

The first video the plaintiff presents in evidence quite literally cuts off the entire situation prior. The reality is that the plaintiff was blocking the entire road, begging cops to get “canuck,” The videos ironically don’t show the part before, where the plaintiff blocks the defendant’s car. The plaintiff is then ordered, as shown in the clip, to move to the sidewalk. Not only does the defendant have grounds to detain the plaintiff, the plaintiff committed a crime in what happened before the clip. It’s the burden of the plaintiff to prove all elements of a case, and the reality is that the situation that caused the interaction to begin between the plaintiff and defendant is cut off in the evidence.

The definition of flight from a police officer includes

II.b. Willfully evading a peace officer on foot in an attempt to evade lawful detainment pursuant to current/future legislation

The plaintiff has not shown, through the evidence, that the defendant did not have lawful grounds to detain the plaintiff. We quite literally have no clue what happened in that clip. In fact, we can see through the speech that the defendant implicates a crime committed prior to the clip multiple times.

Disrespect and immaturity are completely irrelevant to cops. You can have the biggest conflict of interest with someone and nothing is stopping you from arresting them.

You can’t stand in the middle of the road and block a cop car just because you’re asking a “question”, that’s literally obstructing a cop from executing their duties. They can’t go anywhere if you’re sitting in the middle of the road in front of their car.

Finally, what the clip does show is that the plaintiff was detained for an investigation the entire time, similar to a traffic stop. The defendant accuses the plaintiff of committing a crime, notes that he’s violated multiple lawful orders, and backs up the car in an attempt to block the plaintiff from walking past it. If *that* wasn’t clear enough, the defendant literally chases the plaintiff with their lights and sirens on, the plaintiff moves their camera, meaning they SAW the defendant trying to detain him, and kept going. And while the plaintiff moves their camera towards the car, you can see a chat pop up which is revealed later as an order to stop. If the plaintiff would’ve stopped when he saw the lights chasing him, that would have been clear. Any reasonable person would take these actions as a clear attempt to detain them, the plaintiff clearly knew this, and ignored that in an attempt to flee the detainment.

Second motion

Parks Canada policy is quite literally irrelevant to this case. It’s simply about the actions between the plaintiff and defendant. Whether or not parks canada policy was violated doesn’t matter. PC policy doesn’t determine lawful detainment or arrest. Negligence is based off what’s socially and legally expected, not procedurally. If it doesn’t involve disciplinary action policy is irrelevant.