedy, appear on July 28, 2017 to make submissions as to whether she should be personally liable for that litigation costs award;
5. concluded that Maurice Stoney's August 12, 2016 application exhibits indicia of abusive litigation, and, therefore, on my own motion and pursuant to the Court's inherent jurisdiction:
 - a) put in place an interim court order to restrict Maurice Stoney's initiating or continuing litigation in Alberta Courts, and
 - b) instructed that Maurice Stoney, the Sawridge 1985 Trustees, and the intervener Sawridge Band may file written submissions as to whether Maurice Stoney should have his court access restricted via what is commonly called a "vexatious litigant" order.

4 Written submissions were received from the Trustees on July 26, 2017, the Sawridge Band on July 27, 2017, and Maurice Stoney on August 3, 2017.

5 On August 31, 2017 I issued *Sawridge #7*, where I concluded that Priscilla Kennedy and Maurice Stoney were jointly and severally liable for the costs award ordered in *Sawridge #6*.

6 This judgment evaluates whether Maurice Stoney should be the subject of restrictions on his future litigation activity in Alberta courts.

II. Abusive Litigation and Court Access Restrictions

7 The principles and procedure that govern court-ordered restrictions to access Alberta courts are developed in a number of recent decisions of this Court. This Court's inherent jurisdiction to control abuse of its processes includes

that the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench may order that a person requires leave to initiate or continue an action or application: *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 14-25, (2016), 273 A.C.W.S. (3d) 533 (Alta. Q.B.), leave denied 2017 ABCA 63 (Alta. C.A.), leave to the SCC requested, 37624 (12 April 2017) [2017 CarswellAlta 1143 (S.C.C.)]; *Thompson v. IUOE, Local 955*, 2017 ABQB 210 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 56, affirmed 2017 ABCA 193 (Alta. C.A.); *Ewanchuk v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2017 ABQB 237 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 92-96; *McCargar v. Canada*, 2017 ABQB 416 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 110.

8 An intervention of this kind is potentially warranted when a litigant exhibits one or more "indicia" of abusive litigation: *Chutskoff Estate v. Bonora*, 2014 ABQB 389 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 92, (2014), 590 A.R. 288 (Alta. Q.B.), aff'd 2014 ABCA 444 (Alta. C.A.); *Boisjoli, Re*, 2015 ABQB 629 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 98-103, (2015), 29 Alta. L.R. (6th) 334 (Alta. Q.B.); *McCargar v. Canada*, 2017 ABQB 416 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 112. Where a judge concludes these "indicia" are present and control of abusive litigation may be appropriate then the Court usually follows a two-step process prior to imposing court access restrictions, if appropriate: *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 10-11; *Ewanchuk v. Canada (Attorney General)*, at para 97.

9 *Sawridge #6*, at para 55 identified three types of litigation abuse behaviour by Maurice Stoney that potentially warranted court access restrictions:

1. Collateral attack that attempts to reopen an issue that has already been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, to circumvent the effect of a court or tribunal decision, using previously raised grounds and issues.
2. Bringing hopeless proceedings that cannot succeed, here in both the present application and the *Sawridge #3* appeal where Maurice Stoney was an uninvolved third party.
3. Initiating "busybody" lawsuits to enforce the rights of third parties, here the recruited participation of Maurice Stoney's "10 living brothers and sisters."

10 I therefore on an interim basis and pursuant to *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 335 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 105 restricted Maurice Stoney's litigation activities (*Sawridge #6*, at para 65-66), and invited submissions on whether Maurice Stoney's litigation activities should be restricted, and if so, in what manner (*Sawridge #6*, at paras 63-64).

11 Subsequently Associate Chief Justice Rooke on July 20, 2017 granted an exception to this interim order in relation to *Nussbaum v. Stoney* [(July 20, 2017), Doc. 1603-03761 (Alta. Q.B.)], Alberta Court of Queen's Bench docket 1603 03761 (the "Rooke Order").

12 The current decision completes the second step of the two-part *Hok v. Alberta* process.

13 Relevant evidence for this analysis includes activities both inside and outside of court:

Bishop v. Bishop, 2011 ONCA 211 (Ont. C.A.) at para 9, (2011), 200 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1021 (Ont. C.A.), leave to SCC refused, 34271 (20 November 2011) [2011 CarswellOnt 10865 (S.C.C.)]; *Henry v. El*, 2010 ABCA 312 (Alta. C.A.) at paras 2-3, 5, (2010), 193 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1099 (Alta. C.A.), leave to SCC refused, 34172 (14 July 2011) [2011 CarswellAlta 1197 (S.C.C.)]. A litigant's entire court history is relevant, including litigation in other jurisdictions: *McMeekin v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, 2012 ABQB 456 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 83-127, (2012), 543 A.R. 132 (Alta. Q.B.); *Curle v. Curle*, 2014 ONSC 1077 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para 24; *Fearn v. Canada (Customs)*, 2014 ABQB 114 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 102-105, (2014), 586 A.R. 23 (Alta. Q.B.). That includes non-judicial proceedings, as those may establish a larger pattern of behaviour: *Bishop v. Bishop* at para 9; *Canada Post Corp. v. Varma* [2000 CarswellNat 1183 (Fed. T.D.)], 2000 CanLII 15754 at para 23, (2000), 192 F.T.R. 278 (Fed. T.D.); *West Vancouver School District No. 45 v. Callow*, 2014 ONSC 2547 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para 39. A court may take judicial notice of public records when it evaluates the degree and kind of misconduct caused by a candidate abusive litigant: *Wong v. Giannacopoulos*, 2011 ABCA 277 (Alta. C.A.) at para 6, (2011), 515 A.R. 58 (Alta. C.A.).

14 A court may order court access restrictions where future litigation abuse is *anticipated*. As Verville J observed in *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 37:

... when a court makes a vexatious litigant order it should do so to respond to anticipated abuse of court processes. This is a prospective case management step, rather than punitive. [emphasis in original]

15 When a court considers limits to future court access by a person with a history of litigation misconduct the key questions for a court are:

1. Can the court determine the identity or type of persons who are likely to be the target of future abusive litigation?
2. What litigation subject or subjects are likely involved in that abuse of court processes?
3. In what forums will that abuse occur? (*Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 36).

16 Court access restriction orders should be measured versus and responsive to the anticipated potential for future abuse of court processes. Court access restrictions are designed in a functional manner and not restricted to formulaic approaches, but instead respond in a creative, but proportionate, manner to anticipated potential abuse: *Bhamjee v. Forsdick*, [2003] EWCA Civ 1113 (Eng. C.A.).

17 A vexatious litigant order that simply requires the abusive person obtain permission, "leave", from the court before filing documents to initiate or continue an action is a limited impediment to a person's ability to access court remedies: *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 32-33. Though this step is sometimes called "extraordinary", that dramatic language exaggerates the true and minimal effect of a leave application requirement: *Wong v. Giannacopoulos*, at para 8; *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 32-33.

18 Other more restrictive alternatives are possible, where appropriate, provided that more strict intervention is warranted by the litigant's anticipated future misconduct: *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 34; *Ewanchuk v. Canada (Attorney General)*, at paras 167-68.

III. Submissions and Evidence Concerning Appropriate Litigation Control Steps

A. The Sawridge Band

19 The Sawridge Band submits that this Court should exercise its inherent jurisdiction and *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000, c J-2 ss 23-23.1 to restrict Maurice Stoney's access to Alberta courts. The Sawridge Band relied on evidence concerning Maurice Stoney's activities that was submitted to the Court in relation to *Sawridge #6*.

20 The August 12, 2016 application was futile because Maurice Stoney had continued to repeat the same, already discounted argument. Maurice Stoney had not been granted automatic membership in the Sawridge Band by Bill C-31, and that fact had been either admitted or adjudicated in the *Huzar v. Canada*, [2000] F.C.J. No. 873, 258 N.R. 246 (Fed. C.A.) and *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation*, 2013 FC 509, 432 F.T.R. 253 (Eng.) (F.C.) decisions.

21 Maurice Stoney was allowed to apply to become a member of the Sawridge Band, but that application was denied, as was the subsequent appeal. The lawfulness of those processes was confirmed in *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation*.

22 A subsequent 2014 Canadian Human Rights Commission complaint concerning the membership application process again alleged the same previously rejected arguments. The same occurred before the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Stoney v. Twinn*, 2016 ABCA 51 (Alta. C.A.)

23 Maurice Stoney's persistent attempts to re-litigate the same issue represent collateral attacks and are hopeless proceedings. Stoney has failed to pay outstanding costs orders. His attempts to shift litigation costs to the 1985 Sawridge Trust are an aggravating factor. These factors imply that Maurice Stoney had brought these actions for an improper

purpose. The August 12, 2016 application was a "busybody" attempt to enforce (alleged) rights of uninvolved third parties.

24 Combined, these indicia of abusive litigation mean Maurice Stoney should be the subject of a vexatious litigant order that globally restricts his access to Alberta courts. In the alternative, a vexatious litigant order with a smaller scope should, at a minimum, restrict Maurice Stoney's potential litigation activities in relation to the Sawridge Band, its Chief and Council, the Sawridge 1985 and 1986 Trusts, and the Trustees of those trusts.

25 Given Stoney's history of not paying cost awards he should be required to pay outstanding costs orders prior to any application for leave to initiate or continue actions, as in *R. v. Grabowski*, 2015 ABCA 391 (Alta. C.A.) at para 15, (2015), 609 A.R. 217 (Alta. C.A.).

B. The Sawridge 1985 Trust Trustees

26 The Sawridge 1985 Trust Trustees adopted the arguments of the Sawridge Band, but also emphasized the importance of Maurice Stoney's answers and conduct during cross-examination on his May 16, 2016 affidavit. The Trustees stress this record shows that Maurice Stoney is uncooperative and refused to acknowledge the prior litigation results.

C. Maurice Stoney

27 Maurice Stoney's written submissions were signed by and filed by lawyer Priscilla Kennedy, identified as "Counsel for Maurice Stoney". The contents of the written submissions are, frankly, unexpected. Paragraphs 6 through 13 advance legal arguments concerning Maurice Stoney's status as a member of the Sawridge Band:

1. the *Huzar v. Canada* decision cannot be relied on as "evidence in this matter";
2. *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation* is not a "thorough analysis" of Maurice Stoney's arguments;
3. Maurice Stoney has not attempted to re-litigate the membership issue but rather to set out the legal arguments that address the definition of a beneficiary of the 1985 Sawridge Trust; and
4. ". . . there have been a number of recent decisions on these constitutional issues that have and are in the process of completely altering the law related to these issues of the membership/citizenship of Indians, in order to have them comply with the *Constitution*." [Italics in original].

28 Paragraph 14 of the written brief, which follows these statements, reads:

It is acknowledged that this court has dismissed these arguments and they are not referred to here, other than as the facts to set the context for the matters to be dealt

with as directed on the issue of whether or not the application of Maurice Stoney was vexatious litigation.

29 I reject that a bald statement that these are "the facts" proves anything, or establishes these statements are, in fact, true or correct.

30 The brief then continues at paras 16-17, 24, 28 to state:

As shown by the litigation in the Sawridge Band cases above, the on-going case in [Descheneaux c Canada (Procureur Général), 2015 QCCS 3555] and the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in [Daniels v Canada (Indian Affairs and Northern Development), 2016 SCC 12, [2016] 1 SCR 99], and the review of the Federal Court of Appeal decision in Huzar and the judicial review in Stoney, it is submitted that this is not a proceeding where the issue has been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction. Nor is this a matter where proceedings have been brought that cannot succeed or have no reasonable expectation of providing relief.

It is submitted that litigation seeking to determine whether or not you qualify as a beneficiary under a trust established on April 15, 1985 is a matter where the issue of membership/citizenship has not been settled by the courts, and this application was not brought for an improper purpose . . .

Contrary to the argument of Sawridge First Nation these matters have not been determined in the past Federal Court proceedings. Issues of citizenship and the constitutionality of these proceedings remains a legal question today as shown by the on-going litigation throughout Canada. Plainly, this Court has determined that these arguments are dismissed in this matter and that is acknowledged.

. . . No conclusion was made in the 1995 Federal Court proceedings which were struck as showing no reasonable cause of action and the judicial review was concerned with the issue of the Sawridge First Nation Appeal Committee decision based on membership rules post September, 1985.

31 These are reasons why the August 12, 2016 application was not a collateral attack:

No disrespect for the court process or intention to bring proceedings for an improper purpose, was intended to be raised by these arguments respecting this time period and the definitions of a beneficiary of this trust.

(Written brief, para 23).

32 Prior to going any further I will at this point explain that I put no *legal* weight on these statements. If Maurice Stoney wishes to appeal *Sawridge #6* and my conclusions therein he may do so. In fact he did file an appeal of *Sawridge #6* as a self-represented litigant on August 11, 2017. If Maurice Stoney or his counsel wish to revisit *Sawridge #6* then they could have made an application under *Rule 9.13* of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta Reg 124/2010 [the "*Rules*", or individually a "*Rule*"], however they did not elect to do so. I conclude these statements, no matter how they were allegedly framed in paragraphs 14 and 23 of Stoney's written arguments, are nothing more than an attempt to re-argue *Sawridge #6*. Again, I put no *legal* weight on these arguments, but conclude these statements are highly relevant as to whether Maurice Stoney is likely to in the future re-argue issues that have been determined conclusively by Canadian courts.

33 Other submissions by Maurice Stoney are more directly relevant to his potentially being the subject of court-ordered restrictions. He acknowledges that there are unpaid costs to the Sawridge First Nation, but says these will be paid ". . . as soon as it is possible ...". Stoney indicates he has been unable to pay these costs amounts because of a foreclosure action.

34 Affidavit evidence allegedly has established that Maurice Stoney was authorized to represent his brothers and sisters, and that Maurice Stoney was directed to act on their behalf. Counsel for Stoney unexpectedly cites *Federal Courts Rules*, SOR/98-106, s 114 as the authority for the process that Maurice Stoney followed when filing his August 12, 2016 application in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench:

. . . The Federal Court Rules, provide for Representative proceedings where the representative asserts common issues of law and fact, the representative is authorized to act on behalf of the represented persons, the representative can fairly and adequately represent the interests of the represented persons and the use of a representative proceeding is the just, more efficient and least costly manner of proceeding. This method of proceeding is frequently used for aboriginals and particularly for families who are aboriginal. It is submitted that this was the most efficient and least costly manner of proceeding in the circumstances where the claim of all of the living children possess the same precise issues respecting their citizenship.

(Written Brief, para 24.)

Maurice Stoney therefore denies this was a "busybody" proceeding where he without authority attempted to represent third parties.

35 The written argument concludes that Maurice Stoney should not be the subject of court access restrictions, but if the Court concludes that step is necessary then that restriction should only apply to litigation vs the Sawridge Band and 1985 Sawridge Trust.

D. Evidence

36 The Trustees and the Sawridge Band entered as evidence a transcript of Maurice Stoney's cross-examination on his May 16, 2016 affidavit. This transcript illustrates a number of relevant points.

1. Maurice Stoney claims to be acting on behalf of himself and his brothers and sisters, and that he has their consent to do that: pp 9-10.

2. Maurice Stoney believes his father was forced out of Indian status by the federal government: p 12.

2. Maurice Stoney and his counsel Priscilla Kennedy do not accept that Maurice Stoney was refused automatic membership in the Sawridge Band by the *Huzar v. Canada*, [2000] F.C.J. No. 873, 258 N.R. 246 (Fed. C.A.) and *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation*, 2013 FC 509, 432 F.T.R. 253 (Eng.) (F.C.) decisions: pp 23-27, 30-33.

3. Maurice Stoney claims he made an application for membership in the Sawridge Band in 1985 but that this application was "ignored": pp 37-39. Stoney however did not have a copy of that application: pp 39-40.

