

Subject: Urgent Action Required. My Understanding of the Legal Duty's of Public Officials and Individuals to Uphold the Rule of Law and the principles of fundamental justice.

LTB-L-005687-25 May 1st conviction I did not know about. I got the letter may 12th 2025.

May 20, 2025. Time sensitive!

From: Ryan James Johnson,
Human Rights Defender with Full Legal Capacity.
Founder, Human Rights Defenders Coalition HRDC.
Dwelling 64 Grand Avenue. Penthouse 27. London, Ontario, Canada. N6C 1L7.

Please see my Claim of Rights, Recognition and Lawful Excuse Here
MyHumanRights.ca | Ryan@MyHumanRights.ca | 1-226-224-2976
Data Files Attached via USB Drive or on ***GitHub.com/RyanJamesJohnson/Jama***

Re: Jama/Bigbo Property Management.
64 Grand Avenue. Office 31. London, Ontario, Canada. N6C 1L7.
admin@jama.com | 519-601-5577

To Whom It May Concern,

Hello and Great day, I'm Ryan and this letter serves as my formal Honorable assertions of my understandings of the rule of law, the principles of fundamental justice and the administration of justice. In no case is this letter attacking any government official or office or actions taken or not taken. It's just a deceleration that I understand;

That all public officials, residents, citizens, employees of public bodies in Canada at all levels, are legally and ethically bound by the rule of law and the principles of fundamental justice just as much as individuals are.

And both have mandatory duty's to uphold, respect, give effect and protect non-derogable fundamental human rights and freedoms as it's the foundation, the cornerstone of our country.

I. The Rule of Law in Canada

The Rule of Law is a foundational constitutional principle in Canada, affirmed by the Preamble of the Constitution Act, 1982 and recognized repeatedly by the Supreme Court of Canada. It asserts that:

- No one is above the law—including government actors, tribunal members, and public servants.
- The law must be applied fairly, consistently, and without bias.
- All actions of public authorities must be justified, lawful, and transparent.

As established in *Reference re Secession of Quebec*, [1998] 2 SCR 217, the Rule of Law “requires that the exercise of all public power must find its ultimate source in a legal rule.”

II. The Constitution Act, 1982 and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, guarantees certain non-derogable rights and freedoms **that can never be limited or abridged**. These include, but are not limited to:

- Section 7: Right to life, liberty, and security of the person
- Section 8: Right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure
- Section 15(1): Right to equality before and under the law
- Section 24: Right to a legal remedy when Charter rights are violated
- Section 26: Other Rights Not Listed; International and Common Laws
- Section 52(1): The Constitution is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with it is of no force or effect

This binds all government and individual bodies to the Charter.

III. International Human Rights Obligations

Canada is a signatory to numerous legally binding international human rights treaties, including:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
- Declaration on Rights and Responsibilities (DRR)

As affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada (*Baker v. Canada* [1999] 2 SCR 817), international human rights instruments must inform the interpretation of domestic laws, including administrative and tribunal decisions.

IV. Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups, and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

The DRR was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1998. It recognizes the right and responsibility of individuals and groups to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including:

- Article 1: Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels.
- Article 2: Everyone has the right to know, seek, obtain, receive, and hold information about human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- Article 12: *The State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone, individually and in association with others, against any violence, threats, retaliation, discrimination, pressure, or any other arbitrary action.*

These provisions underscore the obligation of public officials and tribunals to protect individuals from violations of their human rights and to ensure access to remedies when rights are infringed.

V. Supreme Court of Canada Jurisprudence

Several Supreme Court of Canada decisions have reinforced the duty of public officials and tribunals to uphold the Rule of Law and human rights:

- R. v. Hynes, 2001 SCC 82, Thomson Newspapers Co. v. Canada (Attorney General), 1997, R. v. Wagner, 2015 & 2017, PPG Industries v. Canada, R. v. Peel Regional Police, R. v. Ontario:

These rulings collectively affirm the obligation of all public bodies and individuals to act within the law, to protect, to give effect to and provide remedy for violations of Non-Derogable Rights and Freedoms.

