



Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario Republic Pursuant to International Law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145
 Consular Jurisdiction and Venue Public Law 856, Chapter 807

United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credential AA222141-TRUTH A-1

International Document

International Court of Justice, decision the case France v. United States of American, "Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J.Reports 1952 p.176."

Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Error

Supreme Court Case Law; "indeed no more than an affidavit is necessary to make the prima facie case".
 United States v. Kis, 658F. 2nd, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981; Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22,1982)

MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159

**Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents
 For the records, and to be place on the record**

Exhibit B <https://moorishamericanconsulate.com/consular-court/> Docket 9

jakim el bey, natural person in propria persona sui juris
 aboriginal and indigenous sovereign Moorish American National
 Authorized Representative at Kanadario republic
 Not a Corporate Person or Entity, Non - Subject
 All Rights Reserved and Retained, U.C.C. 1- 308; U.C.C. 1-103
 Mailing: 1288 Ritson Rd North Suite 212, Oshawa, ON,
 Near [LIG 8B2]
 Email: jakimelbey@gmail.com

Plaintiff / Appellant

VS

Aulaire O'Malley, Acting as Adjudicator
 Human Rights tribunal of Ontario (HRTO)
 15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor, Toronto,
 ON, M7A 2G6
 Phone: 416-326-1312 Toll-Free 1-866-598-22
 Email: hrto.registrar@ontario.ca

York Regional Police, acting as, Key Principal: Billy Courtice
 Address: 171 Major Mackenzie Drive West, Richmond Hill,
 ON, Near [L4C 5J1] CANADA
 Website: www.yrp.ca

York Regional Police, Jim MacSween, et al, acting as Chief/Police
 Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarrett Thomas
 Address: 47 Don Hillock Drive, Aurora, ON, Near [L4G 0S7]
 Phone: 1-866-876-5423
 Website: www.yrp.ca

Fred's Towing, Mr. Fred Walker, acting as Owner
 Address: 25907 Woodbine Avenue Unit 4, Keswick,
 Near ON, [L4P 3E9]
 Phone: 905-722-3520
 Email: freds24hrtowing@icloud.com
 Website: fredtowing.ca

Kathryn L. Meehan, acting as Lawyer
 Hicks Morley Hamilton Stewart Storte LLP
 150 Caroline St. S, Suite 404
 Waterloo, ON, N2L 0A5
 Phone: 519-745-0411 Direct: 519-883-3130 Fax: 519-746-4037
 Email: Kathryn-meeham@hicksmorley.com
 Website: hicksmorley.com

Defendants / Respondents

Re: Consular Court Case No: 777-000000225

HRTO File No.: 2021-47307-1 in the
 Human Rights tribunal of Ontario Inc

Affidavit of Fact - Writ of Error
 International Document

International Law

Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 11
 Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 2,
 Sec 141 – 145, Consular Court and Judicial Authority
 Generally in all Cases to carry into full effect, Treaty
 La w, Embrace all Controversies with Citizens, et al.

Consular Jurisdiction and Venue

Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807, treaty
 law per Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Peace
 Friendship 1787,1836 between the United States
 of North America and the Moors Moroccan
 Empire, and pursuant to Article VI, clause 2,
 and per Article III section 2, clause 1 and 2 of
 the Continental United States Constitution
 for North America, Treaty Law
 Diversity of Citizenship/Nationality Case.

Re: Jakim Bey v. York Regional Police, Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarett Thomas, and Fred's Towing - HRTO File No.: 2021-47307-I [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I

Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Error

International Document

Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents
For the records, and to be place on the record

ERROR. A mistaken judgment or incorrect belief as to the existence or effect of matters of fact, or a false or mistaken conception or application of the law. Such a mistaken or false conception or application of the law to the facts of a cause as will furnish ground for a review of the proceedings upon a writ of error; a mistake of law, or false or irregular application of it, such as vitiates the proceedings and warrants the reversal of the judgment.

Error is also used as an elliptical expression for "writ of error;" as in saying that *error* lies; that a judgment may be reversed on *error*. An act involving a departure from truth or accuracy. Gronseth v. Mohn, 57 S.D. 604, 234 N.W. 603, 604.

I am in receipt of your Misrepresented Instrument – Title [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I, Citation: 2025 HRTO 2751.

1. TAKE NOTICE that I refute your Misrepresented Instrument – Title [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I, Citation: 2025 HRTO 2751.

a. Your Misrepresented Instrument contains false and misleading statements, wrong information, "Errors". Harmful Errors; **Errors Apparent of the Record. Plain, fundamental error that goes to the foundation of the action irrespective of the evidence; an obvious misapprehension of the applicable law.** Kenedy Mercantile Co. v. Ainsworth, Tex.Civ.App., 281 S.W. 637; Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co. v. Johnson, Tex.Civ.App., 235 S.W. 650, 652; Parks v. Parks, 68 App.D.C. 363, 98 F.2d 235, 236. See Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition page 638.