4. Maurice Stoney refused to answer a number of questions, including:

- whether he had read the *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation* decision (pp 32-33),
- whether he had made a Canadian Human Rights Commission complaint against the Sawridge Band (p 54),
- whether he had ever read the Sawridge Trust's documentation (pp 60-61),
- the identity of other persons whose Sawridge Band applications were allegedly ignored (pp 63-64), and
- the health status of the siblings for whom Maurice Stoney was allegedly a representative (p 66).

5. Maurice Stoney claims that the Sawridge Band membership application process is biased: pp 41-42.

37 Maurice Stoney introduced three affidavits which he says indicate the August 12, 2016 application was not a "busybody" proceeding and instead Maurice Stoney was authorized to represent his other siblings in the Sawridge Advice and Direction Application:

1. Shelley Stoney, dated July 20, 2017, saying she is the daughter of Bill Stoney and the niece of Maurice Stoney. She is responsible "for driving my father and uncles who are all suffering health problems and elderly." Shelley Stoney attests " . . . from discussions among my father and his brothers and sisters" that Maurice Stoney was authorized to bring the August 12, 2016 application on their behalf.

2. Bill Stoney, brother of Maurice Stoney, dated July 20, 2017, saying he authorized Maurice Stoney to make the August 12, 2016 application on his behalf in the spring of 2016.

3. Gail Stoney, sister of Maurice Stoney, dated July 20, 2017, saying she authorized Maurice Stoney to make the August 12, 2016 application on his behalf in the spring of 2016.

38 In *Sawridge #7* at paras 133-37 I conclude these affidavits should receive little weight:

The three affidavits presented by Kennedy do not establish that Maurice Stoney was authorized to represent his siblings. Even at the most generous, these affidavits only indicate that Bill and Gail Stoney gave some kind of oral sanction for Maurice Stoney to act on their behalf. I put no weight on the affidavit of Shelley Stoney. It is hearsay, and presumptively inadmissible.

I note that none of these affidavits were supported by any form of documentation, either evidence or records of communications between Maurice Stoney and his siblings, or between Kennedy and her purported clients.

I make an adverse inference from the absence of any documentary evidence of the latter. The fact that no documentation to support that Kennedy and the Stoney siblings communicated in any manner, let alone gave Kennedy authority to act on their behalf, means none exists.

There is no documentation to establish that Maurice Stoney applied to become a litigation representative or was appointed a litigation representative, per *Rules* 2.11-2.21. This is not a class action scenario where Maurice Stoney is a

representative applicant. While Kennedy has argued that Maurice Stoney's siblings are elderly and unable to conduct litigation, then that is not simply a basis to arbitrarily add their names to court filing. Instead, a person who lacks the capacity to represent themselves (*Rule* 2.11(c-d)) may have a self-appointed litigation representative (*Rule* 2.14), but only after filing appropriate documentation (*Rule* 2.14(4)). That did not occur.

39 I come to the same conclusion here and also find as a fact that in this proceeding Maurice Stoney was not authorized to file the August 12, 2016 application on behalf of his siblings.

IV. Analysis

40 What remains are two steps:

1. to evaluate the form and seriousness of Maurice Stoney's litigation misconduct, and
2. determine whether court access restrictions are appropriate, and, if so, what those restrictions should be.

41 However, prior to that I believe it is helpful to briefly explore the inherent jurisdiction of this Court to limit litigant activities, vs the authority provided in *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1, since these two mechanisms were broached in the submissions of the parties.

A. Control of Abusive Litigation via Inherent Jurisdiction vs the Judicature Act

42 An argument can be made that that Alberta Court of Queen's Bench may only restrict prospective litigation via the procedure in *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1. I disagree with that position, though at present this question has not been explicitly and conclusively decided by the Alberta Court of Appeal, or the Supreme Court of Canada.

43 The most detailed investigation of this issue is found in *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.), where Verville J at paras 14-25 concluded that one element of this Court's inherent jurisdiction is an authority to restrict prospective and hypothetical litigation activities, both applications and entirely new actions.

44 In coming to that conclusion Justice Verville rejected a principle found in I H Jacobs often-cited paper, "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court" ((1970) 23:1 Current Legal Problems 23 at 43), that UK tradition courts do not have an inherent jurisdiction to block commencement of potentially abusive proceedings:

The court has no power, even under its inherent jurisdiction, to prevent a person from commencing proceedings which may turn out to be vexatious. It is possibly by virtue of this principle that many a litigant in person, perhaps confusing some substratum of grievance with an infringement of legal right, is lured into using the machinery of

the court as a remedy for his ills only to find his proceedings summarily dismissed as being frivolous and vexatious and an abuse of the process of the court. The inherent jurisdiction of the court has, however, been supplemented by statutory power to restrain a vexatious litigant from instituting or continuing any legal proceedings without leave of the court.

45 Jacobs elsewhere in his paper explains that the inherent jurisdiction of the court flows from its historic operation, and stresses this is an adaptive tool that applies as necessary to address issues that would otherwise interfere with the administration of justice and the court's operations:

. . . inherent jurisdiction of the court may be defined as the reserve or fund of powers, a residual source of powers, which the court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just and equitable to do so, and in particular to ensure the observance of the due process of law, to prevent improper vexation or oppression, to do justice between the parties and to secure a fair trial between them. . .

(Jacobs at 51)

46 However, Jacob's conclusion that courts have no inherent jurisdiction to limit future litigation was based on a historical error, as explained in *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.), at para 17:

Two UK Court of Appeal decisions, *Ebert v Birch & Anor*, (also cited as *Ebert v Venvil*), [1999] EWCA Civ 3043 (UK CA) and *Bhamjee v Forsdick & Ors (No 2)*, [2003] EWCA Civ 1113 (UK CA), set out the common law authority of UK courts to restrict litigant court access. Some Commonwealth authorities had concluded that UK and Commonwealth courts had no inherent jurisdiction to restrict a person from initiating new court proceedings, and instead that authority was first obtained when Parliament passed the Vexatious Actions Act, 1896.

Ebert concludes that is false, as historical research determined that in the UK courts had exercised common law authority to restrict persons initiating new litigation prior to passage of the Vexatious Actions Act, 1896. That legislation and its successors do not codify the court's authority, but instead legislative and common-law inherent jurisdiction control processes co-exist.

47 Furthermore, the Alberta Court of Appeal has itself issued vexatious litigant orders which do not conform to *Judicature Act* processes. For example, in *Dykun v. Odishaw*, 2001 ABCA 204, 286 A.R. 392 (Alta. C.A.), that Court issued an "injunction" that restricted court access without either an originating notice or the consent of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Alberta (then required by *Judicature Act*, s 23.1). Justice Verville concludes (*Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.), at paras 19-20, 25), and I agree, that this means Alberta courts have an inherent jurisdiction to take steps of this kind. If the Court of Appeal had the inherent jurisdiction to make the order it issued in *Dykun v. Odishaw*, then so does the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench.

48 Beyond that, the efficient administration of justice simply requires that there must be an effective mechanism by which the courts may control abusive litigation and litigants. This must, of course, meet the constitutional requirement that any obstacle or expense requirement placed in front of a potential court participant does not ". . . effectively [deny] people the right to take their cases to court ..." or cause "undue hardship": *Trial Lawyers Assn. of British Columbia v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2014 SCC 59 (S.C.C.) at paras 40, 45-48, [2014] 3 S.C.R. 31 (S.C.C.). As I have previously observed, an obligation to make a document-based application for leave to file is a comparatively minor imposition and obviously does not cause "undue hardship".

49 The question, then, is whether the *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 procedure is an adequate one, or does the Court need to draw on its "reserve" of "residual powers" to design an effective mechanism to control abusive litigants and litigation. I conclude that it must. A critical defect in this legislation is that section 23(2) defines proceedings that are conducted in a "vexatious manner" as requiring "persistent" misconduct, for example "persistently bringing proceedings to determine an issue that has already been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction" [emphasis added]: *Judicature Act*, s 23(2)(a).

50 The Alberta Court of Appeal in certain decisions that apply *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 appears to apply this rule in a strict manner, for example, in *O. (R.) v. F. (D.)*, 2016 ABCA 170, 36 Alta. L.R. (6th) 282 (Alta. C.A.) at para 38 the Court stresses this requirement. Further, the *O. (R.) v. F. (D.)* decision restricts the scope of a *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 order on the basis that the vexatious litigant had no "... history of "persistently" ..." engaging in misconduct that involves outside parties. In other words, according to *O. (R.) v. F. (D.)* the *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 process operates retrospectively. *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 authorize court access restrictions only after "persistent" misconduct has occurred.

51 That said, it is clear that the Alberta Court of Appeal does not actually apply that requirement in other instances where it has made an order authorized per the *Judicature Act*. For example, in *Henry v. El Slatter JA* ordered a broad, multi-court ban on the plaintiff's court activities, though only one dispute is mentioned. There is no or little record of 'persistent history'. *Henry v. El* does not identify repeated or persistent litigation steps, nor are multiple actions noted. The misconduct that warranted the litigation restraint was bad arguments, and out- of-court misconduct: a need for the target of the misconduct to obtain police assistance, the plaintiff had foisted allegedly binding legal documents on the defendant, the abusive plaintiff was the target of a court ordered peace bond, and the abusive plaintiff posted a bounty for the defendant on the Internet.

52 In *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 36-37, Justice Verville concluded that an effective mechanism to limit court access should operate in a *prospective* manner - based on evidence that leads to a prediction of future abusive litigation activities. This is also the approach recommended in the UK Court of Appeal *Ebert v. Birch*, [1999] EWCA Civ 3043 (Eng. & Wales C.A. (Civil)) and *Bhamjee v. Forsdick* decisions.

53 However, the strict "persistence"-driven approach in the *Judicature Act* and *O. (R.) v. F. (D.)* only targets misconduct that has already occurred. It limits the court to play 'catch up' with historic patterns of abuse, only fully reining in worst-case problematic litigants after their litigation misconduct has metastasized into a cascade of abusive actions and applications.

54 That outcome can sometimes be avoided.

1. Statements of Intent

55 First, abusive litigants are sometimes quite open about their intentions. For example, in *McMeekin v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, 2012 ABQB 625 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 44, (2012), 543 A.R. 11 (Alta. Q.B.), a vexatious litigant said exactly what he planned to do in the future:

I can write, I can write the judicature counsel, I can write the upper law society of Canada. I got Charter violations. I got administrative law violations. I've got civil contempt. I've got abuse of process. I've got abuse of qualified privilege. I can keep going, I haven't even got, I haven't even spent two days on this so far. And if you want to find out how good I am, then let's go at it. But you know, at the end of the day, I'm not walking away. And it's not going to get any better for them.

56 It seems strange that a court is prohibited from taking that kind of statement of intent into account when designing the scope of court access restrictions. This kind of stated intention obviously favours broad control of future litigation activities.

57 A modern twist on a statement of intentions is that some abusive litigants document their activities and intentions on Internet websites. For example, *West Vancouver School District No. 45 v. Callow*, 2014 ONSC 2547 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras 31, 40 describes how an abusive court litigant had, rather conveniently, documented and recorded online his various activities and his perceptions of a corrupt court apparatus.

58 However, there is no reason why the opposite scenario would not be relevant. Where an abusive litigant chooses to take steps to indicate good faith conduct, then that action predicts future conduct, for example by taking tangible positive steps to demonstrate they are a 'fair dealer' by:

1. voluntarily terminating or limiting abusive litigation,
2. abandoning claims, restricting the scope of litigation, consenting to issues or facts previously in dispute,

59 These kinds of actions may warrant a problematic litigant receiving limited court access restrictions, or no court access restrictions at all. Rewarding positive self-regulation is consistent with the administration of justice, and a modern, functional approach to civil litigation.

2. *Demeanor and Conduct*

3. *Abuse Caused by Mental Health Issues*

4. *Litigation Abuse Motivated by Ideology*

5. *Persistent Abusive Conduct is Only One Predictor of Future Misconduct*

2. *Demeanor and Conduct*

60 Similarly, a trial court judge may rely on his or her perception of an abusive court participant's character, demeanor, and conduct. Obviously, there is a broad range of conduct that may be relevant, but it is helpful to look at one example. Maurice Prefontaine, a persistent and abusive litigant who has often appeared in Alberta and other Canadian courts, presents a predictable in-court pattern of conduct, which is reviewed in *R. v. Prefontaine*, 2002 ABQB 980, 12 Alta. L.R. (4th) 50 (Alta. Q.B.), appeal dismissed for want of prosecution 2004 ABCA 100, 61 W.C.B. (2d) 306 (Alta. C.A.).

61 Mr. Prefontaine presented himself in a generally ordered, polite manner in court. He was at one point a lawyer. He has for years pursued a dispute with the Canada Revenue Agency, and has appeared on many occasions in relation to that matter. Mr. Prefontaine's behaviour changed in a marked but predictable manner when his submissions were rejected. He explodes, making obscene insults and threats directed to the hearing judge and opposing parties. When a person responds to the court in this manner, that conduct is a significant basis to conclude that future problematic litigation is impending from that abusive court participant. Sure enough, that has been the case with Mr. Prefontaine.

62 Also perhaps unsurprising is that Mr. Prefontaine's conduct is probably linked to his being diagnosed with a persecutory delusional disorder, or a paranoid personality disorder: *R. v. Prefontaine*, at paras 8-17, 82, 94-98.

3. *Abuse Caused by Mental Health Issues*

63 There are many other examples of how litigation abuse has a mental health basis. For example, the plaintiff in *Koerner v. Capital Health Authority*, 2011 ABQB 191, 506 A.R. 113 (Alta. Q.B.), affirmed 2011 ABCA 289, 515 A.R. 392 (Alta. C.A.), leave to SCC refused, 34573 (26 April 2012) [2012 CarswellAlta 724 (S.C.C.)] engaged in vexatious litigation because her perceptions were distorted by somatoform disorder, a psychiatric condition where a person reports spurious physical disorders (*Koerner v. Capital Health Authority*, 2010 ABQB 590 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 4-5, (2010), 498 A.R. 109 (Alta. Q.B.)). Similarly, in *R. (F.J.) v. R. (I.)*, 2015 ABQB 112 (Alta. Q.B.), court access restrictions were appropriate because the applicant was suffering from dementia that led to spurious, self-injuring litigation. In these cases future abuse of the courts can be predicted from a person's medical history.

64 Another and very troubling class of abusive litigants are persons who are affected by querulous paranoia, a form of persecutory delusional disorder that leads to an ever-expanding cascade of litigation and dispute processes, which only ends after the affected person has been exhausted and alienated by this self-destructive process. Querulous paranoiacs

attack everyone who becomes connected or involved with a dispute via a diverse range of processes including lawsuits, appeals, and professional complaints. Anyone who is not an ally is the enemy. This condition is reviewed in Gary M Caplan & Hy Bloom, "Litigants Behaving Badly: Querulousness in Law and Medicine" 2015 44:4 Advocates' Quarterly 411 and Paul E Mullen & Grant Lester, "Vexatious Litigants and Unusually Persistent Complainants and Petitioners: From Querulous Paranoia to Querulous Behaviour" (2006) 24 Behav Sci Law 333.

65 Persons afflicted by querulous paranoia exhibit a unique 'fingerprint' in the way they frame and conduct their litigation as a crusade for retribution against a perceived broad-based injustice, and via a highly unusual and distinctive document style. The vexatious litigants documented in *McMeekin v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, 2012 ABQB 456, 543 A.R. 132 (Alta. Q.B.), *McMeekin v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, 2012 ABQB 625, 543 A.R. 11 (Alta. Q.B.), *Chutskoff Estate v. Bonora*, 2014 ABQB 389, 590 A.R. 288 (Alta. Q.B.), *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 335 (Alta. Q.B.), and *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 651 (Alta. Q.B.) all exhibit the characteristic querulous paranoid litigation and document fingerprint criteria.