It's neither discretionary nor symbolic that the obligation to uphold the Rule of Law, the principles of fundamental justice and the protection human rights and freedoms is a legal and constitutional duty placed on all actors within the government, including tribunals, administrative bodies and individuals.

Jama/Bigbo Property Management violation of these principle especially through denial of due process, suppression of evidence, false representations, or failure to address unlawful actions represents a serious breach of public trust and is subject to justice, remedy, punitive and exculpatory damages.

I respectfully and with honour and good consents remind all recipients of this letter that the supremacy of the Constitution and the universality of human rights and freedoms are not subject to administrative convenience or policy preferences. They are the bedrock of a free, democratic, and lawful society.

I. The Right to Adequate Housing is a Legally Protected Human Right Under international law, the right to housing is not a privilege, it's a legally protected, non-derogable, fundamental human right.

1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948)

- Article 25(1): “Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services...”

2. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) – Ratified by Canada

- Article 11(1): “The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living... including adequate housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions.”

Canada ratified the ICESCR in 1976 and is bound to progressively realize the right to housing and to ***refrain from actions that interfere*** with existing access to housing, ***particularly in a discriminatory, punitive, or unjustified manner.***

3. UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (General Comment No. 4)
This document provides detailed interpretation of the right to housing, stating that:

“The right to housing should not be interpreted in a narrow or restrictive sense which equates it with... the mere provision of shelter. Rather it should be seen as the right to live somewhere in security, peace, and dignity.”

And further:

“Evictions should not result in individuals being rendered homeless or vulnerable to the violation of other human rights.”

II. Canadian Law Upholds the Right to Security and Dignity in Housing

1. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

- Section 7:
“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.”

Forced eviction, especially when carried *out without fair legal process or while serious rights violations are under investigation* violate Charter rights to both personal security and due process.

- Section 15:

Ensures equality before and under the law, and protects against discriminatory or retaliatory enforcement of housing rules or eviction practices.

III. Declaration on Human Rights Defenders (UN General Assembly, 1998)

As someone actively asserting legal rights and exposing unlawful conduct, I am protected by this declaration.

- Article 1:

“Everyone has the right... to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights...”

- Article 12(2):

“The State shall take all necessary measures to ensure the protection of everyone... against any violence, threats, retaliation, de facto or de jure adverse discrimination, pressure or any other arbitrary action...”

Evicting or attempting to evict someone who is engaged in human rights defense, legal advocacy, or complaints regarding theft, obstruction of justice, or tenant abuse may amount to retaliatory action prohibited under both international and domestic human rights law.

In light of the above, I formally assert my rent is set aside for payment when these wilful, deliberate actions against me by Jama have been resolved and justice and remedy for the violations against me have been made.

I respectfully request that:

- I'm Recognized in writing my non-derogable right to Freely determine my legal status of **Human Being with Full legal capacity** and not a statutory creature **created by law** and by virtue **NOT ALIVE**. A statutory creature does not have a heart beat, take breath or has conciseness.
- All efforts and actions of interfere with my housing by Jama cease immediately and be reviewed.
- Appropriate protections be given effect to the fullest extent of natural law.
- Appropriate Convictions for unlawful actions taken against me.
- Appropriate Remedies, Punitive and Exculpatory Damages for Violations be provided so I can get on with my life and job.

I am in a very bad situation and if I can not get the help from leading officials with regards to Jamas Property Managements Deliberate actions to weaponize the mail and justice system I will most DEFINATLY be ordered to vacate my dwelling by the Tribunal that is happening now.

Please contact me at your earliest opportunity or at the very least have these documents sent to the proper heads of departments so I can get this matter resolved in a quick and timely manor.

Sincerely, Ryan James Johnson. Human Being with Full Legal Capacity.