b. **Fundamental Error.** In appellate practice. Error which goes to the merits of the plaintiff's cause of action, and which will be considered on review, whether assigned as error or not, where the justice of the case seems to require it. Hollywood v. Wellhausen, 28 Tex.Civ. App. 541, 68 S.W. 329; Goodhue v. Fuller, Tex.Civ. App., 193 S.W. 170, 172. **Error in law apparent on the face of the record.** St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co. of Texas v. Anderson, Tex.Civ.App., 206 S.W. 696, 698. **Ibidem**

c. You Aulaire O'Malley, acting as Adjudicator appears to be a bias racist individual who sit in the position of exercise your racist tendencies. Which is being express in your misrepresented instrument. For example, you stated at [6] "I note that in the Application, the applicant indicated that his first name was "appellation jakim" and his last name was "bey". Neither name in the Application or his Moorish identification appears to be the applicant's legal name as the documentation he provided was not issued by any Canadian or provincial government. Neither was his Moorish identification issued by any state in the United States of America." **Whether I have a legal name or not. What does that have to do with the facts of my complaint?! Second, do you have to have an Identification Card that is issues by CANADA or the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA United States of America or some form of special Identification in order to have someone assaulted or discriminate against you?, or to have some kind of criminal activity being committed against you? Frankly speaking, these are stupid foolish ridiculous arguments which the Supreme Court of Canada has struck down. See Blencoe V. B.C.(Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307- (in relevant part). "Liberty is not restricted to mere freedom from physical restraint. The liberty interest in s.7 protects an individual's personal autonomy and is engaged when state compulsions or prohibitions affect important and fundamental life choices. Individuals are entitled to make decisions of fundamental important free from state interference, albeit, not unconstrained freedom."**

d. Do you even know what autonomy is?! Or the right to Self-determination acting as a Human Rights Commission Adjudicator? If you knew what they are you wouldn't be making these foolish ridiculous arguments! The above case is important because it is against the B.C. Human Rights Commission. Your sister counterpart. **AUTONOMY. The political independence of a nation; the right (and condition) of power of selfgovernment;** the negation of a state of political influence from without or from foreign powers. Lieber, Civ.Lib.; Green v. Obergfell, 121 F.2d 46, 57, 73 App.D.C. 298. See the Legal Lawful Definition of Autonomy in Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition Pg 205.

e. So, it does not matter who or which government issue the Identification Card or whatever I choose to call myself. My Autonomous rights are still protected.

Furthermore, it has nothing to do with my Autonomy or Autonomous rights which the Supreme Court of Canada has already shut down. The Supreme Court affirms that Section 7. of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Constitutional Act protects my right to life, liberty, and my personal autonomous right to self-determination and self-government. See also R. V. Clay, [2003]3 S.C.R.. **"The right to liberty in s.7 touches the core of what it means to be an autonomous human being blessed with dignity and independence in matters that can properly be characterized as fundamental or inherently personal."** **Self-Determination: the right of a people to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development. Barron's Canadian Law Dictionary 7th Edition, page 305.**

2. TAKE FUTHER NOTICE that Moorish American has a continental sovereign indigenous government guided by the virtue of the universal right to Self-determination as well as the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples guaranteed in the Charter; International law, and by Bill C-15 United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act of CANADA. You were also severed with many Moorish States Proclamation and House Resolution Declaring and affirming our continental sovereign indigenous government. You deliberately turn a blind eye to fit your bias racist views and narrative.

3. My Identification Card was issued by our sovereign indigenous Government. My Moorish American Nationality Identification Card is recognized and registered under the registration number AA222141, in **United States Library of Congress Copyright Office Washington D.C., and**

The United States Department of Justice, under Moorish American Credentials AA222141 - TRUTH A-1. See Certified Additional Certification of Registration of a claim to Copyright Affidavit filed in the records. That you probably fail to see with our selective sight. See also the law of CANADA. Bill C-15 United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act;

Article 2

Indigenous peoples and individuals are free and equal to all other peoples and individuals and have the right to be free from any kind of discrimination, in the exercise of their rights, in particular that based on their indigenous origin or identity.

Article 3

Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Article 4

Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions.

4. Do you know what the right to self-determination, and the right to autonomy or self-government is? See *Blencoe v. B.C.(Human Rights Commission)*, [2007] 2 S.C.R.307- (in relevant part). “Liberty is not restricted to mere freedom from physical restraint. **The liberty interest in s.7 protects an individual’s personal autonomy and is engaged when state compulsions or prohibitions affect important and fundamental life choices. Individuals are entitled to make decisions of fundamental important free from state interference, albeit, not unconstrained freedom.**” See again also, *R. V. Clay*, [2003]3 S.C.R.. “**The right to liberty in s.7 touches the core of what it means to be an autonomous human being blessed with dignity and independence in matters that can properly be characterized as fundamental or inherently personal.**”

5. As you can clearly see that your ridiculous arguments and points are irrelevant and have been shut down by the Supreme Court of Canada more than once.

6.

Misinformation

Aulaire O’Malley, aren’t you supposed to be impartial? But here you are trying to spread your racist bias misinformation force assimilation tactics. You are trying to classify myself and other Moors as **Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument litigants [OPCA litigants]. Which is not is not a legal term and have no lawful or legal significance; completely irrelevant in filing a complaint, or wrong doing. Do you have to be a Canadian or a United States Citizen in order to experience violations or wrong doing (discrimination)?**

a. There are many deliberate and false misinformation being spread about Moors / Moorish American. *Meads v. Meads* is popularly use and cited by many Corrupt Canadian personal in order to distort and discredit the legitimacy of the Moors. **Frankly speaking, Meads v. Meads is filled with many false misinformation, and probably have never been challenged lawful or legally.** Let me point out a few points in *Meads v. Meads*. Keep in mind that John D Rooke was frustrated with Dennis Larry Meads, and other challenging the Court Authority, and Jurisdiction etc...

b. **Let’s look at the made-up name or term John D Rooke called these people. Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument litigants [OPCA litigants];**

- **Pseudo:** Not genuine; spurious or sham. Online Dictionary and Oxford.