66 Mullen and Grant observe these persons cannot be managed or treated: pp 347-48. Early intervention is the only possible way to interrupt the otherwise grimly predictable progression of this condition: Caplan & Bloom, pp 450-52; Mullen & Lester, pp 346-47. Disturbingly, these authors suggest that the formal and emotionally opaque character of litigation processes may, by its nature, transform generally normal people into this type of abusive litigant: Caplan & Bloom, pp 426-27, 438.

67 A "persistent misconduct" requirement means persons afflicted by querulous paranoia cannot be managed. They will always outrun any court restriction, until it is too late and the worst outcome has occurred.

4. Litigation Abuse Motivated by Ideology

68 Other abusive litigants are motivated by ideology. A particularly obnoxious example of this class are the Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument ["OPCA"] litigants described in *Meads v. Meads*, 2012 ABQB 571, 543 A.R. 215 (Alta. Q.B.). Many OPCA litigants are hostile to and reject conventional state authority, including court authority. They engage in group and organized actions that have a variety of motives, including greed, and extremist political objectives: *Meads v. Meads*, at paras 168-198. Justice Morissette ("Querulous or Vexatious Litigants, A Disorder of a Modern Legal System?" (Paper delivered at the Canadian Association of Counsel to Employers, Banff AB (26-28 September 2013)) at pp 11) has observed for this population that abuse of court processes is a political action, ". . . the vector of an ideology for a class of actors in the legal system."

69 Some OPCA litigants use pseudolegal concepts to launch baseless attacks on government actors, institutions, lawyers, and others. For example:

- *B. (A.N.) v. Hancock*, 2013 ABQB 97, 557 A.R. 364 (Alta. Q.B.) - after his children were seized by child services the Freeman-on-the-Land father sued child services personnel, lawyers, RCMP officers, and provincial court judges, demanding return of his property (the children) and \$20 million in gold and silver bullion, all on the basis of OPCA paperwork.
- *Ali v. Ford*, 2014 ONSC 6665 (Ont. S.C.J.) - the plaintiff sued Toronto mayor Rob Ford and the City of Toronto for \$60 million in retaliation for a police attendance on his residence. The plaintiff claimed he was a member of the Moorish National Republic, and as a consequence immune from Canadian law.
- *Dove v. R.*, 2015 FC 1126 (F.C.), aff'd 2015 FC 1307 (F.C.), aff'd *Dove v. R.*, 2016 FCA 231 (F.C.A.), leave to the SCC refused, 37487 (1 June 2017) [2017 CarswellNat 2531 (S.C.C.)] - the plaintiffs claimed international treaties and the *Charter* are a basis to demand access to a secret personal bank account worth around \$1 billion that is associated with the plaintiffs' birth certificates; this is allegedly a source for payments owed to the plaintiffs so they can adopt the lifestyle they choose and not have to work.

- *R. v. Claeys*, 2013 MBQB 313, 300 Man. R. (2d) 257 (Man. Q.B.) - the plaintiff sued for half a million dollars and refund of all taxes collected from her, arguing she had waived her rights to be a person before the law, pursuant to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Canada had no authority because Queen Elizabeth II was "... Crowned on a fraudulent Stone and ... violated her Coronation Oath by giving Royal Assent to laws that violate God's Law ...".
- *Doell v. British Columbia (Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General)*, 2016 BCSC 1181 (B.C. S.C.) - an individual who received a traffic ticket for riding without a helmet sued British Columbia, demanding \$150,000.00 in punitive damages, because he is a human being and not a person, and the RCMP had interfered with his right "to celebrate divine service".
- *Fiander v. Mills*, 2015 NLCA 31, 368 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 80 (N.L. C.A.) - a person accused of fisheries offenses sued the Crown prosecutor, fisheries officer, and provincial court judge, arguing he was wrongfully prosecuted because he had opted out of "having" a "person" via the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.
- *Isis Nation Estates v. R.*, 2013 FC 590 (F.C.), the plaintiff, "Maitreya Isis Maryjane Blackshear, the Divine Holy Mother of all/in/of creation", sued Alberta and Canada for

\$108 quadrillion and that they "cease and desist all blasphemy" against the plaintiff.

70 There is little need to explore why these claims are anything other than ridiculous.

71 OPCA litigants have been formally declared vexatious, for example: *Boisjoli, Re*, 2015 ABQB 629, 29 Alta. L.R. (6th) 334 (Alta. Q.B.); *Boisjoli, Re*, 2015 ABQB 690 (Alta. Q.B.); *Cormier v. Nova Scotia*, 2015 NSSC 352, 367 N.S.R. (2d) 295 (N.S. S.C.); *Curle v. Curle*, 2014 ONSC 1077 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Gauthier v. Starr*, 2016 ABQB 213, 86 C.P.C. (7th) 348 (Alta. Q.B.); *Holmes v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2016 FC 918 (F.C.); *R. v. Fearn*, 2014 ABQB 233, 586 A.R. 182 (Alta. Q.B.); *Yankson v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2013 BCSC 2332 (B.C. S.C.).

72 Judicial and legal academic authorities uniformly identify OPCA narratives and their associated pseudolegal concepts as resting on and building from a foundation of paranoid and conspiratorial anti-government and anti-institutional political and social belief. These individuals are sometimes called 'litigation terrorists' for this reason. They may act for personal benefit, but they also do so with the belief they are justified and act lawfully when they injure others and disrupt court processes. Persons who advance OPCA litigation to harm others have no place in Canada's courts. The court's inherent jurisdiction must be able to shield the innocent potential victims of these malcontents. Their next target can be anyone who crosses their path - government officials or organizations, peace officers, lawyers, judges, business employees - and who then offends the OPCA litigant's skewed perspectives.

73 These individuals believe they have a right to attack others via the courts, they like the idea of doing that, and they view their litigation targets as bad actors who deserve punishment. Waiting for these individuals to establish "persistent misconduct" simply means they just have more opportunities to cause harm.

74 The plaintiff in *Henry v. El* was obviously an OPCA litigant engaged in a vendetta. Slatter JA in that matter did not wait for the plaintiff to establish a pattern of "persistently" misusing the courts to attack others. I agree that is the correct approach. If a person uses pseudolaw to attack others as a 'litigation terrorist' then that should be a basis for immediate court intervention to prevent that from recurring. If the *Judicature Act* cannot provide an authority to do that, then this Court's inherent jurisdiction should provide the basis for that step.

5. Persistent Abusive Conduct is Only One Predictor of Future Misconduct

75 All this is not to say that "persistence" is irrelevant. In fact, it is extremely important. A history of persistent abuse of court processes implies the likelihood of other, future misconduct. Persistence is relevant, but must not be *the only*

prerequisite which potentially triggers court intervention. Persistence is a clear and effective basis for a court to predict actions when it cannot ascertain motivation or pathology, and from that derive what is likely and predictable.

However, that should not be the only evidence which is an appropriate basis on which to restrict court access.

76 The reason that I and other Alberta Court of Queen's Bench judges have concluded that this Court has an inherent jurisdiction to limit court access to persons outside the *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 scheme is not simply because the UK appeal courts have concluded that this jurisdiction exists, *but also because that authority is necessary*. *Sawridge #7* at paras 38-49 reviews how the Supreme Court has instructed that trial courts conduct a "culture shift" in their operation towards processes that are fair and proportionate, without being trapped in artificial and formulaic rules and procedures. This is *an obligation* on the courts. The current *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 process is an inadequate response to the growing issue of problematic and abusive litigation.

77 Even though the *Judicature Act* is not the sole basis for this Court's jurisdiction to control abusive litigation, that legislation could be amended to make it more effective. One helpful step would be to remove the requirement that "vexatious" litigation involves misconduct that occurs "persistently". Another would be to re-focus the basis for when intervention should occur.

Currently, section 23.1(1) permits intervention when ". . . a Court is satisfied that a person is instituting vexatious proceedings in the Court or is conducting a proceeding in a vexatious manner ...". This again is backwards-looking, punitive language. In my opinion a superior alternative is "... when a Court is satisfied that a person may abuse court processes ...".

78 The Legislature should also explicitly acknowledge that the *Judicature Act* procedure does not limit how courts of inherent jurisdiction may on their own motion and inherent authority restrict a person's right to initiate or continue litigation.

79 As Veit J observed in *Sikora Estate v. Sikora*, 2015 ABQB 467 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras 16-19, where a person seeks to have the court make an order that restricts court access then the appropriate procedure is *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1. That is a distinct process and authority from that possessed by judges of this Court. Given that the Masters of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench derive their authority from legislation, another helpful step would be for the Legislature to extend *Judicature Act*, ss 23-23.1 to authorize Masters, on their own motion, to apply the *Judicature Act* procedure to control abusive litigants who appear in Chambers. This is not an uncommon phenomenon; the Masters are in many senses the 'front line' of the Court, and frequently encounter litigation abuse in that role.

B. Maurice Stoney's Abusive Activities

80 In reviewing Maurice Stoney's litigation activities I conclude on several independent bases that his future access to Alberta courts should be restricted. His misconduct matches a number *Chutskoff Estate v. Bonora* "indicia" categories and exhibits varying degrees of severity.

1. Collateral Attacks

81 First, Maurice Stoney has clearly attempted to re-litigate decided issues by conducting the *Stoney v. Sawridge First Nation* judicial review, the 2016 Canadian Human Rights Commission application, and his attempts to interfere in the Advice and Direction Application litigation via the *Stoney v. Twinn*, 2016 ABCA 51 (Alta. C.A.) appeal and his August 12, 2016 application. In each case he attempted to argue that he has automatically been made a member of the Sawridge Band by the passage of Bill C-31. He has also repeatedly attacked the processes of the Sawridge Band in administering its membership. My reasons for that conclusion are found in *Sawridge #6* at paras 41-52.

82 This is the first independent basis on which I conclude Maurice Stoney's litigation activity should be controlled. He has a history of repeated collateral attacks in relation to this subject and the related parties. This has squandered important court resources and incurred unnecessary litigation and dispute-related costs on other parties.

2. *Hopeless Proceedings*

83 Maurice Stoney's attempts to re-litigate the same issues also represent hopeless litigation. The principle of *res judicata* prohibits a different result. This is a second independent basis on which I conclude Maurice Stoney's litigation conduct needs to be controlled, though it largely overlaps with the issue of collateral attacks.

3. *Busybody Litigation*

84 Maurice Stoney appears to have alleged two bases for why I should conclude his purportedly acting in court as a representative of his "living brothers and sisters" is not "busybody" litigation:

1. he has provided affidavit evidence to establish he was an authorized representative, and
2. representation in this manner is authorized by the *Federal Court Rules*, s 114.

85 As I have previously indicated I reject that the affidavit evidence of Shelley, Bill, and Gail Stoney established on a balance of probabilities that Maurice Stoney was authorized to represent his siblings. As for the *Federal Court Rules*, that legislation has no legal relevance or application to a proceeding conducted in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench.

86 "Busybody" litigation is a very serious form of litigation abuse, particularly since it runs the risk of injuring otherwise uninvolved persons. I am very concerned about how the weak affidavit evidence presented by Maurice Stoney represents an after-the-fact attempt to draw Maurice Stoney's relatives not only into this litigation, but potentially with the result these individuals face court sanction, including awards of solicitor and own client indemnity costs. While I have rejected that possibility (*Sawridge #7* at paras 8, 139), the fact that risk emerged is a deeply aggravating element to what is already a very serious form of litigation abuse. This is a third independent basis on which I conclude Maurice Stoney's court access should be restricted.

4. *Failure to Follow Court Orders - Unpaid Costs Awards*

87 Maurice Stoney admitted he has outstanding unpaid cost awards. Maurice Stoney says he is unable to pay the outstanding costs orders because he does not have the money for that. No evidence was tendered to substantiate that claim.

88 A costs order is a court order. A litigant who does not pay costs is disobeying a court order.

89 Outstanding costs orders on their own may not be a basis to conclude that a person's litigation activities require control. What amplifies the seriousness of these outstanding awards is that Maurice Stoney has attempted to shift all his litigation costs to a third party, the 1985 Sawridge Trust: *Sawridge #6* at para 78. Worse, the effect of that would be to deplete a trust that holds the communal property of an aboriginal community: *Sawridge #7* at paras 145-46, 148.

90 A court may presume that a person intends the natural consequences of their actions: *Starr v. Ontario (Commissioner of Inquiry)*, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 1366, 68 D.L.R. (4th) 641 (S.C.C.). Maurice Stoney appears to intend to cause harm to those he litigates against. He conducts hopeless litigation and then attempts to shift those costs to innocent third parties. If unsuccessful, he says he is unable to pay those costs. In this context Maurice Stoney's failure to pay outstanding costs orders to the Sawridge Band is in itself a basis to take steps to restrict his court access.

5. *Escalating Proceedings - Forum Shopping*

91 In *Sawridge #6* and *Sawridge #7* I noted that Maurice Stoney's dispute with the Sawridge Band has been spread over a range of venues. He acted in Federal Court, and when unsuccessful there he shifted to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. Again unsuccessful, he now renewed his abusive litigation, this time in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and the Alberta Court of Appeal.

92 I conclude this is a special kind of escalating proceedings, "forum shopping", where a litigant moves between courts, tribunals, and jurisdictions in an attempt to prolong or renew abusive dispute activities. Forum shopping is a particular issue in relation to vexatious litigants because court-ordered restrictions on litigation have a limited scope. For example, I have no authority to order steps that would affect a litigant's access to a court in a different province, or the federal courts.

93 Abusive litigants can exploit this gap in Canadian court jurisdictions to repeatedly harm other litigants and, in the process, multiple courts. The litigation activities of a British Columbia resident, Roger Callow, are a dramatic example of forum shopping: reviewed in *West Vancouver School District No. 45 v. Callow*, 2014 ONSC 2547 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Callow v. West Vancouver School District No. 45*, 2008 BCSC 778, 168 A.C.W.S. (3d) 906 (B.C. S.C.).

94 Callow's dispute began in 1985 as a labour arbitration proceeding in response to Callow's employment being terminated. That led to litigation and appeals in that jurisdiction. The Supreme Court refused leave. More British Columbia lawsuits followed, and by 2003 Callow was declared a "vexatious litigant" in British Columbia. Callow then persisted with multiple appeals and leave applications. That led to a further 2010 order to control his court access. Callow now shifted to the Federal Court, where his actions were struck out as an abuse of process: *Callow v. British Columbia (Court of Appeal Chief Justice)* (November 9, 2011), Doc. T-1386-11 (F.C.), aff'd (December 2, 2011), Doc. Vancouver T-138611 (F.C.); *Callow v. Board of School Trustees (#45 West Vancouver)* (February 2, 2015), Doc. Vancouver T-2360-14 (F.C.). In 2012 Callow then sued in Ontario, which led to him being subjected to broad court access restrictions in that jurisdiction as well: *West Vancouver School District No. 45 v. Callow*, 2014 ONSC 2547 (Ont. S.C.J.).

95 The saga then continued, with Callow next having filings struck out in Quebec (*Callow v. West Vancouver S.D. No. 45*, 2015 QCCS 5002 (C.S. Que.), affirmed 2016 QCCA 60 (C.A. Que.), leave to the SCC refused, 36883 (9 June 2016) [2016 CarswellQue 4744 (S.C.C.)] and Saskatchewan (*Callow v. West Vancouver S.D. No. 45*, 2015 SKQB 308 (C.S. Que.), affirmed 2016 SKCA 25 (Sask. C.A.), leave to the SCC refused, 36993 (6 October 2016) [2016 CarswellSask 624 (S.C.C.)]. I would be unsurprised if Alberta is not at some point added to this list.