Human Rights Defender. MyHumanRights.ca

Ryan@MyHumanRights.ca | 1-226-224-2976 Please Leave a Message,

Data Files Attached via USB Drive or on **GitHub.com/RyanJamesJohnson/Jama**



R. v. Peel Regional Police Courts are Duty Bound to Apply Charter

[104] The courts too must conform to the rule of law: *MacMillan Bloedel Ltd. v. Simpson*, supra, at 774 per McLachlin J. The rule of law is the very foundation of the Charter. *B.C.G.E.U. v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, supra, at 299, per Dickson C.J.C. It stands to reason then that the courts are duty bound to apply the Charter: *R. v. Domm* (1996), 1996 CanLII 1331 (ON CA), 111 C.C.C. (3d) 449 (Ont. C.A.) at 465, per Doherty J.A. (leave to appeal refused [1997] 2 S.C.R. viii, 114 C.C.C. (3d) vi). In *R. v. Domm*, supra, at 455, Doherty J.A. stated that whatever the contours of the rule of law:

The rule of law encompasses several interrelated and, in some ways, countervailing principles: E. Colvin, "Criminal Law and the Rule of Law", to P. Fitzgerald ed. *Crime, Justice and Codification: Essays in Commemoration of Jacques Fortin* (Toronto: Carswell, 1986) at pp. 127-130. It refers to a system of government of laws in which both the governed and the government are subject to and must comply with the law: Reference re: Language Rights under Manitoba Act, 1870, 1985 CanLII 33 (SCC), [1985] 1 S.C.R. 721 (S.C.C.) at 748-49. Judicial orders are one manifestation of the law with which the state and the individual must comply. The rule of law, however, does more than demand compliance with the law. To validate this demand, the law must provide individuals with meaningful access to independent courts with the power to enforce the law by granting appropriate and effective remedies to those individuals whose rights have been violated... [Emphasis added.]

Courts of Competent Jurisdiction

The reference in s. 32 to the "Parliament" and a "legislature" make clear that the Charter operates as a limitation on the powers of those legislative bodies. Any statute enacted by either Parliament or a Legislature which is inconsistent with the Charter will be outside the power of (ultra vires) the enacting body and will be invalid. It follows that any body exercising statutory authority, for example, the Governor in Council or Lieutenant Governor in Council, ministers, officials, municipalities, school boards, universities, administrative tribunals and police officers, is also bound by the Charter. Action taken under statutory authority is valid only if it is within the scope of that authority. Since neither Parliament nor a Legislature can itself pass a law in breach of the Charter, neither body can authorize action which would be in breach of the Charter. Thus, the limitations on statutory authority which are imposed by the Charter will flow down the chain of statutory authority and apply to regulations, by-laws, orders, decisions and all other action (whether legislative, administrative or judicial) which depends for its validity on statutory authority.

PPG Industries v. Canada

Artificial Vs. Natural Persons & How to Interpret the Constitution!

[9] It must be taken that the framers of our new constitution were aware of such restrictions of the right to a trial by jury, and thus in using the opening words in s. 11(f) "any person" rather than the word "everyone" meant to restrict the right so as to exclude corporations.

[4] It can readily be seen that some subsections of s. 11 can apply to a corporation and others cannot. Obviously, s. 11(e) providing for bail is inapplicable. In that context "person" means an individual and does not include a corporation. Likewise, subs. (c) is inapplicable. If one now looks at the wider category of rights under the heading of "Legal Rights" (ss. 7-14), then one notes that three modes of expression are used to open each of these sections. Sections 13 and 14 use the words "witness" or "party and witness"; ss. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 use the word "everyone" and only s. 11 uses the words "any person".

Where the language of the Charter is straightforward, there is no need for presumptions or for aids to interpretation. Such aids might lead the courts to interpret the Charter so as to give only those rights that the court thinks ought to be given. The Charter is entitled to greater respect than that. In this new field we are followers, the Charter is the leader, and we must give effect to its plain meaning. There is no need for judicial tampering. If the plain meaning of a provision gives a wholly unacceptable result, then s. 1 of the Charter provides the remedy.

In view of the number of cases in Ontario trial courts in which Charter provisions are being argued, and especially in view of some of the bizarre and colourful arguments being advanced, it may be appropriate to observe that the Charter does not intend a transformation of our legal system or the paralysis of law enforcement. Extravagant interpretations can only trivialize and diminish respect for the Charter which is a part of the supreme law of this country.