- **Commercial:** Related to or connected with trade and traffic or commerce in general; is occupied with business and commerce. *Anderson v. Humble Oil & Refining Co.*, 226 Ga 252, 174 S.E. 2d 415, 416. **Generic term for all aspects of buying and selling.** Henry Campbell Black’s Law Dictionary 5th Edition Page 245.

c. **As you can clearly see the name or term makes absolutely no sense whatsoever, and cannot be found in any law dictionary. Furthermore, it has no lawful or legal significance.**

d. **John D Rooke claimed that Moors are an “offshoot of urban American churches as a Nation of Islam.” Frankly speaking, I don’t know where John D Rooke got is information from. Probably from the ridiculous nonsense he read about Moors on the internet.** John D Rooke, doesn’t even know his own history let alone trying to teach someone about the story of the Moors. Let’s look at some of the facts surrounding his ridiculous nonsense and claims:

d. (1) **The Church of Islam was founded in the 1930’s**

d. (2) **Moors are a race of people.**

d. (3) **Moors have been here for hundreds of years before Europeans arrived on these lands.**

d. (4) **Moors have been here long before CANADA or UNITED STATES ever existed, and before the (alleged) Borders where established. See *The State Records of South Carolina Journals* of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1789-1790. Published for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press Columbia, SC 8557 Copyright ©1984. A petition was presented to the House from Sundry Free Moors, Subjects of the Emperor of Morocco; and residents in this State, etc... Dated January 04 - 20, 1790 concern Free Moors, way long before CANADA ever exist.**

d. (5) **John D Rooke doesn’t know what he is talking about. He stated that Moors were an offshoot of the Church of Islam, which was established in the 1930’s. Aulaire O’Malley, you have no clue or accurate information of what you are talking about! You have no idea or truthful information about moors. You are misinformed and are deliberately trying to spread misinformation.**

d. (6) **This North American Continent is the Ancestral Estate of the Moors; and are under binding International Law., i.e. The Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire, See World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case**

France V. United States of America, “ Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27th,1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176.”

d. (7) Moors names were change to be called Negroes, Blacks, Colored, African American, Indians, etc. See Delaware Code Title 29 State – Government, Chapter 1. Jurisdiction and Sovereignty, see #6 point 3-4 and 5-9, (a)-(I); See link. <https://law.justia.com/codes/delaware/2016/title-29/chapter-1/section-106/>

§ 106. Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware; recognition.

(a) *Legislative findings.* — The General Assembly finds all of the following:

(1) The Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware, referred to as “the Tribe” in this section, has an unbroken history of hundreds of years of settlement and continued residency in the vicinity of the Town of Cheswold in Kent County.

(3) The Tribe can date their ancestral ties as far back as the early 1700s.

(4) The Tribe was formerly known as “the Moors” and, for many decades of the twentieth century, state documents such as driver’s licenses designated the Tribe’s race with an “M”.

(5) The Delaware School Code of 1921 provided that the State Board of Education could establish a school “for the children of people called Moors.” As a result, 2 schools were built, 1 in the Town of Cheswold and 1 at Fork Branch on Denney’s Road in Kent County.

(6) There has been unofficial statewide acceptance and recognition of the Tribe for at least 125 years. Through a formal process of reviewing applicable state laws, historical and anthropological references, and previous actions of the General Assembly and State agencies, the Department of State concluded by 2009 that this State has historically acknowledged the Tribe.

(7) The Smithsonian Institute issued an annual report in 1948, in which the Tribe was referred to as the “Moors of Kent County, Delaware,” and identified as a surviving Indian group of the eastern United States.

(9) The Tribe has a constitutional tribal government, and the preamble of its constitution states that its purpose is to:

- a. Preserve the legacy of its ancestors.
- b. Promote the interests of its people.
- c. Affirm its tribal identity.
- d. Establish justice.
- e. Ensure domestic tranquility.
- f. Defend the general welfare.
- g. Exercise its governmental jurisdiction.
- h. Protect its environmental, cultural, and human resources.
- i. Secure its national sovereignty for future generations of its people.

(b) *Recognition.* — The Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware is designated and recognized as an American Indian Tribe with a recognized tribal governing body carrying out and exercising substantial governmental duties and powers. The Tribe is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services that the United States provides to Indians because of their status as Indians.

d. (8) Moor are everywhere on this (North) American Continent. Moors been here for hundreds of years before the creation of CANADA and its existence; way before the arrival of the colonial pale skin Europeans. Which were verified in many States Proclamations. See Relevant Part of the Definition of an American. **AMERICAN, noun A native of America; originally applied to the aboriginals, or copper-colored races, found here by the Europeans; Webster Dictionary 1828.**

d. (9) Also, keep in mind that there were no Borders, and that the Land was one open Landmass. CANADIAN / EUROPEANS later Incorporated and occupied the Northern part of the Land refers to as North America; See World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Judgment of August 27th, 1952. You would clearly see many of the existing Nation States having Treaties with the Moors Moroccan Empire, i.e. See Page 19 of the I.C.J. Case;

d. (10) 192 JUDGMENT OF 27 VIII 52 (U.S. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

general treaty pattern which emerges from an examination of the treaties made by Morocco with France, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Denmark, Spain, United States, Sardinia, Austria, Belgium and Germany over the period from 1631 to 1892. These treaties show that the intention of the most-favoured-nation clauses was to establish and to maintain at all times fundamental equality without discrimination among all of the countries concerned. Further, the provisions of Article 17 of the Madrid Convention, regardless of their scope, were clearly based on the maintenance of equality.