96 Clearly, at least some persistent abusive court participants are willing to 'shop around', and Roger Callow's litigation is an extreme example of the waste that can result. Given the manner in which Canadian court and tribunal jurisdictions are structured there seems little way at present to escape scenarios like this. Academic commentary on the control of abusive litigation has recommended a national "vexatious litigant" registry: Caplan & Bloom at 457-58, Morissette at 22. I agree that would be a useful addition.

97 Forum shopping by its very nature implies an intent to evade legitimate litigation control processes and legal principles, including *res judicata*. In the case of Maurice Stoney his forum shopping largely overlaps his abusive collateral attack and futile litigation activities, and is a highly aggravating factor to that misconduct.

6. Unproven Allegations of Fraud and Corruption

98 The May 16, 2016 cross-examination transcript reveals that Maurice Stoney believes he and his relatives are the subjects of fraud and conspiracy that is intended to deny them their birthright. For example, he says Sawridge Band membership applications have been ignored, though he has no proof of that.

99 These allegations are not in themselves a basis to restrict Maurice Stoney's court access, however they provide some insight into his litigation objectives and how he views his now longstanding conflict with the Sawridge Band and its administration.

7. Improper Litigation Purposes

100 The Sawridge Band argues Maurice Stoney's August 12, 2016 application has an improper purpose, or no legitimate purpose. Maurice Stoney's exact objective is not obvious. It may be he intends to pursue his perceived objective no matter the consequences or justification, to disrupt the membership process of the Sawridge Band, to obtain monies from the 1985 Sawridge Trust, or a combination of those motives. However, as I have previously indicated, the combination of futile litigation, unpaid costs awards, costs shifting, forum shopping, and a claim that the abusive litigant lacks the means to pay costs leads to a logical inference. The August 12, 2016 application had no legitimate purpose. Its only effect was to waste court and litigant resources.

101 This is another independent basis on which I conclude court intervention is warranted to control Maurice Stoney's access to Alberta Courts.

C. Anticipated Litigation Abuse

102 This decision identifies five independent bases on which this Court should take steps to control future litigation abuse by Maurice Stoney in Alberta Courts. Collectively, that strongly favours court intervention. His litigation history predicts future litigation abuse.

103 But that is secondary to another fact - that the submissions received in the second stage of the procedure found in *Hok v. Alberta* shows that Maurice Stoney and his counsel still do not accept that prior decisions mean Maurice Stoney has no right to continue his interference with the Sawridge Band and its membership processes. Instead, Maurice Stoney and his counsel say his arguments are viable, if not correct. Those are "the facts". This is a very strong predictor of future abusive litigation activities. Maurice Stoney's objectives and beliefs remain unchanged.

104 What remains is to determine the scope of that court access restriction order. The combination of trial, appeal, judicial review, and tribunal activities strongly predicts that Maurice Stoney will not restrict his abusive litigation activities to a particular forum. Instead, his history of forum shopping suggests the opposite.

105 While I have agreed with many of the Sawridge Band and 1985 Sawridge Trust's arguments, I do not accept that Maurice Stoney's litigation history and apparent intentions means that his plausible future abusive litigation activities cannot be restricted to a particular target group or dispute. Instead, Maurice Stoney's complaint-related activities have a clear focus: his long-standing dispute with the Sawridge Band concerning band membership. I did not receive any evidence or statements that suggest that Stoney's abusive activities will expand outside that target set. I therefore only require Stoney obtain leave to initiate or continue litigation in Alberta courts where the litigation involves:

1. the Sawridge Band,
2. the 1985 Sawridge Trust,
- 3 the 1986 Sawridge Trust,
- 4 the current, former, and future Chief and Council of the Sawridge Band,
5. the current, former, and future Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and 1986 Sawridge Trust,
6. the Public Trustee of Alberta,
7. legal representatives of categories 1-6,
8. members of the Sawridge Band,
9. corporate and individual employees of the Sawridge Band, and

10. the Canadian federal government.

106 I have defined this plausible target group broadly because Maurice Stoney's allegations of conspiracy against himself and his siblings raises a concern that Maurice Stoney may shift his focus from the Sawridge Band and the Trusts to the individuals who are involved in the prior litigation and Sawridge Band membership-related processes and decisions.

107 Maurice Stoney's litigation misconduct extends to appeals. Normally that would mean that I would restrict his access to all three levels of Alberta Courts, however in light of the inconsistent Alberta Court of Appeal jurisprudence on control of abusive and vexatious litigation in that forum I do not extend my order to that Court: *Hok v. Alberta*, 2016 ABQB 335 (Alta. Q.B.); *Ewanchuk v. Canada (Attorney General)*.

108 I agree that Maurice Stoney's future litigation activities should be made dependent on him first paying outstanding cost awards.

109 Maurice Stoney's "busybody" activities, and his attempts to justify his purportedly authorized representation activities in this hearing raise the troubling possibility that Stoney will again attempt to draw others into his disputes. Persons have no constitutional right to represent others (*Gauthier v. Starr*, 2016 ABQB 213, 86 C.P.C. (7th) 348 (Alta. Q.B.)), and appearing before a court is a privilege solely subject to the court's discretion (*R. v. Dick*, 2002 BCCA 27, 163 B.C.A.C. 62 (B.C. C.A.)). Maurice Stoney has badly abused that privilege and his arguments concerning his "busybody" activities are highly problematic. He has demonstrated he is an unfit litigation representative. I therefore order that Maurice Stoney is prohibited from representing any person in all Alberta Courts.

D. Court Access Control Order

110 I therefore order:

1. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited, under the inherent jurisdiction of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, without an order of the Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, of the Court in which the proceeding is conducted, or his or her designate, where that litigation involves any one or more of:

- (i) the Sawridge Band,
- (ii) the 1985 Sawridge Trust,
- (iii) the 1986 Sawridge Trust,
- (iv) current, former, and future Chief and Council of the Sawridge Band,
- (v) the current, former, and future Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and 1986 Sawridge Trust,
- (vi) Public Trustee of Alberta,
- (vii) legal representatives of categories 1-6,
- (viii) members of the Sawridge Band,
- (ix) corporate and individual employees of the Sawridge Band, and
- (x) the Canadian federal government.

2. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, until Maurice Felix Stoney pays in full all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
3. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may, at any time, direct that notice of an application to commence or continue an appeal, action, application, or proceeding be given to any other person.
4. Maurice Felix Stoney must describe himself, in the application or document to which this Order applies as "Maurice Felix Stoney", and not by using initials, an alternative name structure, or a pseudonym.
5. Any application to commence or continue any appeal, action, application, or proceeding must be accompanied by an affidavit:
 - (i) attaching a copy of the Order issued herein, restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's access to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Provincial Court of Alberta;
 - (ii) attaching a copy of the appeal, pleading, application, or process that Maurice Felix Stoney proposes to issue or file or continue;
 - (iii) deposing fully and completely to the facts and circumstances surrounding the proposed claim or proceeding, so as to demonstrate that the proceeding is not an abuse of process, and that there are reasonable grounds for it;
 - (iv) indicating whether Maurice Felix Stoney has ever sued some or all of the defendants or respondents previously in any jurisdiction or Court, and if so providing full particulars;
 - (v) undertaking that, if leave is granted, the authorized appeal, pleading, application or process, the Order granting leave to proceed, and the affidavit in support of the Order will promptly be served on the defendants or respondents;
 - (vi) undertaking to diligently prosecute the proceeding; and
 - (vii) providing evidence of payment in full of all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
6. Any application referenced herein shall be made in writing.
7. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may:
 - (i) give notice of the proposed claim or proceeding and the opportunity to make submissions on the proposed claim or proceeding, if they so choose, to:
 - a) the involved potential parties;
 - b) other relevant persons identified by the Court; and
 - c) the Attorney Generals of Alberta and Canada.
 - (ii) respond to the leave application in writing; and
 - (iii) hold the application in open Court where it shall be recorded.
8. Leave to commence or continue proceedings may be given on conditions, including the posting of security for costs.

9. An application that is dismissed may not be made again.

10. An application to vary or set aside this Order must be made on notice to any person as directed by the Court.

111 This order will be prepared by the Court and filed at the same time, as this Case Management Decision and takes effect immediately. The exception granted in the Rooke Order shall apply to this court access control order.

112 The interim order made per *Sawridge #6* at para 65-66 is vacated.

V. Representation by Priscilla Kennedy in this Matter

113 I have deep concerns about the manner in which Maurice Stoney's lawyer, Priscilla Kennedy, has conducted herself in this matter. Certain of those issues are reviewed in *Sawridge #7*, a judgment where I determined that Kennedy should be personally responsible for her client's costs award because of her misconduct. She represented a client who made a hopeless application that was a serious abuse of the Court and other litigants, and involved other third parties without their authorization.

114 In *Sawridge #7* Ms. Kennedy was represented by Mr. Donald Wilson, a partner of the law firm DLA Piper, which is the law firm that employs Ms. Kennedy. I reproduce verbatim certain of Mr. Wilson's submissions to the Court in *Sawridge #7*:

. . . in these circumstances, I will say that Ms. Kennedy has prosecuted this action on [Maurice Stoney's] behalf further than I would've, further than I think she should've. ...

. . . the reason I go through this, Sir, is I think quite candidly I've conceded that Ms. Kennedy prosecuted this action further than I would've, further than I think she ought to have ...

Now, if I'm [counsel for the Sawridge Band], I can tell you that the Band is the person that gets to determine their membership and that is entirely appropriate. And in Mr. Stoney's case they've done that. Appeals were made on two different

levels. An additional attempt was made at the Human Rights tribunal. And Mr. Stoney has been told, and I know he's been told this because I told him this, he is at the end of his rope with respect to the Sawridge Band and the Court system.

And the reason for that is background and history. It's one of Montgomery's campaigns in World War II, it's a bridge too far. He would've been fine if he'd stopped at bridges, by going for a third bridge the campaign itself stopped. In this instance, had -- if I'd been engaged or consulted, if I read *Sawridge 5* . . . the fact that the Court is not, unlikely earlier trust litigation where often the trust ends up paying for part of the litigant's costs, the Court could not have been clearer that is not going forward. And the Court indicated interlope. That is, someone does not have a claim on the trust, presumably would make the trial more complicated, more time consuming, higher costs for everyone. ...

Now, I can tell you that in the course of the last week . . . I had occasion to speak in depth with Ms. Kennedy. And Ms. Kennedy tried to convince me as to the merits of Mr. Stoney's case. And at a certain point in time, I had to tell her that he has exhausted his remedies in the legal realm with respect to the Sawrid ges an d it's time to move on.

. . .

My submission would be the application that resulted in Sawridge 6 should not have been made. It was ill-advised. But was not done with bad motives, an attempt to abuse the process. It had that effect, I have to say in front of my friends it absolutely had that effect . . .

. . . what the Court is trying to do, as you properly cite in your decision with respect to sanctions, is to change behaviour. It's the same rationale behind torts which is you're giving a tort award so that some other idiot isn't going to follow and do the same thing. And, with respect, I would submit to you that the seriousness of what Sawridge 6 is has been driven home to Ms. Kennedy. And, with respect, it's been driven home as much as an order of contempt or a referral to the Law Society.

The decision is out there, we have a courtroom full of reporters here to report on the matter.

And I'm reminded of someone once asked Warren Buffett when he was testifying at the congress as to what was reasonable, and it was on the context of a company he owned and insider trading. And Mr. Buffett to the U.S. congress testified it meets a very easy standard. And the standard is, if they printed the story in your home town and your mother and your father had an opportunity to read it, would you be embarrassed? And, with respect, Ms. Kennedy and the Sawridge 6

decision has brought home the falling off continuing to prosecute the remedy she's seeking for Mr. Stoney. Which, after meeting Mr. Stoney, I understand. But there's a certain point in time the legal remedies have been exhausted. . . .

[Emphasis added.]

115 I believe I am fair when I indicate these submissions say that at the *Sawridge #7* hearing Mr. Wilson, on behalf of Ms. Kennedy, had acknowledged that there was no merit to the August 12, 2016 application, and that the legal issues involved in that application had been decided,

conclusively, in a series of earlier court proceedings. Yet, here in her written submissions, Ms. Kennedy on behalf of Maurice Stoney, re-argues the very same points. Her submissions are the law is unsettled, issues remain arguable, despite her counsel's admission on July 28, 2017 that

the effect of the August 12, 2016 application was to abuse of the court's process: ". . . it absolutely had that effect ..." [emphasis added].

116 Mr. Wilson told me in open court that Ms. Kennedy had learned her lesson. When I read the written brief Kennedy prepared and submitted on behalf of Maurice Stoney, I questioned whether that was true.

117 In *Sawridge #7* at paras 98-99 I explained my conclusion why a lawyer who re-litigates or repeatedly raises settled issues has engaged in serious misconduct that is contrary to the standards expected of persons who hold the title "lawyer". I also observed on how advancing abusive litigation is a breach not merely of a lawyer's professional and court officer duties. It is a betrayal of the solicitor-client relationship, and 'digs a grave for two': para 74.

118 I am also troubled by Ms. Kennedy relying on a procedure found in the *Federal Court Rules* to explain why Maurice Stoney's August 12, 2016 application was not a "busybody" proceeding. Stating what should be obvious, civil proceedings in front of this Court are governed by the *Alberta Rules of Court*, not the *Federal Court Rules*. I question the competence of a lawyer who does not understand what court rules apply in a specific jurisdiction.

119 In *Sawridge #7* at paras 51-58 I reviewed case law concerning the inherent jurisdiction of a Canadian court to control lawyers and their activities. At para 56 I cited *MacDonald Estate v. Martin*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1235 (S.C.C.) at 1245, (1990), 77 D.L.R. (4th) 249 (S.C.C.) for the rule that courts as part of their supervisory function may remove lawyers

from litigation, where appropriate. In that decision representation by lawyers was challenged on the basis of an alleged conflict of interest.

However, the inherent jurisdiction of the court is not expressly restricted to simply that:

. . . The courts, which have inherent jurisdiction to remove from the record solicitors who have a conflict of interest, are not bound to apply a code of ethics. Their jurisdiction stems from the fact that lawyers are officers of the court and their conduct in legal proceedings which may affect the administration of justice is subject to this supervisory jurisdiction. ... [Emphasis added.]

120 In my opinion Ms. Kennedy's conduct raises the question of whether she is a suitable representative for Maurice Stoney, and whether the proper administration of justice requires that Ms. Kennedy should be removed from this litigation.

121 This judgment represents what I believe should be Ms. Kennedy's final opportunity to participate in the Advice and Direction Application in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench as a representative of Maurice Stoney. If that were not the case then I would have proceeded to invite submissions from Ms. Kennedy why she and her law firm, DLA Piper, should not be removed as representatives of Maurice Stoney, and prohibited from any future representation of Maurice Stoney in the Advice and Direction Application.

122 Instead I will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review.

VI. Conclusion

123 I conclude that Maurice Felix Stoney has engaged in abusive litigation activities resulting in him being required to seek leave prior to initiating or continuing litigation in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Alberta Provincial Court that relates to persons and organizations involved with the Sawridge Band and Maurice Stoney's disputes concerning membership in that Band. Maurice Stoney may only seek leave after he has paid all outstanding costs awards.

124 Maurice Stoney is also prohibited from representing others in any litigation before the Alberta Provincial Court, Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, and Alberta Court of Appeal.

125 I confirm that I will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review in respect to Ms. Kennedy.

Order made.