I would hold, however, that in seeking the meaning to be ascribed to a constitutional document we are not bound by the "literal" approach. In my view, we should be construing the clause having regard, not to the literal meaning of the words used, but to s. 11 of the Charter when read in its entirety. It will be noted that the other subsections in s. 11 vest rights only in persons (human and artificial) actually affected by the fact of being "charged with an offence". Thus subs. (a), (b), (d), (g), (h) and (i) apply to all persons (human and artificial). Section 11(c) does not apply to a corporation because a corporation cannot be a witness. Section 11(e) does not apply to a corporation because, as a corporation cannot be imprisoned, it does not require bail. It would, in my opinion, be a strange thing if all the other rights vested in "persons" by s. 11 could apply only to those actually affected by being "charged with an offence", but the clause in question would apply to all persons "charged with an offence" merely because they were charged with a certain class of offence. It follows, as I have already said, that the clause in question should apply only to those persons (human and artificial) who are actually exposed to the possibility of being imprisoned for a term of five years or more.

[51] Firstly, the language used in the clause is not "technical". Secondly, in construing constitutional documents such as the charter, a "technical" approach should be avoided. In my view, wherever possible, we should, instead, take the approach which would be taken by a reasonable member of the public when discussing the rights afforded to him by the Charter.

R. v. Hynes

Constitution Protects Humans from Government

[83] Prior to the Charter's advent, the individual really had no special means of protecting against incursions upon his or her basic fundamental rights by executive or legislative arm of the state, beyond making representations to the executive or administrative arms of government, or petitioning and lobbying Parliament or Legislatures for changes in the law. Linked as they were to concepts of parliamentary supremacy and sovereignty, there were no means at the disposal of individuals to muster court challenges aimed at invalidating legislative, executive or administrative acts, save for demonstrating that they were ultra vires of the particular order of government under the division of powers within the Canadian confederation, or of subordinate agencies to whom the relevant powers were delegated. Apart from these exceptions, the individual's means of challenging incursions on fundamental rights were extra-judicial and of a precatory nature that were neither effective nor potent. Respect for the rule of law, upon which, as W. Ivor Jennings in his text entitled The Law and the Constitution (University of London Press, 4th ed.) points out at p. 42, hinges the existence of public order, mandated compliance with directives and ordinances even if they impinged upon individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

[84] A primary purpose of the Charter was to change this relationship of the individual with the state and its laws by endowing individuals with an effective means of challenging acts of the state in courts on the ground of violation of their constitutionally protected rights and freedoms. This is accomplished through s. 24 of the Charter, in the first subsection of which anyone whose guaranteed rights or freedoms have been infringed or denied is empowered to apply to "a court of competent jurisdiction" for such remedy as is considered just and appropriate "in the circumstances". Section 24(2) goes on to specifically provide that that power extends to the exclusion of evidence if, "having regard to all the circumstances" its admission would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

[85] It is clear, therefore, that s. 24(2) is critical to carrying out the Charter's purpose of investing individuals with the power to defend themselves against incursions on their guaranteed fundamental rights and freedoms. The process of entrenching them, which is the term frequently used to describe the Charter's purpose, entails giving a solid means of defending them to every individual holder. This is accomplished through s. 24(2) which invests everyone with the power to apply to have evidence derived from infringement or denial of a guaranteed fundamental right and liberty excluded from consideration. With no such power existing prior to the advent of the Charter, an individual had no basis to challenge the admissibility of, for example, evidence found in the course of an unreasonable search, or of the confession made without the benefit of counsel. The Charter opened the door to such challenges through s. 24(2) which, with the preceding subsection, is designed to acquit the vitally important purpose of providing individuals with means of defending their constitutional rights against undue incursions by the state.