d. (11) These Lands still remained as the Ancestral Estate of the Moors under Binding International Law (Treaty) agreements, which formed part of The Supreme Law of the Land under the Supremacy Clause of Article VI, Clause 2, of the Constitution for the United States of North America; (which includes CANADA). “**This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land, and the Judges in every States shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any States to the Contrary notwithstanding.**”

d. (12) Aulaire O’Malley, you and John D Rooke have no clue or idea what you’re talking about! John D Rooke was jurisdictionally challenged. He did not provide any prove of jurisdiction on the record. So he decided that he was going to come up with a way to avoid Jurisdiction challenges. Knowing full well that Jurisdiction must be determined by the [Court oat the first instance. He came up with a fraudulent, fictitious term that have no lawful or legal significance. [Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument litigants [OPCA litigants].

Which Law Dictionary can I look up and find the term Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument litigants? I bet you it doesn't exist. It is nowhere to be found, because it's a bunch of rubbish! "Since jurisdiction is fundamental to any valid judicial proceeding, the first question that must be determined by a trial court in any case is that of jurisdiction [of the charging entity]," Dillon v. Dillon, 187 P.2d 27. "Once Challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist." Stucuk v Medical Examiners 94 Ca 2d 751, 211 P.2d 389. "A court has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court must have the authority to decide that question in the first instance." Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles, 171 P.2d 8; 331 US 549, 91 L. ed. 1666, 67 S.Ct. 1409. Hagans v Lavine 415 U.S. 533, "There is no discretion to ignore lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v U.S. 474 2d 215; "The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction have been challenged, it must be proven." Main v Thiboutot 100. S. Ct 2501 (1980); This false and incorrect information is deliberately being spread about the Moors. Meads v. Meads is nothing more than you and John D Rooke, et al WISH CANADIAN FANTASY!!!

7. National and International Law

CANADA is signatory to many International Law Agreements and Obligations. i.e., United Nation Universal Declaration of Human Rights, The American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, et al, etc...

a. CANADA reiterates its commitment to the American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Other International Human Rights Obligations and Agreements. See Page 2 of ADRIP:

b. RESOLVES: To adopt the following Draft American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: 1/2/1 The United States remains committed to addressing the urgent issues of concern to indigenous peoples across the Americas, including combating societal discrimination against indigenous peoples and... (Continues on page 47). 2 **Canada reiterates its commitment to a renewed relationship with its indigenous peoples, based on recognition of rights, respect, cooperation and partnership. Canada is now fully engaged,** (Continues on page 49).. See Link <https://www.oas.org/en/sare/documents/decamind.pdf>

c. The Supreme Court of Canada made it very clear CANADA cannot violate International Law and its International Human Rights obligations. "The principle of comity cannot be invoked to allow Canadian authorities to participate in investigative activities sanctioned by foreign law that would put Canada in violation of its international human rights obligations. **Deference to foreign law ends where clear violations of international law and fundamental human rights begin.**" See Supreme Court of Canada R. V. Hape [2007] 2 S.C.R. 292, 47 C.R. (6th) 96, 220 C.C.C.(3d) 161. Canadian authorities cannot violate international law and its human rights obligations.

8. AND TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that on June 21, 2021. CANADA Passed and Adopted United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act in full. All Articles of United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples adopted. **The Bill known as Bill C-15, (S.C. 2021, c. 14). According Canadian Parliament the Bill was adopted and given Royal Assent, and is now Law.** Act respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. See Link. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/annualstatutes/2021_14/page-1.html

9. In receipt of your Misrepresented Instrument – Title [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I, Citation: 2025 HRTO 2751, and the Errors presented in your Misrepresented Instrument and given the conclusive evidence presented by the plaintiff jakim el bey.

10. WHEREFORE, this Affidavit of Fact - Writ of Error is here entered against you Aulaire O'Malley, et al, and any representative of the Human Rights tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) or the foreign de facto PROVINCE OF ONTARIO Inc.

11. This Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario republic has competent jurisdiction pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807, per Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; and per Res judicata World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI, clause 2, and per Article III, section 2 of the Continental Constitution for North America, and under International law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145 Consular Jurisdiction and Venue to issue a Writ of Error.

Affidavit

In witness hereof, I trustee and beneficiary jakim el bey, declare and affirm under the penalties of perjury that everything in this Affidavit of Fact-Writ of Error to right, truthful, and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Autograph Trustee:  Date: February 17, 2026

Executed this [17th day of February, 2026, C.C.Y.] 1447 M.C. Y.

MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159.

United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1

Affiant: Trustee and beneficiary, jakim el bey, Chief Consul / Judicial Officer / Registrar
AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:
All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice
Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity
Mailing Location: 1288 Ritson Road North, Suite #212, Oshawa, ON, [L1G 8B2
Email: jakimelbey@gmail.com



Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario Republic Pursuant to International Law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145
 Consular Jurisdiction and Venue Public Law 856, Chapter 807

United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credential AA222141-TRUTH A-1

International Document

International Court of Justice, decision the case France v. United States of American, “ Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27 th, 1952: I.C.J.Reports 1952 p.176.”

Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Error

Supreme Court Case Law; “indeed no more than an affidavit is necessary to make the prima facie case”.
 United States v. Kis, 658F. 2nd, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981; Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22,1982)

MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159

Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents
 For the records, and to be place into the records

Re: Affidavit of Fact – WRIT OF ERROR

Date: February 17, 2026

Re: Consular Court Case No: 777-000000225

HRTO File No.: 2021-47307-1 in the
 Human Rights tribunal of Ontario Inc

Consular Court Case No: 777-000000225

Jakim el bey, V. Aulaire O’Malley, Human Rights tribunal of Ontario Inc, et al
<https://moorishamericanconsulate.com/consular-court/> Docket 9

Jakim el bey, V. Aulaire O’Malley, York Regional Police, Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarett Thomas, and Fred’s Towing, et al

Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario republic, to wit:

Aulaire O’Malley, Acting as Adjudicator, and et al.
 Human Rights tribunal of Ontario (HRTO)
 15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor, Toronto,
 ON, M7A 2G6
 Phone: 416-326-1312 Toll-Free 1-866-598-22
 Email: hrto.registrar@ontario.ca

ORDER

Upon the Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Error (Exhibit A) hereto and having been sworn to by oath of affirmation and under the penalties of perjury of the plaintiff jakim el bey, and base upon the facts asserted therein and the conclusive evidence presented before this Morocco Consular Court at kanadario republic. This court has competent jurisdiction and judicial authority in all cases under international law Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Chapter 2, Section 141 – 145, and pursuant to Public Law 859, Chapter 807 to issued this Order:

On this 17th day of February, 2026, it is hereby **ORDERED** that your Misrepresented Instrument – Title [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I, Citation: 2025 HRTO 2751; be overturn, removed and expunge from your records pursuant to United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People Act-Bill C-15, (S.C. 2021, c. 14), assented June 21, 2021; and per Article 20 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27th,1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI clause 2 and Article III section 2 clause 1 and 2 of the Continental Constitution for United States of North America; and per the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Blencoe V. B.C.(Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307; and R, V. Hope, 2007; CANADA cannot violate International Law nor its International Human Rights Obligation.

It is further **ORDERED** that this Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Error be and the same is hereby entered against you Aulaire O'Malley, York Regional Police, Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarett Thomas, and Fred's Towing, et al and any other representative or joint principle agents of the Human Rights tribunal of Ontario Inc; the PROVINCE OF ONTARIO Inc, for "**Errors**" pursuant to United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People Act-Bill C-15, (S.C. 2021, c. 14), assented June 21, 2021; and per Article 20 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI clause 2 and Article III section 2 clause 1 and 2 of the Continental Constitution for United States of North America; and per the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Blencoe V. B.C.(Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307; and R, V. Hope, 2007; CANADA cannot violate International Law nor its International Human Rights Obligation.

Treaties

"The obligation of a treaty, the supreme law of the land, must be admitted. The execution of the contract between the two nations is to be demanded from the executive of each nation; **but where a treaty affects the rights of the parties litigating in court, the treaty as much binds those rights, and is as much regarded by the Supreme Court as an act of Congress.** United States v. The Schooner Peggy, 1 Cranch, 103; 1 Cond. Rep. 25668.. The Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America, volume 8 pages 2.

"Whenever a right grows out of or is protected by a treaty, it prevails against all laws or decision of the courts of the states, and whoever may have the right under the treaty, is protected."(in relevant parts) Ibidem.

The Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 Between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire.

The Treaty of Peace and Friendship was established under the authority of Mohammed Ibn Abdullah, the Sultan of Morocco, and seal by his 'Royal Seal' in the court of Morocco in the year 1199 – corresponding to 1786 A.D. The Treaty was ratified by President Author St Clair of the United States of America Republic in the year 1787 A.D., which corresponds to 1200. The Treaty is one of Amity and Commerce between Moors Moroccan Emperor and the United States of North America.

Article 20: "If any of the Citizens of the United States, or any Persons under their Protection, shall have any disputes with each other, the Consul shall decide between the Parties, **and whenever the Consul shall require any Aid or Assistance from our Government, to enforce his decisions, it shall be immediately granted to him.**" The Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 Between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire.

MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159

Moorish American States Proclamations from Georgia, Illinois, Washington, Nebraska, Texas, New Jersey, and Little Rock Arkansas; affirms **Moorish Americans are Aboriginal and Indigenous to North America [CANADA], Central America, and South America, and have its own Sovereign Government.** In (relevant parts) "**WHEREAS**, the indigenous Moorish People of the Americas are now united in order to again link themselves with the family of Nations; and

WHEREAS, the Moorish Americans, being a aboriginal to the territories of North, Central, and South Americas, have formed **a sovereign Theocratic Government** guided by the command principles of love, truth, peace, freedom, and justice **through virtue of the universal right to self-determination as well as with the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples guaranteed in the Charter."**

Court. A space which is uncovered, but which may be partly or wholly inclosed by buildings or walls. The person and suit of the sovereign; the place where the sovereign sojourns with regal retinue, wherever that maybe. Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, page 186.

214 JUDGMENT OF 27 VIII 52 (u.s. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

The Act of Algeciras, as far as the jurisdictional clauses are concerned, was concluded on the basis of a kind of consular jurisdiction as it existed at that time in its full form and in complete uniformity among the Powers in Morocco. **The various provisions, in referring to "consular jurisdiction", "competent consular authority", "consular court of the defendant", etc., clearly meant that jurisdiction which was being uniformly exercised by foreign States over their respective nationals as defendants in all cases.**

World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America Judgment of August 27, 1952, Page 42.

SO ORDERED, sui juris

DONE AND ORDERED at Kanadario Maghrib Aqsa, North – West Amexem / North America in Morocco.