Tab B



COURT FILE NUMBER 1103 114112
 COURT Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
 JUDICIAL CENTRE Edmonton
 APPLICANT Maurice Felix Stoney

RESPONDENTS Roland Twinn, Catherine Twinn, Walter Felix Twin, Martha L'Hirondelle and Clara Midho, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust, the Public Trustee of Alberta, and the Sawridge Band

DOCUMENT **COURT ACCESS CONTROL ORDER FOR MAURICE FELIX STONEY**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT Justice D.R.G. Thomas, Alberta Court of Queen's Bench Judicial District of Edmonton 3rd Floor – Law Courts Building 1A Sir Winston Churchill Square Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 12, 2017
 NAME OF THE JUDGE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: Honourable D.R.G. Thomas

WHEREAS on July 12, 2017 this Court dismissed the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney and "His Brothers and Sisters" to be added to Docket 11103 14112 action, that decision reported as *1985 Sawridge Trust v Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 436;
 AND WHEREAS on concluding that the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney disclosed indicators of vexatious and abusive litigation;

AND UPON the Court receiving and reviewing written submissions filed on behalf of Maurice Felix Stoney and others concerning whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted, and if so, the scope of those restrictions;

AND UPON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION;

This is Exhibit "B" referred to in the Affidavit of
 SUSAN HAGERMAN
 Sworn before me this 23 day
 of NOVEMBER A.D., 2017
 J. Hiemstra
 A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
 in and for the Province of Alberta


J. HEATHER HIEMSTRA
 A Commissioner for Oaths
 in and for Alberta
 My Commission Expires June 15, 2019

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Interim Court Filing Restriction Order for Maurice Felix Stoney made and filed July 12, 2017 is vacated.
2. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited, under the inherent jurisdiction of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, without an order of the Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, of the Court in which the proceeding is conducted, or his or her designate, where that litigation involves any one or more of:
 - (i) the Sawridge Band,
 - (ii) the 1985 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iii) the 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iv) the current, former, and future Chief and Council of the Sawridge Band,
 - (v) the current, former, and future Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (vi) the Public Trustee of Alberta,
 - (vii) legal representatives of categories 1-6,
 - (viii) members of the Sawridge Band,
 - (ix) corporate and individual employees of the Sawridge Band, and
 - (x) the Canadian federal government.
3. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, until Maurice Felix Stoney pays in full all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
4. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may, at any time, direct that notice of an application to commence or continue an appeal, action, application, or proceeding be given to any other person.
5. Maurice Felix Stoney must describe himself, in the application or document to which this Order applies as "Maurice Felix Stoney", and not by using initials, an alternative name structure, or a pseudonym.

6. Any application to commence or continue any appeal, action, application, or proceeding must be accompanied by an affidavit:
 - (i) attaching a copy of the Order issued herein, restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's access to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Provincial Court of Alberta;
 - (ii) attaching a copy of the appeal, pleading, application, or process that Maurice Felix Stoney proposes to issue or file or continue;
 - (iii) deposing fully and completely to the facts and circumstances surrounding the proposed claim or proceeding, so as to demonstrate that the proceeding is not an abuse of process, and that there are reasonable grounds for it;
 - (iv) indicating whether Maurice Felix Stoney has ever sued some or all of the defendants or respondents previously in any jurisdiction or Court, and if so providing full particulars;
 - (v) undertaking that, if leave is granted, the authorized appeal, pleading, application or process, the Order granting leave to proceed, and the affidavit in support of the Order will promptly be served on the defendants or respondents;
 - (vi) undertaking to diligently prosecute the proceeding; and
 - (vii) providing evidence of payment in full of all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
7. Any application referenced herein shall be made in writing.
8. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may:
 - (i) give notice of the proposed claim or proceeding and the opportunity to make submissions on the proposed claim or proceeding, if they so choose, to:
 - a) the involved potential parties;
 - b) other relevant persons identified by the Court; and
 - c) the Attorney Generals of Alberta and Canada.
 - (ii) respond to the leave application in writing; and
 - (iii) hold the application in open Court where it shall be recorded.
9. Leave to commence or continue proceedings may be given on conditions, including the posting of security for costs.
10. An application that is dismissed may not be made again.

11. An application to vary or set aside this Order must be made on notice to any person as directed by the Court.
12. The exception granted in the Order made by Associate Chief Justice Rooke on July 20, 2017 in the matter of *Nussbaum v Stoney*, Alberta Court of Queen's Bench docket 1603 03761 shall apply to this Court Access Control Order.



D.R.G. Thomas *Thomas*
JUSTICE OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

ENTERED this 12 day of Sept, A.D. 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

Tab C



October 23, 2017

EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C.
DIRECT DIAL: 780.423.8506
DIRECT FAX: 780.423.2870
EMAIL: emolstad@parlee.com
OUR FILE #: 64203-24/EHM

*Delivered by Hand and
Via email to denise.sutton@albertacourts.ca*

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
6th Floor Law Courts Building
1A Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2

Attention: The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas

Dear Mr. Justice Thomas:

**Re: Sawridge #8 Order
Court of Queen's Bench Action No: 1103 14112**

Counsel are unable to agree with Ms Kennedy's legal counsel, Mr. Faulds with respect to the terms of the Order for Sawridge #8.

We are attaching the communication between counsel as follows:

Appendix #1 - Email from Mr. Faulds dated September 28, 2017, at 5:49 pm, with draft Order attached;

Appendix #2 - Email from our offices to Mr. Faulds dated October 10, 2017, at 11:33 am, with draft Order attached;

Appendix #3 - Email from Mr. Faulds dated October 16, 2107, at 12:42 pm enclosing a further draft Order;

Appendix #4 - Email from our office to Mr. Faulds dated October 18, 2017, at 8:41 am requesting advice as to who is representing Mr. Maurice Stoney;

Appendix #5 - Email from Mr. Faulds dated October 18, 2017, at 10:11 am advising they represent Ms. Kennedy and do not represent Mr. Stoney

Appendix #6 - Email from our offices to Mr. Faulds dated October 18, 2017, at 11:17 am setting out the position on behalf of the Sawridge First Nation and the Sawridge Trustees in relation to the terms of the Order;

This is Exhibit "C" referred to in the Affidavit of

SUSAN HAGERMAN
Sworn before me this 23 day
of NOVEMBER A.D., 20 17

J. Heather Hiemstra
A Notary Public & Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta
J. HEATHER HIEMSTRA
A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for Alberta
My Commission Expires June 15, 20 19

Appendix #7 - Letter from Mr. Wilson enclosing a filed copy of the Affidavit of Service of Notice of Withdrawal;

We are attaching as Appendix #8 the draft Order that we propose be signed in relation to this matter. We have removed the provision for this to be signed by any counsel approving the form and content and added a provision for the Order to be entered by the Clerk of the Court. In all other respects, this draft Order is the same as the draft Order that we forwarded to Mr. Faulds in our email of October 10, 2017 as described in Appendix #2.

It is our submission that it is open to the Court to take the position that no Order is required as the Court has already drafted and signed an Order in relation to the Court restricting Mr. Maurice Stoney's ability to commence proceedings.

In event that the Court is of the view that an Order is required in relation to Sawridge #8, we would propose that the Order be in accordance with the Order drafted by our offices which is attached as Appendix #8.

We have reviewed this matter with Ms Bonora and we can confirm that she agrees with the position that we have set out in this letter.

We would emphasize that we have not consulted with Mr. Maurice Stoney in relation to the terms of the enclosed Order and Mr. Maurice Stoney is no longer represented by Ms. Kennedy or DLA Piper.

Yours truly,

PARLEE McLAWS LLP



EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C.
EHM/hfw
Enclosures

- cc: Jon Faulds, Field Law
Via email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
- cc: Don Wilson, DLA Piper
Via email: donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
- cc: Janet Hutchison, Hutchison Law
Via email: jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca
- cc: Doris Bonora, Dentons Canada LLP
Via email: doris.bonora@dentons.com

cc: Karen Platten, Q.C., McLennan Ross
Via email: kplatten@mross.com

cc: Ellery Sopko, Parlee McLaws
Via email: esopko@parlee.com

APPENDIX "1"

Heather F. Williams

From: Jon Faulds <jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 5:49 PM
To: 'Lafuente, Erin'; 'Bonora, Doris'; 'donald.wilson@dlapiper.com'
Cc: Edward H. Molstad
Subject: RE: Sawridge #8
Attachments: Draft order-Sawridge #8 (E3486044x9D6E6).docx

Further to my previous email below, I attach a proposed draft of the form of Order arising from the decision in Sawridge #8 that I would recommend to Ms. Kennedy.

Jon

FIELD LAW **P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner**
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

Field Law and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Jon Faulds
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 4:47 PM
To: 'Lafuente, Erin'; Bonora, Doris; donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
Cc: 'emolstad@parlee.com'
Subject: RE: Sawridge #8

Hi Erin,

Thanks for your message.

I have reviewed the draft Order forwarded by Ms. Bonora. I assume the Court Access Control Order referred to in paragraph 1 is the Order prepared and filed by the Court on September 12, 2017. That Order already deals with the matters referred to in paragraphs 2 through 5 of Ms. Bonora's draft and I think it is unnecessary and unwise to have two orders dealing with the same thing with different wording

I also have concerns regarding the wording of the preamble. In the circumstances I will prepare a revised draft and return it to you for your consideration.

Jon

FIELD LAW **P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner**
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

Field Law and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Lafuente, Erin [<mailto:erin.lafuente@dentons.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 10:28 AM
To: Bonora, Doris; Jon Faulds; donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
Cc: 'emolstad@parlee.com'
Subject: RE: Sawridge #8

As you are aware, Doris Bonora is away from the office and I am assisting with follow up on outstanding Sawridge matters in her absence.

Please refer to Doris' email below, dated September 21, 2017 with respect to the draft Order for Sawridge #8. We have

Mr. Molstad's confirmation of his acceptance of the draft. We look forward to hearing from you so that we may send the Order to Justice Thomas for his signature.

Thank you,
Erin



Erin M Lafuente
Partner

D +1 780 423 7126
erin.lafuente@dentons.com
Bio | Website

Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place, 10180 - 101 Street Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5 Canada

大成 Salans FMC SNR Denton McKenna Long

Dentons is a global legal practice providing client services worldwide through its member firms and affiliates. This email may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete this email from your systems. To update your commercial electronic message preferences email dentonsinsightsca@dentons.com or visit our website. Please see dentons.com for Legal Notices.

From: Bonora, Doris
Sent: 21-Sep-17 11:43 AM
To: Edward H. Molstad; jfaulds@fieldlaw.com; donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
Subject: Sawridge #8

Here is a draft of the order for Sawridge #8.

We would appreciate your comments so that we may send the order to Justice Thomas for his signature

Doris



Doris C.E. Bonora
Partner

D +1 780 423 7188
doris.bonora@dentons.com
Bio | Website

Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place, 10180 - 101 Street Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5 Canada

大成 Salans FMC SNR Denton McKenna Long

Dentons is a global legal practice providing client services worldwide through its member firms and affiliates. This email may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete this email from your systems. To update your commercial electronic message preferences email dentonsinsightsca@dentons.com or visit our website. Please see dentons.com for Legal Notices.

COURT FILE NUMBER 1103 14112

Clerk's Stamp

COURT: COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE: EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT, RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO 19 now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION ON APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS: MAURICE STONEY and HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS

RESPONDENTS: ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN, WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the "Sawridge Trustees") and

INTERVENOR SAWRIDGE BAND ("SB")

DOCUMENT ORDER RE: SAWRIDGE #8

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT
Dentons Canada LLP
2900, 10180 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5
Attention: Doris Bonora
Telephone: (780) 423-7188
Facsimile: (780) 423-7276
File No.: 551860 -1

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

September 12, 2017

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

Edmonton, Alberta

NAME OF JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER:

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

UPON THE DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice, the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas, that Maurice Stoney is to make written submissions by close of business on August 4, 2017, if he chooses to do so, on whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted and, if so, what the scope of that restriction should be;

AND UPON THE FURTHER DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice that the Sawridge Trustees and the Sawridge Band may make written submissions on Maurice Stoney's potential vexatious litigant status and introduce additional evidence relevant to that question by close of business on July 28, 2017;

AND UPON HAVING READ the written submissions of counsels for Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters, the Sawridge First Nation and the Sawridge 1985 Trustees filed in accordance with the foregoing;

AND UPON the delivery of written reasons for the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas dated September 12, 2017:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Maurice Stoney's is subject to the Court Access Control Order prepared by the Court and filed on September 12, 2017;
2. The Court will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review in respect to Priscilla Kennedy.

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

Approved as to Form and Content:

P.E. Kennedy DLA Piper LLP
Counsel for Maurice Stoney

D.C.E. Bonora, Dentons Canada LLP
Counsel for the Trustees for the 1985
Sawridge Trust

E.H. Molstad, Q.C.
Counsel for the Respondent, Sawridge First
Nation

APPENDIX "2"

Heather F. Williams

From: Tracy L. Kaiser on behalf of Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2017 11:33 AM
To: 'jfaulds@fieldlaw.com'
Cc: 'Wilson, Donald'; doris.bonora@dentons.com; Ellery Sopko
Subject: ORDER - Sawridge #8 [October 10, 2017] (Parlee File: 64203-7/EHM)
Attachments: ORDER - Sawridge #8 [October 10, 2017] (E7573162).PDF

Dear Mr. Faulds,

With respect to the above-described Order, we have taken your draft and added a new paragraph to the preamble which is now the first paragraph of the preamble and which is the same as the first paragraph of the preamble in Sawridge #6.

I have amended paragraph 1 of the Order to attach the Court Access Control Order. I have also amended the style of cause to be the same as the style of cause that has been used in these proceedings and the reference to myself as counsel for the Intervenor, Sawridge First Nation.

We would ask that if the terms of this Order are acceptable that you have Ms Kennedy sign approval as to form and content in order that it might be signed by The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas.

Yours truly,

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio



PARLEE MCLAWS^{LLP}

1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor-client privilege, all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient, you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you

COURT FILE NUMBER 1103 14112

Clerk's Stamp

COURT: COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE: EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT, RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO 19 now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION ON APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS: MAURICE STONEY and HIS BROTHERS AND SISTERS

RESPONDENTS: ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN, WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the "Sawridge Trustees") and

THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND GUARDIAN ("OPGT")

INTERVENOR SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION aka THE SAWRIDGE BAND ("SFN")

DOCUMENT ORDER RE: SAWRIDGE #8

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Dentons Canada LLP
2900, 10180 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5
Attention: Doris Bonora
Telephone: (780) 423-7188
Facsimile: (780) 423-7276
File No.: 551860 -1

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

September 12, 2017

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

Edmonton, Alberta

NAME OF JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER:

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

UPON the application of Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters to be added as parties or intervenors in the within action as beneficiaries of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and for the legal costs of Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters to be paid by the 1985 Sawridge Trust;

AND UPON THE DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice, the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas, that Maurice Stoney is to make written submissions by close of business on August 4, 2017, if he chooses to do so, on whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted and, if so, what the scope of that restriction should be;

AND UPON THE FURTHER DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice that the Sawridge Trustees and the Sawridge Band may make written submissions on Maurice Stoney's potential vexatious litigant status and introduce additional evidence relevant to that question by close of business on July 28, 2017;

AND UPON HAVING READ the written submissions of counsels for Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters, the Sawridge First Nation and the Sawridge 1985 Trustees filed in accordance with the foregoing;

AND UPON the delivery of written reasons for the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas dated September 12, 2017:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Maurice Stoney's is subject to the Court Access Control Order prepared by the Court and filed on September 12, 2017, a copy of which is attached;
2. The Court will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review in respect to Priscilla Kennedy.