Thomson Newspapers Ltd. v. Canada

Everyone only Human Being

That is, read as a whole, it appears to us that this section [s. 7] was intended to confer protection on a singularly human level. A plain, common sense reading of the phrase "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person" serves to underline the human element involved; only human beings can enjoy these rights. "Everyone" then, must be read in light of the rest of the section and defined to exclude corporations and other artificial entities incapable of enjoying life, liberty or security of the person, and include only human beings.

The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to criminate him. He owes no such duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

Modern corporate existence carries with it a notion of privacy which is at odds with the privacy inhering in physical persons. This difference flows from the nature of corporate existence. While individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities. Even if corporations are given legal capacity, their legal powers may be restricted by the enabling articles of incorporation and legislation. The corporation's legal existence can be terminated by the state for failure to comply with these restrictions. Since the state defines the parameters of corporate existence, it would in my view be unreasonable for the corporation to expect that it is completely free to determine by itself whether it exercises its delegated powers in accordance with restrictions imposed by law. The particularity of corporate privacy interests was discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43 (1906), at pp. 74-75:

Upon the other hand, the corporation is a creature of the State. It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public. It receives certain special privileges and franchises, and holds them subject to the laws of the State and the limitations of its charter. Its powers are limited by law. It can make no contract not authorized by its charter. Its rights to act as a corporation are only preserved to it so long as it obeys the laws of its creation. There is a reserved right in the legislature to investigate its contracts and find out whether it has exceeded its powers. It would be a strange anomaly to hold that a State, having chartered a corporation to make use of certain franchises, could not in the exercise of its sovereignty inquire how these franchises had been employed, and whether they had been abused, and demand the production of the corporate books and papers for that purpose.

R. v. Wagner 2015 & 2017

Rule of Law & Administration of Justice

116. The Chief Justice goes on to develop the scope of these binding principles as follows:

This "rich intellectual tradition" of natural law seeks to give the law minimum moral content. It rests on the proposition that there is a distinction between rules and the law. Rules and rule systems can be good, but they can also be evil. Something more than the very existence of rules, it is argued, is required for them to demand respect: in short, to transform rules into law. The distinction between rule by law, which is the state of affairs in certain developing countries, and rule of law, which developed democracies espouse, succinctly captures the distinction between a mere rules system and a proper legal system that is founded on certain minimum values. The debate about unwritten constitutional principles can thus be seen as a debate about the nature of the law itself and what about it demands our allegiance.

[47] I note that in *R. v. Caron*, 2011 SCC 5, [2011] 1 S.C.R. 78, the Supreme court recognized that the superior court of a province has inherent jurisdiction to grant an interim remedy in litigation taking place in the provincial court as superior courts have,

"a residual source of powers, which the court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just or equitable to do so": I. H. Jacob, "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court" (1970), 23 *Curr. Legal Probs.* 23, at p. 51. These powers are derived "not from any statute or rule of law, but from the very nature of the court as a superior court of law" (Jacob, at p. 27) to enable "the judiciary to uphold, to protect and to fulfil the judicial function of administering justice according to law in a regular, orderly and effective manner" (p. 28). In equally broad language Lamer C.J., citing the Jacob analysis with approval (*MacMillan Bloedel Ltd. v. Simpson*, 1995 CanLII 57 (SCC), [1995] 4 S.C.R. 725, at paras. 29-30), referred to "those powers which are essential to the administration of justice and the maintenance of the rule of law", at para. 38. See also *R. v. Cunningham*, 2010 SCC 10, [2010] 1 S.C.R. 331, at para. 18, per Rothstein J., relying on the Jacob analysis, and *Canada (Human Rights Commission) v. Canadian Liberty Net*, 1998 CanLII 818 (SCC), [1998] 1 S.C.R. 626, at paras. 29-32.

... "The inherent jurisdiction of the court may be invoked in an apparently inexhaustible variety of circumstances and may be exercised in different ways" (p. 23 (Jacobs, emphasis added)).

Of course the very plenitude of this inherent jurisdiction requires that it be exercised sparingly and with caution. In the case of inferior tribunals, the superior court may render "assistance" (not meddle), but only in circumstances where the inferior tribunals are powerless to act and it is essential to avoid an injustice that action be taken."