United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1

Affiant: Trustee and beneficiary, jakim el bey, Chief Consul / Judicial Officer / Registrar
AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:
All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice
Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity
Mailing Location: 1288 Ritson Road North, Suite #212, Oshawa, ON, [L1G 8B2
Email: jakimelbey@gmail.com

Page 2 of Order



moorish national republic federal government
 ~ ~ *societas republicae ea al maurikanos* ~ ~
 moorish divine and national movement of the earth
 northwest amexem / south amexem / central amexem / north gate
 all adjoining islands
 the true and de jure natural people – heirs to the land
 ~ ~ *i.s.l.a.m.* ~ ~

Affidavit of Service

MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159

February 19, 2026

Re: Jakim Bey v. York Regional Police, Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarett Thomas, and Fred's Towing - HRTO File No.: 2021-47307-I [DECISION] Date: November 3, 2025, File Number: 2021-47307-I

1. Affidavit of Fact-Writ of Error
2. Affidavit of Service

I jakim el bey, did served and enclosed the above documents round about February 19, 2026, via email to the following recipients;

Aulaire O'Malley, Acting as Adjudicator, and et al.
 Human Rights tribunal of Ontario (HRTO)
 15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor, Toronto,
 ON, M7A 2G6
 Phone: 416-326-1312 Toll-Free 1-866-598-22
 Email: hrt.registrar@ontario.ca

York Regional Police, acting as, Key Principal: Billy Courtice
 Address: 171 Major Mackenzie Drive West, Richmond Hill,
 ON, Near [L4C 5J1] CANADA
 Website: www.yrp.ca

York Regional Police, Jim MacSween, et al, acting as Chief/Police , et al
 Mark Olsen, Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarrett Thomas
 Address: 47 Don Hillock Drive, Aurora, ON, Near [L4G 0S7]
 Phone: 1-866-876-5423
 Website: www.yrp.ca

CC: Witnesses Sianna Browne, Moorish American Consulate, Kamau Bey, et al

I Jakim el bey, declare and affirm that everything in this affidavit of Service to be right, truthful and correct to the best of our knowledge.

Executed this 19th day of February, 2026

United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1

Affiant: Trustee jakim el bey, Chief Consul / Judicial Officer / Registrar
 AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority
 Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:
 All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time
 U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice
 Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity
 Mailing Location: 1288 Ritson Road North, Suite #212, Oshawa, ON, [L1G 8B2]
 Email: jakimelbey@gmail.com



HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO

B E T W E E N:

Appellation Jakim Bey

Applicant

-and-

**The Regional Municipality of York Police Service Board, Mark Olsen,
Lucas Hoekstra, Bryan Ball, Jarrett Thomas, and Fred's Towing**

Respondents

DECISION

Adjudicator: Aulaire O'Malley
Date: November 3, 2025
File Number: 2021-47307-1
Citation: 2025 HRTO 2751
Indexed as: **Bey v. York (Police Service Board)**

[1] The applicant filed an Application alleging discrimination on the basis of ancestry, place of origin, citizenship, ethnic origin, and creed with respect to membership in a vocational association contrary to the *Human Rights Code*, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, as amended (the “Code”). The applicant also alleges that the respondent discriminated against him because of his association with a person or persons identified by a prohibited ground of discrimination.

[2] On May 9, 2025, the Tribunal advised the applicant via a Case Assessment Direction (“CAD”) that his Application appeared to be outside of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction because the Application does not clearly explain why the applicant believes the adverse treatment he received from the respondents was because of his enumerated *Code* grounds. The Tribunal also advised the applicant that it appears that the name he used to file the Application was not his legal name and as such, the applicant was directed to provide the Tribunal a certified copy of a piece of government-issued identification confirming the applicant’s identity, legal name, and address.

[3] The Tribunal directed the applicant to provide additional written submissions addressing these issues and cautioned the applicant that once it received the submissions, it would take one of several actions, including dismissing the Application, in whole or in part.

[4] The applicant filed submissions as directed. After reviewing his submissions, I have determined that the Application is outside the Tribunal’s jurisdiction for the reasons that follow.

[5] This Decision was made following receipt of written submissions. The Tribunal need not hold an oral hearing on the issue of its jurisdiction: see *Wu v. Toronto Ombudsman*, 2023 ONSC 6192.

ANALYSIS

Background

[6] While the applicant provided a “Moorish National identification” card which states that his name is Jakim Bey, I note that in the Application, the applicant indicated that his first name was “appellation jakim” and his last name was “bey”. Neither name in the Application or his Moorish identification appears to be the applicant’s legal name as the documentation he provided was not issued by any Canadian or provincial government. Neither was his Moorish identification issued by any state in the United States of America. As such, the style of cause continues to reflect the name stated in the Application.

[7] In response to the CAD, the applicant provided a copy of something purporting to be an “Allodial American National Identification Card” indicating that his name is “Jakim Bey,” that his “National Domicile” is North America, and that he belongs to the “Human” race. It further indicates that his nationality is “Moor American”. In addition to providing this “identification card”, the applicant filed documents to support his alleged Moorish American citizenship. As noted, it appears that none of the documentation provided are issued by the Canadian government, the government of Ontario, or any other province in Canada or state in the United States of America.