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

Approved as to Form and Content:

P.E. Kennedy DLA Piper LLP
Counsel for Maurice Stoney

D.C.E. Bonora, Dentons Canada LLP
Counsel for the Trustees for the 1985
Sawridge Trust

E.H. Molstad, Q.C.
Counsel for the Intervenor, Sawridge First
Nation

COURT FILE NUMBER 1103 114112
COURT Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
JUDICIAL CENTRE Edmonton
APPLICANT Maurice Felix Stoney
RESPONDENTS Roland Twinn, Catherine Twinn, Walter Felix Twin, Martha L'Hirondelle and Clara Midho, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust, the Public Trustee of Alberta, and the Sawridge Band
DOCUMENT **COURT ACCESS CONTROL ORDER FOR MAURICE FELIX STONEY**
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT Justice D.R.G. Thomas,
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench
Judicial District of Edmonton
3rd Floor – Law Courts Building
1A Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2



DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 12, 2017

NAME OF THE JUDGE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: Honourable D.R.G. Thomas

WHEREAS on July 12, 2017 this Court dismissed the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney and "His Brothers and Sisters" to be added to Docket 11103 14112 action, that decision reported as *1985 Sawridge Trust v Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 436;
AND WHEREAS on concluding that the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney disclosed indicators of vexatious and abusive litigation;

AND UPON the Court receiving and reviewing written submissions filed on behalf of Maurice Felix Stoney and others concerning whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted, and if so, the scope of those restrictions;


AND UPON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Interim Court Filing Restriction Order for Maurice Felix Stoney made and filed July 12, 2017 is vacated.
2. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited, under the inherent jurisdiction of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, without an order of the Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, of the Court in which the proceeding is conducted, or his or her designate, where that litigation involves any one or more of:
 - (i) the Sawridge Band,
 - (ii) the 1985 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iii) the 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iv) the current, former, and future Chief and Council of the Sawridge Band,
 - (v) the current, former, and future Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (vi) the Public Trustee of Alberta,
 - (vii) legal representatives of categories 1-6,
 - (viii) members of the Sawridge Band,
 - (ix) corporate and individual employees of the Sawridge Band, and
 - (x) the Canadian federal government.
3. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, until Maurice Felix Stoney pays in full all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
4. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may, at any time, direct that notice of an application to commence or continue an appeal, action, application, or proceeding be given to any other person.
5. Maurice Felix Stoney must describe himself, in the application or document to which this Order applies as "Maurice Felix Stoney", and not by using initials, an alternative name structure, or a pseudonym.

6. Any application to commence or continue any appeal, action, application, or proceeding must be accompanied by an affidavit:
 - (i) attaching a copy of the Order issued herein, restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's access to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Provincial Court of Alberta;
 - (ii) attaching a copy of the appeal, pleading, application, or process that Maurice Felix Stoney proposes to issue or file or continue;
 - (iii) deposing fully and completely to the facts and circumstances surrounding the proposed claim or proceeding, so as to demonstrate that the proceeding is not an abuse of process, and that there are reasonable grounds for it;
 - (iv) indicating whether Maurice Felix Stoney has ever sued some or all of the defendants or respondents previously in any jurisdiction or Court, and if so providing full particulars;
 - (v) undertaking that, if leave is granted, the authorized appeal, pleading, application or process, the Order granting leave to proceed, and the affidavit in support of the Order will promptly be served on the defendants or respondents;
 - (vi) undertaking to diligently prosecute the proceeding; and
 - (vii) providing evidence of payment in full of all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
7. Any application referenced herein shall be made in writing.
8. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may:
 - (i) give notice of the proposed claim or proceeding and the opportunity to make submissions on the proposed claim or proceeding, if they so choose, to:
 - a) the involved potential parties;
 - b) other relevant persons identified by the Court; and
 - c) the Attorney Generals of Alberta and Canada.
 - (ii) respond to the leave application in writing; and
 - (iii) hold the application in open Court where it shall be recorded.
9. Leave to commence or continue proceedings may be given on conditions, including the posting of security for costs.
10. An application that is dismissed may not be made again.

11. An application to vary or set aside this Order must be made on notice to any person as directed by the Court.
12. The exception granted in the Order made by Associate Chief Justice Rooke on July 20, 2017 in the matter of *Nussbaum v Stoney*, Alberta Court of Queen's Bench docket 1603 03761 shall apply to this Court Access Control Order.



D.R.G. Thomas *Thomas*
JUSTICE OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

ENTERED this 12 day of Sept, A.D. 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

APPENDIX “3”

Heather F. Williams

From: Jon Faulds <jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 12:42 PM
To: Edward H. Molstad
Cc: 'Wilson, Donald'; doris.bonora@dentons.com; Ellery Sopko; Kimberly Precht; Amy Ball
Subject: RE: ORDER - Sawridge #8 [October 10, 2017] (Parlee File: 64203-7/EHM)
Attachments: Draft Order Re. Sawridge #8 v. 2 (E3505537x9D6E6).docx


Mr. Molstad,

Thanks for your message and draft order. Since forwarding our previous draft Justice Thomas has approved forms of orders in Sawridge #6 and Sawridge#7 which, *inter alia*, include terms setting forth his conclusions with respect to Ms. Kennedy.

Accordingly we have amended the draft you sent us to include the same type of term, which adopts the language from paragraphs 120 and 121 of the decision.

We have also made some clerical corrections to ensure the style of cause and naming of parties matches the decision. If this draft is acceptable to you and Ms. Bonora we are agreeable on behalf of Ms. Kennedy to this draft being forwarded to Justice Thomas for his signature.

Jon Faulds



P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

© 2017 P. Jonathan Faulds and his law firm, a limited liability partnership of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Tracy L. Kaiser [<mailto:tkaiser@parlee.com>] **On Behalf Of** Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2017 11:33 AM
To: Jon Faulds
Cc: 'Wilson, Donald'; doris.bonora@dentons.com; Ellery Sopko
Subject: ORDER - Sawridge #8 [October 10, 2017] (Parlee File: 64203-7/EHM)

Dear Mr. Faulds,

With respect to the above-described Order, we have taken your draft and added a new paragraph to the preamble which is now the first paragraph of the preamble and which is the same as the first paragraph of the preamble in Sawridge #6.

I have amended paragraph 1 of the Order to attach the Court Access Control Order. I have also amended the style of cause to be the same as the style of cause that has been used in these proceedings and the reference to myself as counsel for the Intervenor, Sawridge First Nation.

We would ask that if the terms of this Order are acceptable that you have Ms Kennedy sign approval as to form and content in order that it might be signed by The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas.

Yours truly,

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio



PARLEE McLAWS^{LLP}

1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor-client privilege, all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient, you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you.

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>

COURT FILE NUMBER: 1103 14112

Clerk's Stamp

COURT: Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta

JUDICIAL CENTRE: Edmonton

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT,
RSA 2000, C T-8, AS AMENDED, and

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND,
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO. 19, now
known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION, ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS: MAURICE FELIX STONEY AND HIS
BROTHERS AND SISTERS

RESPONDENTS (ORIGINAL APPLICANTS): ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE AND CLARA MIDBO, AS
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE TRUST
(the "1985 Sawridge Trustees" or
"Trustees")

RESPONDENT: Public Trustee of Alberta ("OPTG")

INTERVENOR: THE SAWRIDGE BAND

DOCUMENT: ORDER RE: Sawridge #8

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE
AND CONTACT
INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT: Dentons Canada LLP
2900, 10180 101 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 3V5
Attention: Doris Bonora
Phone: 780-423-7188
Fax: 780-423-7276
File: 551860-1

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 12, 2017

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: Edmonton, Alberta

NAME OF JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

UPON the application of Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters to be added as parties or interveners in the within action as beneficiaries of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and for legal costs of Maurice Stoney and his brother and sisters to be paid by the 1985 Sawridge Trust;

AND UPON THE DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice, the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas, that Maurice Stoney is to make written submissions by close of business on August 4, 2017, if he chooses to do so, on whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted and, if so, what the scope of that restriction should be;

AND UPON THE FURTHER DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice that the 1985 Sawridge Trustees and the Sawridge Band may make written submissions on Maurice Stoney's potential vexatious litigant status and introduce additional evidence relevant to that question by close of business on July 28, 2017;

AND UPON HAVING READ the written submissions of counsels for Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters, the Sawridge Band, and the 1985 Sawridge Trustees filed in accordance with the foregoing;

AND UPON the delivery of written reasons for the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas dated September 12, 2017:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Maurice Stoney is subject to the Court Access Control Order prepared by the Court and filed on September 12, 2017, a copy of which is attached;
2. Priscilla Kennedy's conduct raises the question of whether she is a suitable representative for Maurice Stoney, and whether the proper administration of justice requires that Ms. Kennedy should be removed from this litigation. This judgement represents what the Court believes should be Ms. Kennedy's final opportunity to participate in the Advice and Direction Application in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench as a representative of Maurice Stoney; and

3. The Court will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review in respect to Priscilla Kennedy.

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

APPENDIX “4”

Heather F. Williams

From: Tracy L. Kaiser on behalf of Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 8:41 AM
To: 'jfaulds@fieldlaw.com'
Cc: doris.bonora@dentons.com; 'Wilson, Donald'; Ellery Sopko; erin.lafuente@dentons.com
Subject: Draft Order - Appeal of Sawridge #8 by Priscilla Kennedy (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)

Mr. Faulds,

Further to the correspondence in relation to this matter, we note that the draft Order prepared and forwarded in your email of September 28th, 2017 included a provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.


When we forwarded you a redraft of this Order in our email of October 10th, 2017, our draft also included a provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.

In your email of October 16th, 2017, the draft Order that you have attached does not have any provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.

We would advise that the terms of the draft Order included in your email of October 16th, 2017 are not acceptable however, before we have any further communication in relation to this matter, we would appreciate your advice whether your offices, Ms Kennedy or DLA Piper LLP continue to represent Maurice Stoney with respect to the resolution of the terms of the Sawridge #8 Order.

Yours truly,

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio



1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor/client privilege, all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you

APPENDIX "5"

Edward H. Molstad

From: Jon Faulds <jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Edward H. Molstad
Cc: doris.bonora@dentons.com; 'Wilson, Donald'; Ellery Sopko; erin.lafuente@dentons.com; Kimberly Precht; Amy Ball
Subject: RE: Draft Order - Appeal of Sawridge #8 by Priscilla Kennedy (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)


Mr. Molstad,

Thanks for your message. We represent Ms. Kennedy, including in relation to matters pertaining to the settlement of the Orders arising from the matters in which her interests were engaged. We do not represent Mr. Stoney. We also note Mr. Stoney's interests arising from Sawridge #8 were determined by the Court-issued Order which has already been filed, and not by this Order.

We did not include signature lines for any counsel in our most recent draft of the proposed Order arising from the decision of Justice Thomas in Sawridge #8 because, as indicated in our covering email, we proposed the Order go to Justice Thomas for his signature as ultimately occurred with the Orders in Sawridge #6 and #7.

We look forward to your substantive comments with respect to the draft.

Jon Faulds



P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

"Field Law" and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Tracy L. Kaiser [<mailto:tkaiser@parlee.com>] **On Behalf Of** Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 8:41 AM
To: Jon Faulds
Cc: doris.bonora@dentons.com; 'Wilson, Donald'; Ellery Sopko; erin.lafuente@dentons.com
Subject: Draft Order - Appeal of Sawridge #8 by Priscilla Kennedy (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)

Mr. Faulds,

Further to the correspondence in relation to this matter, we note that the draft Order prepared and forwarded in your email of September 28th, 2017 included a provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.

When we forwarded you a redraft of this Order in our email of October 10th, 2017, our draft also included a provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.

In your email of October 16th, 2017, the draft Order that you have attached does not have any provision for Ms Kennedy of DLA Piper LLP as counsel for Maurice Stoney to approve the same as to form and content.

We would advise that the terms of the draft Order included in your email of October 16th, 2017 are not acceptable however, before we have any further communication in relation to this matter, we would appreciate your advice whether your offices, Ms Kennedy or DLA Piper LLP continue to represent Maurice Stoney with respect to the resolution of the terms of the Sawridge #8 Order.

Yours truly,



PARLEE MCLAWS^{LLP}

1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor/client privilege. all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient, you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>

APPENDIX “6”

Heather F. Williams

From: Tracy L. Kaiser on behalf of Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 11:17 AM
To: 'jfaulds@fieldlaw.com'
Cc: doris.bonora@dentons.com; 'Wilson, Donald'; erin.lafuente@dentons.com; Ellery Sopko
Subject: RE: ORDER - Sawridge #8 (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)

Mr. Faulds,

In reply to your email of October 16th, 2017, the name of our client is the Sawridge First Nation. Some parties continue to describe our client as the Sawridge Band and this is why, in the style of cause that we have prepared, they are described as the Sawridge First Nation aka the Sawridge Band ("SFN").

As a result, we are not prepared to agree to what you describe as "clerical corrections".

With respect to paragraph 2 of the Order, we would advise that it is our position that in Paragraph 120 and 121 of Sawridge #8, Mr. Justice Thomas did not order the removal of Ms Kennedy and DLA Piper as counsel of record. What the Court stated is that if Ms Kennedy and DLA Piper elected to continue to participate in the advice and direction application before the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court would have invited submissions from Ms Kennedy as to why she and her law firm, DLA Piper should not be removed as representatives of Maurice Stoney and prohibited from any future representation of Maurice Stoney in the advice and direction application. This did not happen.

We are not prepared to agree to the insertion of Paragraph 2 in your draft of the Order.


Kindly advise if you are prepared to agree to the terms of the Order that was previously sent to you or alternatively, whether it will be necessary for us to write to the Court setting out our respective positions.

If we are required to write to the Court, we will present them with our draft of the Order and in the alternative, the position that no Order is necessary as a result of the Order drafted and signed by the Court restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's ability to commence any proceedings.

If the terms of the Order are agreed to by Counsel, we will provide it to the Court and advise who has approved the terms of the Order and further, that Maurice Felix Stoney has not been consulted nor has anyone represented him with respect to the terms of the Order.

Yours truly,

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio



1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor/client privilege, all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient, you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you

APPENDIX "7"

Heather F. Williams

From: Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 1:09 PM
To: Edward H. Molstad
Subject: FW: Sawridge #6 and Sawridge #7 - Court of Queen's Bench Action No. 1103 14112 - Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record
Attachments: 18OCT2017 Letter to Edward Molstad (Parlee) providing filed Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record.PDF

From: Grove, Shelley [<mailto:shelley.grove@dlapiper.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 12:59 PM
To: Edward H. Molstad
Cc: Tracy L. Kaiser; jfaulds@fieldlaw.com; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; doris.bonora@dentons.com; erin.lafuente@dentons.com; kplatten@mross.com; Ellery Sopko; Wilson, Donald; Krolik, Eve
Subject: Sawridge #6 and Sawridge #7 - Court of Queen's Bench Action No. 1103 14112 - Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter of today's date from Donald Wilson, together with a filed copy of the Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record as requested.

Regards,
Shelley

Shelley Grove
Paralegal

T 780.429.6809
F 780.702.4351
E shelley.grove@dlapiper.com



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
1201 Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
Canada
www.dlapiper.com



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Donald J. Wilson
donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6817
F 780.702.4366

October 18, 2017

FILE NUMBER: 84021-00001

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

Parlee McLaws LLP
1700 Enbridge Centre
10175 - 101 Street NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3

Attention: Edward H. Molstad, Q.C.

Dear Sir:

**Re: Sawridge #6 and Sawridge #7 - Court of Queen's Bench Action No. 1103 14112
Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record - Your File No. 64203-7/EHM**

Further to your email today received at 12:27 pm, we enclose for you a copy of the filed Affidavit of Service of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record filed September 20, 2017.

Regards,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Wilson'.

