

Case No.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PROVINCIAL COURT
for *Vancouver B.C.*

**RESPONSE TO THE MOTION FOR A
DISMISSAL**

In re dev_Typ

PRESIDING JUDGE koalaMedvedeva

DATE FILED: 12/03/2022

IN RESPONSE: MOTION TO DISMISS

The defense **motioned for a dismissal** “on the grounds that the petitioner has failed to state a claim, failed to show jurisdiction, and lacks standing.” **These are not grounds.** (1) The petitioner, first of all, clearly stated a claim. The respondent in the matter already tried dismissing the case for lack of grounds/failure to state a claim and the situation was rectified and the court denied the dismissal request. (2) **The court has jurisdiction.** The respondent **does not** have Crown Immunity as the tort of negligence is merely a general claim towards a sole person of the department, Shellykeepers, who is mentioned in the notice of claim, that works towards the writ of mandamus which does not grant any agency immunity. The term ‘negligent’ is used merely as a right for the granting of a ‘writ of mandamus’. (3) **The case does not lack standing.** There is clear standing of this case as mentioned in the dispute of the first claim.

The respondent claimed that the court cannot grant me any of my claims under my first listed tort. The respondent failed to recognize that this **was a tort cited**. I merely **cited a tort**. The tort is named **Violation of rights** and is defined as “Violation of rights shall be defined as the act of denying or impeding a person's rights, that right which has been established through Statute or

socially established common law.” There is no correct relief for this tort violation, nor is there a limit. Furthermore, the *Revised Employee Rights Bylaw* merely cited **a way someone can be relieved**. It does not limit relief

Respectfully submitted,
dev_Typ