[8] The applicant alleges that the respondents discriminated against him by arresting him during a traffic stop because of (1) his Moorish American ancestry and (2) the respondents failed to acknowledge or accept his Moorish American identification. This incident resulted in multiple criminal charges against the applicant. The applicant also alleges that the respondents further discriminated against him during a property search. According to the applicant, the respondents tried to force him to identify himself as Garry Browne and wrote his traffic tickets noting Garry Browne as the defendant, despite the applicant repeatedly telling the respondents that his name was “Jakim El Bey”.

[9] On its face, arresting an individual on the sole basis of their citizenship, ancestry, ethnic origin, and other *Code* grounds could potentially be a violation of the *Code*.

However, in this case, the applicant alleges that his refusal to produce a government-issued or recognized identification resulted in the adverse treatment. I also note that the respondents' use of what they think is the applicant's legal name does not, without more, amount to adverse treatment.

Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument (OPCA)

[10] In the Application, the applicant states that his ancestry is Moorish American, that he was travelling as an "Aboriginal, Indigenous American National" and that he had "[a] different Political Status and the name [Garry Browne] was being force (sic) onto me". He further states that his citizenship is an "American National" and that his "Ethnic Origin is from the Land of the American Continent". The applicant also provided a document titled "Public Notice: I am not Garry Browne".

[11] The submissions of the applicant indicate that he adheres to a world view which has been described in other courts as "Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument" ("OPCA"). The characteristics of these kinds of arguments have been best described in *Meads v. Meads*, 2012 ABQB 571 ("*Meads*"):

[1] This Court has developed a new awareness and understanding of a category of vexatious litigant. As we shall see, while there is often a lack of homogeneity, and some individuals or groups have no name or special identity, they (by their own admission or by descriptions given by others) often fall into the following descriptions: Detaxers; Freemen or Freemen-on-the-Land; Sovereign Men or Sovereign Citizens; Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International (CERI); **Moorish Law**; and other labels - there is no closed list. In the absence of a better moniker, I have collectively labelled them as Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument litigants ["OPCA litigants"], to functionally define them collectively for what they literally are. These persons employ a collection of techniques and arguments promoted and sold by 'gurus' (as hereafter defined) to disrupt court operations and to attempt to frustrate the legal rights of governments, corporations, and individuals.

...

[4] OPCA litigants do not express any stereotypic beliefs other than a general rejection of court and state authority; nor do they fall into any

common social or professional association. Arguments and claims of this nature emerge in all kinds of legal proceedings and all levels of Courts and tribunals. This group is unified by:

1. a characteristic set of strategies (somewhat different by group) that they employ,
2. specific but **irrelevant formalities and language** which they appear to believe are (or portray as) significant, and
3. the commercial sources from which their ideas and materials originate.

This category of litigant shares one other critical characteristic: they will only honour state, regulatory, contract, family, fiduciary, equitable, and criminal obligations if they feel like it. And typically, they don't.

. . .

[7] . . . OPCA litigants frequently adopt unusual variations on personal names, for example adding irrelevant punctuation, or using unusual capital and lower-case character combinations. While OPCA litigants and their gurus put special significance on these alternative nomenclature forms, these are ineffectual in law and are meaningless paper masks. . .

[Emphasis added.]

[12] OPCA litigants often deny that a court has jurisdiction or authority over them (*Meads* at para 248). They also refer to obsolete, foreign or otherwise irrelevant legislation, such as the UCC (*Meads* at para 228).

Is the Applicant an OPCA litigant?

[13] In my view, the applicant is an OPCA litigant, given the several pieces of documentation he provided to the Tribunal in support of his citizenship, ancestry and other *Code* grounds. As noted, these pieces of documentation are obsolete, foreign and do not engage the *Code*. For example, the applicant provided excerpts of legal text that appears to be from the United States of America pre-1960s. Furthermore, the documentation provided also repeatedly rejects the jurisdiction of the court over their person. For example, the applicant adduced a “Judicial Notice and Proclamation”, which states:

Every Sovereign State (People) is bound to respect the independence of every other Sovereign State (People) and the courts of one country (People) will not sit in judgement of the acts of the government of another, done within (the same or) its own territory.”

[14] For further example, the applicant also submitted a document titled, “LEGAL NOTICE! NAME DECLARATION, CORRECTION PROCLAMATION AND PUBLICATION”, which states:

I, Jakim El Bey, being duly Affirmed, standing squarely, Declare, and Proclaim, upon Divine Law; Nature’s Law; Universal Law, Moorish Birthrights; International Law; and Constitutional Law; Declare and say:

... I am now Rightfully Declaring, Publishing, and Proclaiming my own Free National Name, Affirming my Actual, Rightful, and Civil ‘In Full Life’ Status; Conjoined to my Moorish American Consanguine Pedigree and National Honor ... I am Jakim El Bey, ‘In Propria Persona Sui Juris’ (being my own proper person), by birthright, an Inheritance WITHOUT THE FOREIGN, IMPOSED COLOR-OF-LAW, OR ASSUMED DUE PROCESS of the Union States Society...

[15] Therefore, applying *Meads* and given the above, the applicant appears to be an OPCA litigant.

No Link Analysis

[16] To proceed in the Tribunal’s process, an application must fall within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction. An adjudicative body either has jurisdiction or it does not. See *G.-L. v. OHIP (General Manager)*, 2014 ONSC 5392.

[17] The Tribunal’s jurisdiction is limited to enforcement of the *Code*. The *Code* only prohibits actions that discriminate against people based on enumerated grounds. The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction over general allegations of unfairness unrelated to the *Code*: see *Hay v. Ontario (Human Rights Tribunal)*, 2014 ONSC 2858 (“Hay”), *Bello v. Toronto Transit Commission*, 2014 ONSC 5535.