Donald J. Wilson
/ek

Enclosure
cc Jon Faulds via email
cc Janet Hutchinson via email
cc Doris Bonora via email
cc Erin Lafuente via email
cc Karen Platten via email
cc Ellery Sopko via email



Clerk's stamp:

COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *TRUSTEE ACT*,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")**

RESPONDENTS

**MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS**

APPLICANTS

**ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST**

DOCUMENT

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

**ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT**

**Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066**

File No.: 84021-00001/PXK

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE OF HANNIFER DICK


Sworn September 20, 2017

I, HANNIFER DICK, of the City of St. Albert, in the Province of Alberta, MAKE OATH AND SAY THAT:

1. I am employed as a Legal Assistant by the law firm of DLA Piper (Canada) LLP, solicitors for the Respondent, Maurice Felix Stoney and as such have personal knowledge of the facts and matters hereinafter deposed to except where otherwise stated.
2. On September 19, 2017, I caused Edward H. Molstad, Q.C. ("Molstad") to be served with a true copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record by personally attending at the offices of Parlee McLaws LLP, 1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175 – 101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta and delivering same to the Receptionist, Alyson at 2:44 p.m..
3. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "A" to this my Affidavit is a true copy of the service letter, business card with recorded name and time of delivery together with Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record to Molstad.
4. On September 19, 2017, I caused Doris C.E. Bonora ("Bonora") to be served with a true copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record by personally attending at the offices of Dentons Canada LLP, 2900 Manulife Place, 10180 – 101 Street, Edmonton, Alberta and delivering same to the Receptionist Maria McDonald at 2:50 p.m.
5. Attached and marked as Exhibit "B" to this my Affidavit is a copy service letter, business card with recorded name and time of deliver together with Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record to Bonora.
6. On September 19, 2017, I served Janet L. Hutchison ("Hutchison") of Hutchison Law by sending a copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record by fax to (780) 417-7872.
7. Attached and marked as Exhibit "C" to this my Affidavit is the Fax Confirmation Receipt confirming that it was successfully received.

8. On September 19, 2017, I served Karen Platten, Q.C. ("Platten") of McLennan Ross LLP by sending a copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record by fax to (780) 482-9100.
9. Attached and marked as Exhibit "D" to this my Affidavit is the Fax Confirmation Receipt confirm that it was successfully received.
10. On September 20, 2017, I served Maurice Felix Stoney by sending a copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record as instructed by him by faxing to (780) 849-3128. I also sent the above by regular mail to Mr. Stoney's home address of 500 – 4th Street NW, Slave Lake, Alberta, T0G 2A1. I further contacted Mr. Stoney by telephone at (780) 516-1143 at 2:10 p.m. (on September 20, 2017) to confirm that he had indeed received the above documents. By way of confirmation, I had Mr. Stoney read to me the letter and page 2 of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record.
11. Attached and marked as Exhibit "E" to this my Affidavit is the Fax Confirmation Receipt confirming that it was successfully received.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of
Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta, this
20th day of September, 2017.


A Commissioner for Oaths in and for Alberta

KALIE VICTORINE NAND
Commissioner for Oaths
Commission Expires May 10th, 2019


HANNIFER DICK



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10080 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

September 19, 2017

FILE NUMBER: 84021-00001

DELIVERED BY HAND

Parlee McLaws LLP
1700 Enbridge Centre
10175 - 101 Street NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3

Attention: Edward H. Moistad, Q.C.

Dear Sir:

Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8 as Amended et al v. Roland Twinn,
Catherine Twinn et al
Court of Queen's Bench Action No.: 1103 14112
Your File No.: 64203-7/EHM


Please find enclosed for service the filed copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record in relation to Maurice Felix Stoney filed September 19, 2017.

We trust the enclosed to be satisfactory.

Sincerely,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per:


Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

hd
Encl.

This is Exhibit " A " referred to in the
Affidavit of
HANNIFER DICK
Sworn before me this 20th day
of SEPTEMBER, A.D., 20 17

A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta


KALIE VICTORINE NAND
Commissioner for Oaths
Commission Expires May 10th, 2019

RECEIVED
SEP 19 2017

Barristers & Solicitors | Patent & Trademark Agents
EDMONTON | CALGARY

Alyson 2:44pm
9/19/17

Clerk's stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

**IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")**

APPLICANTS

**MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS**

RESPONDENTS

**ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST**

DOCUMENT

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
LAWYER OF RECORD**

**ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT**

**Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066
File No.: 84021-00001/PXK**

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LAWYER OF RECORD

Counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY withdraws as lawyer of record for that party.

The last known address for MAURICE FELIX STONEY is as follows:

500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Legal counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY
DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP:

Per: 
PRISCILLA KENNEDY

WARNING

This withdrawal of lawyer of record takes effect 10 days after the affidavit of service of this document on every party is filed. After that date, no delivery of a pleading or other document relating to the action is effective, service on the former lawyer of record or at any address for service previously provided by the former lawyer of record.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

September 19, 2017

FILE NUMBER: 84021-00001

DELIVERED BY HAND

Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place
10180 - 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5

Attention: Doris C.E. Bonora

Dear Madam:

Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8 As Amended v. Roland Twinn, Catherine Twinn et al
Court of Queen's Bench Action No.: 1103 14112
Your File No.: 551860-1

Please find enclosed for service the filed copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record in relation to Maurice Felix Stoney filed September 19, 2017.

We trust the enclosed to be satisfactory.

Sincerely,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per:

Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

hd
Encl.

This is Exhibit " B " referred to in the


Affidavit of

HANNIFER DICK

Sworn before me this 20th day
of SEPTEMBER A.D., 20 17


A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

KALIE VICTORINE NAND
Commissioner for Oaths
Commission Expires May 10th, 2019



Maria McDonald.

Clerk's stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE *TRUSTEE ACT*,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")

APPLICANTS

MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS

RESPONDENTS

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST

DOCUMENT

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
LAWYER OF RECORD

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066
File No.: 84021-00001/PXK

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LAWYER OF RECORD

Counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY withdraws as lawyer of record for that party.

The last known address for MAURICE FELIX STONEY is as follows:

500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Legal counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY
DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP:

Per: 

PRISCILLA KENNEDY

WARNING

This withdrawal of lawyer of record takes effect 10 days after the affidavit of service of this document on every party is filed. After that date, no delivery of a pleading or other document relating to the action is effective, service on the former lawyer of record or at any address for service previously provided by the former lawyer of record.

hp LaserJet 4345mfp series



Fax Call Report

1

DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
780-428-1066
19-Sep-2017 03:07 PM

Job	Date/Time	Type	Identification	Duration	Pages	Result
4724	19-Sep-2017 03:06 PM	Send	40210000197804177872	0:52	4	Success



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10080 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE: September 19, 2017 FILE NO.: 84021-00001

TO: Janet L. Hutchison
Hutchison Law
Sherwood Park FAX NO.: (780) 417-7872
TEL NO.: (780) 417-7871

FROM: Priscilla Kennedy, Associate Counsel E-MAIL: priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com

DIRECT LINE: 780.429.6830 PAGES SENT: 4

DIRECT FAX: 780.702.4383 If you do not receive all pages, phone 804.843.8325

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

This is Exhibit "C" referred to in the
Affidavit of
HANNIFER DICK
I appeared before me this 20th day
SEPTEMBER A.D. 2017
[Signature]
Secretary, Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
and for the Province of Alberta

KALIE VICTORINE NANO
Commissioner for Oaths
Commission Expires May 10th, 2019

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail: Yes No

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE: September 19, 2017

FILE NO.: 84021-00001

TO: Janet L. Hutchison
Hutchison Law
Sherwood Park

FAX NO.: (780) 417-7872

TEL NO.: (780) 417-7871

FROM: Priscilla Kennedy, Associate Counsel

E-MAIL: priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com

DIRECT LINE: 780.429.6830

PAGES SENT: 1

DIRECT FAX: 780.702.4383

If you do not receive all pages, phone
604.643.6325

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail:

Yes: No:

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

September 19, 2017

FILE NUMBER: 84021-00001

DELIVERED BY FAX

Hutchison Law
#190 Broadway Business Square
130 Broadway Boulevard
Sherwood Park, AB T8H 2A3


Attention: Janet L. Hutchison

Dear Madam:

**Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8 as Amended et al v. Roland Twinn,
Catherine Twinn et al
Court of Queen's Bench Action No.: 1103 14112
Your File No.: 51433 JLH**

Please find enclosed for service the filed copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record in relation to Maurice Felix Stoney filed September 19, 2017.

We trust the enclosed to be satisfactory.


Sincerely,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per: 

Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

hd
Encl.

CAN: 25479511.1

Clerk's stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE *TRUSTEE ACT*,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")

APPLICANTS

MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS

RESPONDENTS

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST

DOCUMENT

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
LAWYER OF RECORD**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066
File No.: 84021-00001/PXK

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LAWYER OF RECORD

Counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY withdraws as lawyer of record for that party.

The last known address for MAURICE FELIX STONEY is as follows:

500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Legal counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY
DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP:

Per: 

PRISCILLA KENNEDY

WARNING

This withdrawal of lawyer of record takes effect 10 days after the affidavit of service of this document on every party is filed. After that date, no delivery of a pleading or other document relating to the action is effective service on the former lawyer of record or at any address for service previously provided by the former lawyer of record.

hp LaserJet 4345mfp series



Fax Call Report

1

DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
780-428-1066
19-Sep-2017 03:12 PM

Job	Date/Time	Type	Identification	Duration	Pages	Result
4725	19-Sep-2017 03:09 PM	Send	40210000197804829100	1:58	4	Success



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.428.8830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE: September 19, 2017 FILE NO.: 84021-00001

TO: Karen Platten, Q.C.
McLennan Ross LLP
Edmonton FAX NO.: (780) 482-8100
TEL NO.: (780) 482-8200

FROM: Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel E-MAIL: priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
DIRECT LINE: 780.429.6830 PAGES SENT: 4

DIRECT FAX: 780.702.4383
If you do not receive all pages, phone
604.843.6325

MESSAGE
Please attached.

This is Exhibit " D " referred to in the
Affidavit of
HANNIFER DICK
taken before me this 20th day
of SEPTEMBER A.D., 2017
Kalie Victorine Nand
a Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

KALIE VICTORINE NAND
Commissioner for Oaths
Commission Expires May 10th, 2019

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail: Yes: No:

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE: September 19, 2017

FILE NO.: 84021-00001

TO: Karen Platten, Q.C.
McLennan Ross LLP
Edmonton

FAX NO.: (780) 482-9100

TEL NO.: (780) 482-9200

FROM: Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

E-MAIL: priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com

DIRECT LINE: 780.429.6830

PAGES SENT: 4

DIRECT FAX: 780.702.4383

If you do not receive all pages, phone
604.643.6325

MESSAGE

Please attached.

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail:

Yes: No:

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

September 19, 2017

FILE NO.: 84021-00001

DELIVERED BY FAX

McLennan Ross LLP
600 McLennan Ross Building
12220 Stony Plain Road, nw
Edmonton, AB T5N 3Y4

Attention: Karen Platten, Q.C.


Dear Madam:

Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8 as Amended et al v. Roland Twinn,
Catherine Twinn et al
Court of Queen's Bench Action No.: 1103 14112

Please find enclosed for service the filed copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record in relation to Maurice Felix Stoney filed September 19, 2017.

We trust the enclosed to be satisfactory.


Sincerely,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per:


Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

hd
Encl.

CAN: 25479644.1

Clerk's stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE *TRUSTEE ACT*,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")

APPLICANTS

MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS

RESPONDENTS

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST

DOCUMENT

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
LAWYER OF RECORD

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066
File No.: 84021-00001/PXK

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LAWYER OF RECORD

Counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY withdraws as lawyer of record for that party.

The last known address for MAURICE FELIX STONEY is as follows:

500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Legal counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY
DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP:

Per: 
PRISCILLA KENNEDY

WARNING

This withdrawal of lawyer of record takes effect 10 days after the affidavit of service of this document on every party is filed. After that date, no delivery of a pleading or other document relating to the action is effective, service on the former lawyer of record or at any address for service previously provided by the former lawyer of record.

hp LaserJet 4345mfp series



Fax Call Report

1

DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
780-428-1066
20-Sep-2017 11:59 AM

Job	Date/Time	Type	Identification	Duration	Pages	Result
4727	20-Sep-2017 11:57 AM	Send	02100001917808493128	0:53	4	Success



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10080 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.8830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE: September 20, 2017

FILE NO.: 84021-00001

TO: Maurice Felix Stoney
c/o Insurance Agency
Slave Lake, AB

FAX NO.: 1-780-849-3128

TEL NO.:

FROM: Priscilla Kennedy, Associate Counsel

E-MAIL: priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com

DIRECT LINE: 780.429.8830

PAGES SENT: 4

DIRECT FAX: 780.702.4383

If you do not receive all pages, phone +1
780.429.8830

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

This Exhibit "E" referred to in the

Affidavit of

HANNIFER DICK

is sworn to before this 20th day

SEPTEMBER, A.D. 2017

[Signature]

Notary Public, A.C. Commissioner for Oaths

and for the Province of Alberta

KALIE VICTORINE NAND

Commissioner for Oaths

Commission Expires May 10th, 2019

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail:

Yes: No:

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmitted to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

FAX

DATE:	September 20, 2017	FILE NO.:	84021-00001
<hr/>			
TO:	Maurice Felix Stoney c/o Insurance Agency Slave Lake, AB	FAX NO.:	1-780-849-3128
		TEL NO.:	
<hr/>			
FROM:	Priscilla Kennedy, Associate Counsel	E-MAIL:	priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
DIRECT LINE:	780.429.6830	PAGES SENT:	4
DIRECT FAX:	780.702.4383		If you do not receive all pages, phone +1 780.429.6830

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

Original of this facsimile forwarded by mail: Yes: No:

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us without making a copy.



DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Suite 1201, Scotia Tower 2
10060 Jasper Ave
Edmonton AB T5J 4E5
www.dlapiper.com

Priscilla Kennedy
priscilla.kennedy@dlapiper.com
T 780.429.6830
F 780.702.4383

September 20, 2017

FILE NUMBER: 84021-00001

VIA FACSIMILE, ORIGINAL TO FOLLOW

Maurice Felix Stoney
500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Dear Sir:

**Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, c T-8 as Amended et al v. Roland Twinn,
Catherine Twinn et al
Court of Queen's Bench Action No.: 1103 14112**

Please find enclosed for service the filed copy of the Notice of Withdrawal of Lawyer of Record in relation to the above-noted matter filed September 19, 2017.

We trust the enclosed to be satisfactory.


Sincerely,
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Per:


Priscilla Kennedy
Associate Counsel

hd
Encl.

CAN: 25482011.1

Clerk's stamp:



COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE *TRUSTEE ACT*,
RSA 2000, c T-8, as amended

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND
INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT, CREATED BY
CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19 ON
APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST")

APPLICANTS

MAURICE FELIX STONEY ON HIS OWN
BEHALF AND THAT OF HIS LIVING
SISTERS AND BROTHERS

RESPONDENTS

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN,
WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA
L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as
TRUSTEES FOR THE 1985 SAWRIDGE
TRUST

DOCUMENT

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
LAWYER OF RECORD

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY
FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Lawyer Priscilla Kennedy
DLA Piper (Canada) LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Address 1201 Scotia 2 Tower
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 4E5
Phone: (780) 426-5330
Fax: (780) 428-1066
File No.: 84021-00001/PXK

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF LAWYER OF RECORD

Counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY withdraws as lawyer of record for that party.

The last known address for MAURICE FELIX STONEY is as follows:

500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1

Legal counsel for MAURICE FELIX STONEY
DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP:

Per: 
PRISCILLA KENNEDY

WARNING

This withdrawal of lawyer of record takes effect 10 days after the affidavit of service of this document on every party is filed. After that date, no delivery of a pleading or other document relating to the action is effective service on the former lawyer of record or at any address for service previously provided by the former lawyer of record.

