Court File: T-1450-15

FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA

BETWEEN:

Radu Hociung

Plaintiff

and

Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and Canada Border Services Agency and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada

Defendants

LETTER TO THE COURT
Re: Defendant's Summary Motion improper filing

Radu Hociung 246 Southwood Drive Kitchener, Ontario N2E 2B1

Tel: (519) 883-8454 Fax: (226) 336-8327 email: radu.cbsa@ohmi.org

TO:

The Registrar Federal Court of Canada 180 Queen Street West Suite 200 Toronto, Ontario M5V 3L6

Honourable Court,

I am writing to point out two irregularities with respect to the Defendant's Motion of Summary Judgement that is before you, and to propose a just solution.

As the record shows, the defendant filed an affidavit of service for this motion **by email**, **however**, **the Plaintiff has not consented to electronic service** according to Rule 141(1), ie, by filing and serving a notice of consent. The Defendant's email service is therefore prohibited under Rule 141(5).

The Plaintiff submitted the responding record to the motion the business day following the deadline of March 24, 2017 set by Prothonotary Aalto, due to technical difficulties. The Plaintiff lives in Guatemala, where internet connectivity is slow and unstable. The responding record is a 652 page, 36 megabyte PDF file, and on several attempts to submit it through the Court's E-file system the upload failed due to session timeouts. At the available upload speed in Guatemala, the session would time out before the upload completed. Unfortunately the Plaintiff was not able to find a faster internet connection until Sunday, when he was able to successully upload the file to the Registry; However by this time, it was considered late.

The Plaintiff proposes that both the improperly served Motion and the late Response be allowed, and both irregularities be deemed inconsequential, or in the alternate, the Defendant ordered to properly serve the motion upon the Plaintiff, and the Plaintiff be ordered to submit the Response on time. Given that the Response has already been delivered to the court and served in electronic and hardcopy format, it should be considered as filed on time.

Sincerely,

Radu Hociung - Plaintiff