[18] An applicant must provide some factual basis for his or her belief that the respondent's actions are linked to the applicant's *Code*-protected characteristics: see *Hay*, above. A bald assertion of belief is insufficient to establish this factual basis: see *Moulton v. The Toronto Police Services Board and the Chief of Police of the Toronto Police Service*, 2023 HRT0 1180 at paras. 9-10.

[19] The applicant only alleges discrimination in the area of membership in a vocational association, however, he fails to identify any adverse treatment he received that relates to membership in any trade union, trade, occupational association, or self-governing profession. The respondents are police officers who arrested him and a company providing towing services. Therefore, and for the sake of completeness, I find it reasonable to assume that he is also alleging discrimination in the social area of goods, services, and facilities. As pleaded, the Application occurs within this social area.

[20] Now I turn to the applicant's allegation that he was discriminated based on his citizenship, creed, ancestry, and place of origin.

[21] Overall, I do not find that the applicant's allegations are *Code*-engaging and that his OPCA identities do not engage the *Code*. Based on the application, the applicant identifies as a "Moorish American National (sic), governed by the Moorish National Republic Federal Government". While the applicant may have *Code*-protected characteristics that align with OPCA identities, he does not provide any facts that could support a finding that he was discriminated based on his actual *Code* grounds.

[22] The applicant alleges that being questioned and arrested for relying on his Moorish ID as his identification was discriminatory.

[23] I take judicial notice that the applicant's ID is not a government or state-issued ID. It may have been issued by a "moorish national republic federal government" as he provided in his "affidavit of fact". However, the applicant's ID does not resemble any Canadian or any Canadian province-issued ID. Neither does it resemble government-issued IDs from the United States of America, despite the applicant providing documents

concerning its Constitution, state laws, court decisions, and proclamations from several of its states and cities (e.g., North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, etc.) in support of his OPCA identity. Government-issued IDs do not state “human” as the identifying race or use the words “nationality autograph”, or refer to a “national domicile” that comprises of “North America”, as the applicant’s ID does.

[24] As I have found that the applicant’s ID is not a government-issued ID and therefore, it would not have been recognized by the respondents as such, the respondents’ action of failing to recognize the applicant’s ID as a government-issued one cannot be a basis to link the respondent’s actions to the applicant’s *Code* grounds.

[25] In line with the finding that the failing to recognize the applicant’s ID is not discriminatory, I find that the applicant has not provided facts that could support a finding that the respondent’s actions related to his *Code* grounds. A reading of his narrative suggests that the respondents questioned and arrested him for not having a government-issued pieces of identification. Other than the failure to recognize his Moorish identification, the applicant has not provided details that could connect the respondent’s actions to his *Code* grounds. Without such a connection, the allegations are no more than claims of unfairness that do not engage the *Code*, and the Application is outside the Tribunal’s jurisdiction.

[26] Moreover, I also do not find that applicant’s OPCA-aligning characteristics, as he has self-identified and pled, can replace or be a proxy for actual *Code* grounds. In other words, I find that the applicant’s identity as a Moorish American, by virtue of his OPCA arguments, is not a *Code*-protected ground.

[27] While not binding, the case of *Potvin (Re)*, 2018 ABQB 652 (“*Potvin*”), is quite persuasive in this aspect.

[28] In *Potvin*, the court found that Church of the Ecumenical Redemption International (CERI)-type OPCA litigants “who claim to shelter from Canadian law via their purported adherence to CERI claims ... or any other CERI “Strawman” nonsense” are “a total

fabrication, a flag of inconvenience under which [these litigants hope] to sail to success”. The court further states that no person could reasonably hold these OPCA ideas as a religious belief.

[29] While *Potvin* discusses CERI-type OPCA litigants, I find that there are numerous similarities between CERI-type OPCA litigants and Moorish-OPCA litigants, as the applicant in this case. For example, both of the litigants in *Potvin* and in this case are OPCA litigants (as described in *Meads*, above) and claim that the respective opposing parties or respondents discriminated against them when they were referred to by their legal names. Both have also provided numerous documentations with similar concepts such as their identification or beliefs being supreme to any other. Therefore, I find that the ruling in *Potvin* is applicable to the applicant’s case.

[30] I also find that the reasoning in *Potvin* with respect to creed could also extend to other grounds under the *Code* in this case. Similar to *Potvin*, the applicant claims to have OPCA beliefs and asserts that these OPCA beliefs shield him from what appears to be a non-discriminatory exercise of the respondents’ duties, which in this case include questioning and arresting the applicant during a traffic stop when the applicant’s identification card does not appear to be a government-issued one. This is also in conjunction with the finding that the applicant’s ID is not a government or state-issued one, as above. As noted in *Potvin*, seeking shelter from Canadian law using OPCA arguments is a total fabrication. Therefore, and in line with *Potvin*, I find that the applicant could not reasonably hold his OPCA characteristics, without more, as a valid citizenship, religious belief, place of origin, or ancestry under the *Code*.

[31] The applicant also alleges that discrimination because of his association with a person or persons identified by a prohibited ground of discrimination. However, he does not mention any other person, aside from himself, who allegedly identifies with a prohibited ground of discrimination.

[32] Based on all of the foregoing, the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction of the Application.

ORDER

[33] The Application is dismissed.

Dated at Toronto, this 3rd day of November, 2025.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Aulair O'Malley".

Aulair O'Malley
Member