APPENDIX “8”

COURT FILE NUMBER

1103 14112

Clerk's Stamp

COURT:

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF
ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE
ACT, RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE
BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT
CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER
PATRICK TWINN, OF THE
SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO 19
now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST
NATION ON APRIL 15, 1985 (the
"1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS:

MAURICE STONEY and HIS
BROTHERS AND SISTERS

RESPONDENTS:

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE
TWINN, WALTER FELIX TWIN,
BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA
MIDBO, as Trustees for the 1985
Sawridge Trust (the "Sawridge
Trustees") and

THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC
TRUSTEE AND GUARDIAN ("OPGT")

INTERVENOR

SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION aka THE
SAWRIDGE BAND ("SFN")

DOCUMENT

ORDER RE: SAWRIDGE #8

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE
AND
CONTACT INFORMATION
OF
PARTY FILING THIS
DOCUMENT

Dentons Canada LLP
2900, 10180 101 Street
Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5
Attention: Doris Bonora
Telephone: (780) 423-7188
Facsimile: (780) 423-7276
File No.: 551860 -1

DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

September 12, 2017

LOCATION WHERE ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED:

Edmonton, Alberta

NAME OF JUSTICE WHO MADE THIS ORDER:

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

UPON the application of Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters to be added as parties or intervenors in the within action as beneficiaries of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and for the legal costs of Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters to be paid by the 1985 Sawridge Trust;

AND UPON THE DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice, the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas, that Maurice Stoney is to make written submissions by close of business on August 4, 2017, if he chooses to do so, on whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted and, if so, what the scope of that restriction should be;

AND UPON THE FURTHER DIRECTION of the Case Management Justice that the Sawridge Trustees and the Sawridge Band may make written submissions on Maurice Stoney's potential vexatious litigant status and introduce additional evidence relevant to that question by close of business on July 28, 2017;

AND UPON HAVING READ the written submissions of counsels for Maurice Stoney and his brothers and sisters, the Sawridge First Nation and the Sawridge 1985 Trustees filed in accordance with the foregoing;

AND UPON the delivery of written reasons for the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas dated September 12, 2017:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Maurice Stoney's is subject to the Court Access Control Order prepared by the Court and filed on September 12, 2017, a copy of which is attached;
2. The Court will send a copy of this judgment to the Law Society of Alberta for review in respect to Priscilla Kennedy.

Honourable Justice D.R.G. Thomas

ENTERED this ____ day of _____, A.D. 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

COURT FILE NUMBER 1103 114112
COURT Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
JUDICIAL CENTRE Edmonton
APPLICANT Maurice Felix Stoney
RESPONDENTS Roland Twinn, Catherine Twinn, Walter Felix Twin, Martha L'Hirondelle and Clara Midho, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust, the Public Trustee of Alberta, and the Sawridge Band
DOCUMENT **COURT ACCESS CONTROL ORDER FOR MAURICE FELIX STONEY**
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT Justice D.R.G. Thomas,
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench
Judicial District of Edmonton
3rd Floor – Law Courts Building
1A Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2



DATE ON WHICH ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED: September 12, 2017

NAME OF THE JUDGE WHO MADE THIS ORDER: Honourable D.R.G. Thomas

WHEREAS on July 12, 2017 this Court dismissed the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney and "His Brothers and Sisters" to be added to Docket 11103 14112 action, that decision reported as *1985 Sawridge Trust v Alberta (Public Trustee)*, 2017 ABQB 436;
AND WHEREAS on concluding that the Application of Maurice Felix Stoney disclosed indicators of vexatious and abusive litigation;

AND UPON the Court receiving and reviewing written submissions filed on behalf of Maurice Felix Stoney and others concerning whether his access to Alberta courts should be restricted, and if so, the scope of those restrictions;

AND UPON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Interim Court Filing Restriction Order for Maurice Felix Stoney made and filed July 12, 2017 is vacated.
2. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited, under the inherent jurisdiction of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, without an order of the Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, of the Court in which the proceeding is conducted, or his or her designate, where that litigation involves any one or more of:
 - (i) the Sawridge Band,
 - (ii) the 1985 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iii) the 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (iv) the current, former, and future Chief and Council of the Sawridge Band,
 - (v) the current, former, and future Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust and 1986 Sawridge Trust,
 - (vi) the Public Trustee of Alberta,
 - (vii) legal representatives of categories 1-6,
 - (viii) members of the Sawridge Band,
 - (ix) corporate and individual employees of the Sawridge Band, and
 - (x) the Canadian federal government.
3. Maurice Felix Stoney is prohibited from commencing, or attempting to commence, or continuing any appeal, action, application, or proceeding in the Court of Queen's Bench or the Provincial Court of Alberta, on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person or estate, until Maurice Felix Stoney pays in full all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.
4. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may, at any time, direct that notice of an application to commence or continue an appeal, action, application, or proceeding be given to any other person.
5. Maurice Felix Stoney must describe himself, in the application or document to which this Order applies as "Maurice Felix Stoney", and not by using initials, an alternative name structure, or a pseudonym.

6. Any application to commence or continue any appeal, action, application, or proceeding must be accompanied by an affidavit:

(i) attaching a copy of the Order issued herein, restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's access to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench and Provincial Court of Alberta;

(ii) attaching a copy of the appeal, pleading, application, or process that Maurice Felix Stoney proposes to issue or file or continue;

(iii) deposing fully and completely to the facts and circumstances surrounding the proposed claim or proceeding, so as to demonstrate that the proceeding is not an abuse of process, and that there are reasonable grounds for it;

(iv) indicating whether Maurice Felix Stoney has ever sued some or all of the defendants or respondents previously in any jurisdiction or Court, and if so providing full particulars;

(v) undertaking that, if leave is granted, the authorized appeal, pleading, application or process, the Order granting leave to proceed, and the affidavit in support of the Order will promptly be served on the defendants or respondents;

(vi) undertaking to diligently prosecute the proceeding; and

(vii) providing evidence of payment in full of all outstanding costs ordered by any Canadian court.

7. Any application referenced herein shall be made in writing.

8. The Chief Justice or Associate Chief Justice, or Chief Judge, or his or her designate, may:

(i) give notice of the proposed claim or proceeding and the opportunity to make submissions on the proposed claim or proceeding, if they so choose, to:

a) the involved potential parties;

b) other relevant persons identified by the Court; and

c) the Attorney Generals of Alberta and Canada.


(ii) respond to the leave application in writing; and

(iii) hold the application in open Court where it shall be recorded.

9. Leave to commence or continue proceedings may be given on conditions, including the posting of security for costs.

10. An application that is dismissed may not be made again.

11. An application to vary or set aside this Order must be made on notice to any person as directed by the Court.
12. The exception granted in the Order made by Associate Chief Justice Rooke on July 20, 2017 in the matter of *Nussbaum v Stoney*, Alberta Court of Queen's Bench docket 1603 03761 shall apply to this Court Access Control Order.



D.R.G. Thomas *Thomas*
JUSTICE OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

ENTERED this 12 day of Sept, A.D. 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

Tab D

please notify us immediately and delete this email from your systems. To update your commercial electronic message preferences email dentonsinsightsca@dentons.com or visit our website.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jon Faulds <jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>
Date: October 25, 2017 at 9:47:47 AM MDT
To: "'Edward H. Molstad'" <emolstad@parlee.com>, "Denise.Sutton@albertacourts.ca" <Denise.Sutton@albertacourts.ca>
Cc: "'Wilson, Donald'" <donald.wilson@dlapiper.com>, "jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca" <jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca>, "doris.bonora@dentons.com" <doris.bonora@dentons.com>, "erin.lafuente@dentons.com" <erin.lafuente@dentons.com>, "Karen Platten (kplatten@mross.com)" <kplatten@mross.com>, Ellery Sopko <esopko@parlee.com>
Subject: RE: Sawridge #8 Order - Court of Queen's Bench Action No: 1103 14112

Ms. Sutton,

Would you kindly bring the following to the attention of Justice Thomas:

My Lord,

We acknowledge receipt of Mr. Molstad's letter to the Court of October 23 concerning the settling of the Order arising from your judgment in Sawridge #8.

The form of Order which we propose is the draft found at Appendix #3 to Mr. Molstad's letter. As explained in the covering email at Tab #3 it differs from Mr. Molstad's letter in two respects:

- ? The style of cause has been changed to match the style of cause in your Lordship's decision;
- ? A paragraph has been included setting forth your finding which formed the basis for sending the decision to the Law Society of Alberta with respect to Ms. Kennedy

We note that at Appendix 6 to his letter Mr. Molstad included a copy of his October 18 email to me concerning our proposed form of Order, but did not include a copy of my reply from the same date. A copy of my reply, which responds to Mr. Molstad's comments and further explains the rationale for our proposed draft, is attached.

We look forward to your further direction.

Thank you.

Jon Faulds

This is Exhibit "D" referred to in the Affidavit of

SUSAN HABERMAN

Sworn before me this 23 day

of NOVEMBER A.D. 2017

J. Heemstra
A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

J. HEATHER HIEMSTRA
A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for Alberta
My Commission Expires June 15, 2019



P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

"Field Law" and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Tracy L. Kaiser [<mailto:tkaiser@parlee.com>] **On Behalf Of** Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 11:32 AM
To: Denise.Sutton@albertacourts.ca
Cc: Jon Faulds; 'Wilson, Donald'; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; doris.bonora@dentons.com;

erin.lafuente@dentons.com; Karen Platten (kplatten@mross.com); Ellery Sopko
Subject: Sawridge #8 Order - Court of Queen's Bench Action No: 1103 14112

Denise,

Please find attached letter dated October 23, 2017 with attachments which we would ask that you bring to the attention of The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas. An original of this will be delivered to the Court House today for the convenience of the Court.

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio

Hagerman, Susan

From: Jon Faulds <jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>
Sent: 18-Oct-17 1:16 PM
To: 'Edward H. Molstad'
Cc: Bonora, Doris; 'Wilson, Donald'; Lafuente, Erin; Ellery Sopko
Subject: RE: ORDER - Sawridge #8 (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)

Mr. Molstad,

Thank you for your message.

With respect to the clerical corrections referred to in our message of October 16, as indicated in that message their purpose was to make the style of cause and reference to the parties, including your client, conform to the style of cause in Justice Thomas' decision which in our view is the governing style of cause.

With respect to paragraph 2 of our proposed draft, we are in agreement that paragraphs 120 and 121, from which paragraph 2 directly quotes, do not order the removal of Ms. Kennedy or DLA Piper as counsel. Rather, paragraph 2 sets forth the finding of Justice Thomas giving rise to his determination to refer his decision to the Law Society of Alberta. As such its inclusion is consistent with the inclusion of similar findings in the Orders in Sawridge #6 and #7.

Kindly advise whether, in light of the foregoing, you are agreeable to our form of Order. If not we concur with your suggestion that we each write to Justice Thomas regarding our respective drafts.

I should add that I am assuming that for the purposes of settling the Order you are speaking on behalf of Ms. Bonora. If that is not the case please let us know.

Jon Faulds



P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner
T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

"Field Law" and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Tracy L. Kaiser [<mailto:tkaiser@parlee.com>] **On Behalf Of** Edward H. Molstad
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Jon Faulds
Cc: doris.bonora@dentons.com; 'Wilson, Donald'; erin.lafuente@dentons.com; Ellery Sopko
Subject: RE: ORDER - Sawridge #8 (Parlee File: 64203-24/EHM)

Mr. Faulds,

In reply to your email of October 16th, 2017, the name of our client is the Sawridge First Nation. Some parties continue to describe our client as the Sawridge Band and this is why, in the style of cause that we have prepared, they are described as the Sawridge First Nation aka the Sawridge Band ("SFN").

As a result, we are not prepared to agree to what you describe as "clerical corrections".

With respect to paragraph 2 of the Order, we would advise that it is our position that in Paragraph 120 and 121 of Sawridge #8, Mr. Justice Thomas did not order the removal of Ms Kennedy and DLA Piper as counsel of record. What the Court stated is that if Ms Kennedy and DLA Piper elected to continue to participate in the advice and direction application before the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court would have invited submissions from Ms Kennedy as to why she

and her law firm, DLA Piper should not be removed as representatives of Maurice Stoney and prohibited from any future representation of Maurice Stoney in the advice and direction application. This did not happen.

We are not prepared to agree to the insertion of Paragraph 2 in your draft of the Order.

Kindly advise if you are prepared to agree to the terms of the Order that was previously sent to you or alternatively, whether it will be necessary for us to write to the Court setting out our respective positions.

If we are required to write to the Court, we will present them with our draft of the Order and in the alternative, the position that no Order is necessary as a result of the Order drafted and signed by the Court restricting Maurice Felix Stoney's ability to commence any proceedings.

If the terms of the Order are agreed to by Counsel, we will provide it to the Court and advise who has approved the terms of the Order and further, that Maurice Felix Stoney has not been consulted nor has anyone represented him with respect to the terms of the Order.

Yours truly,

Edward H. Molstad Q.C. | Counsel | Bio



1700 Enbridge Centre, 10175-101 Street NW, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H3
Direct: 780.423.8506 | Fax: 780.423.2870 | Email: emolstad@parlee.com

LEGAL NOTICE: The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is: (a) confidential, proprietary and subject to copyright, and may be subject to solicitor/client privilege, all such rights being reserved and not waived, and (b) intended only for the use of the named recipient(s). If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or telephone and delete all copies of the original message. If you are not an intended recipient, you are advised that copying, forwarding or other distribution of this email is prohibited. Thank you

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>



October 25, 2017

EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C.
DIRECT DIAL: 780.423.8506
DIRECT FAX: 780.423.2870
EMAIL: emolstad@parlee.com
OUR FILE #: 64203-24/EHM

Via email to Nicole.stansky@albertacourts.ca

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
6th Floor Law Courts Building
1A Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2

Attention: The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas

Dear Mr. Justice Thomas:

Re: **Sawridge #8 Order**
Court of Queen's Bench Action No: 1103 14112

We apologize to Mr. Faulds and the Court for not including a copy of his reply to our October 18th, 2017 email. This was an oversight on our part.

Yours truly,

PARLEE McLAWS LLP

EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C.
EHM/tlk

- cc: Jon Faulds, Field Law
Via email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com
- cc: Don Wilson, DLA Piper
Via email: donald.wilson@dlapiper.com
- cc: Janet Hutchison, Hutchison Law
Via email: jhutchison@jhlhlaw.ca
- cc: Doris Bonora, Dentons Canada LLP
Via email: doris.bonora@dentons.com

cc: Karen Platten, Q.C., McLennan Ross
Via email: kplatten@mross.com

cc: Ellery Sopko, Parlee McLaws
Via email: esopko@parlee.com

Tab E

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE
DENNIS R. THOMAS



THE LAW COURTS
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T5J 0R2
TEL: (780) 422-2200
FAX: (780) 427-0334

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

November 10, 2017

Via Email

Edward Molstad, QC
Parlee McLaws LLP
emolstad@parlee.com

Dear Mr. Molstad:

**Re: Sawridge #8 Order
Court of Queen's Bench Action No. 1103 14112**

With respect to your letter of October 23, 2017, a further Order in relation to Sawridge #8 is not necessary. I am copying all of the other counsel named in your correspondence by email.

Yours truly,

D.R.G. Thomas
DRGT/bn

Jon Faulds, QC
Field Law LLP
jfaulds@fieldlaw.com

Doris Bonora
Dentons Canada LLP
Doris.bonora@dentons.com

Ellery Sopko
Parlee McLaws
esopko@parlee.com

Donald Wilson
DLA Piper LLP
Donald.Wilson@dlapiper.com

Janet Hutchison
Hutchinson Law LLP
jhutchison@jhlhlaw.ca

Karen Platten, QC
McLennan Ross
kplatten@mross.com

THIS IS EXHIBIT "E" referred to in the
Affidavit of

SUSAN HAGERMAN

Sworn before me this 23 day

of NOVEMBER A.D., 2017

J. Heather Hiemstra

A Notary Public, A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for the Province of Alberta

J. HEATHER HIEMSTRA
A Commissioner for Oaths
in and for Alberta
My Commission Expires June 15, 2019