

# Court of King's Bench of Alberta

**Citation: Manulife Bank of Canada v Thomas, 2023 ABKB 564**

**Date:** 20231011  
**Docket:** 2303 00423  
**Registry:** Edmonton

2023 ABKB 564 (CanLII)

Between:

**Manulife Bank of Canada**

Plaintiff

- and -

**Shelley M. Thomas**

Defendant

- and -

**Peter Temple**

Interfering Third Party

---

**Memorandum of Decision  
Of Associate Chief Justice  
K.G. Nielsen**

---

## **I. Introduction**

[1] On January 9, 2023, Manulife Bank of Canada (Manulife) filed a Statement of Claim seeking foreclosure of a property owned by Shelley M. Thomas (Ms. Thomas), and judgment to collect an unpaid credit card debt (*Foreclosure Action*). This Memorandum of Decision responds to two issues:

- 1) the emergence of Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments (OPCA) (*Meads v Meads*, 2012 ABQB 571) in the *Foreclosure Action*; and
- 2) that an interfering unauthorized third party, Peter Temple (Mr. Temple), has introduced himself into this litigation, and, worse, is at a minimum arguing and advancing OPCA concepts that can only have negative effects on the operation of the Court, and the interests of both involved parties.

I am the Administrative Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta who responds to abusive litigation and litigants. This matter was referred to me by Fraser J after Fraser J heard and rejected an appeal of decisions of the Applications Judges of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta. Subsequently, this Court received a large volume of abusive OPCA documents that targeted court clerks and judicial decisionmakers.

[2] All OPCA schemes and concepts are categorically rejected by Canadian and other international courts. "Anyone who employs OPCA concepts is an abusive litigant.": *Unrau v National Dental Examining Board*, 2019 ABQB 283 at para 180 (*Unrau #2*). Furthermore, as this Memorandum of Decision explains, the particular form of pseudolaw being employed by Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple is "Strawman Theory" (*Meads v Meads*, at paras 417-446; *Pomerleau v Canada (Revenue Agency)*, 2017 ABQB 123 at paras 67-88; *Potvin (Re)*, 2018 ABQB 652 at paras 83-92; Donald J Netolitzky, "Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments and Magic and Ceremony" (2018) 55:4 Alta L Rev 1045 at 1068-1078), a form of pseudolaw that is so notoriously false that anyone who employs Strawman Theory is presumed to do so in bad faith, and for abusive, ulterior purposes: *Fiander v Mills*, 2015 NLCA 31 at paras 37-40; *Rothweiler v Payette*, 2018 ABQB 288 at paras 6-21 (*Rothweiler #2*); *Unrau #2* at para 180.

[3] This timeline summarizes the *Foreclosure Action* to date:

January 9, 2023 – Statement of Claim filed.

February 21, 2023 – Ms. Thomas is noted in default in relation to the mortgage.

March 16, 2023 – Counsel for Manulife applies for a Redemption Order over the foreclosed personal residence. The supporting February 24, 2023 Affidavit of Cathy Straus deposes that the unpaid mortgage debt, unpaid City of Edmonton Municipal taxes for at least three years, credit card debt, and interest to date total \$262,727.63, which is substantially more than the appraised value of the foreclosed property, \$248,000.

March 22, 2023 – Ms. Thomas is noted in default in relation to the credit card debt.

March 29, 2023 – Applications Judge Schlosser granted the Redemption Order sought by Manulife.

May 3, 2023 – Manulife received and accepted a \$230,000 offer for the foreclosed residence. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple appeared for the first time in the *Foreclosure Action* before Applications Judge Summers. The *Foreclosure Action* was adjourned to June 14, 2023.

May 25, 2023 – Mr. Temple submitted a "JUDICIAL COMPLAINT" against Applications Judge Summers that was incorrectly addressed and mailed to Chief Justice Redman of the Alberta Court of Justice. That correspondence was then re-directed to Chief Justice Moreau of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta on June 8, 2023. This

correspondence was rejected by letter on July 5, 2023, because Mr. Temple was not a party to the *Foreclosure Action*.

June 14, 2023 – Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple appeared before Applications Judge Smart, claiming no sale should occur because they have located a “private investor”, and demand documentation in relation to the debt. Applications Judge Smart ordered that the sale for \$230,000 proceed, and that Ms. Thomas vacate the property by July 14, 2023.

June 26, 2023 – Ms. Thomas filed a Civil Notice of Appeal of the June 14, 2023 decision of Applications Judge Smart with the Court of Appeal of Alberta. That Civil Notice of Appeal was subsequently unfiled as premature, and outside the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Alberta.

July 4, 2023 – Ms. Thomas filed an appeal of the May 3, 2023 decision of Applications Judge Summers, and the June 14, 2023 decision of Applications Judge Smart.

July 11, 2023 – Justice Fraser heard and dismissed that appeal.

July 13, 2023 – Extensive and largely duplicate pseudolaw packages addressed to the Applications Judges involved in the *Foreclosure Action*, two Court of King’s Bench of Alberta Clerks, and Chief Justice Moreau were received by the Court via registered mail. These materials are discussed in more detail below.

## **II. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple’s OPCA and Illegal Activities**

[4] Considerable information is available on the problematic manner in which Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple have conducted themselves in the *Foreclosure Action*, including court filings, transcripts of the May 3 and June 14, 2023 proceedings, and Mr. Temple’s irregular “JUDICIAL COMPLAINT”.

### **A. Peter Temple’s Illegal and Unauthorized Representation of Shelley Thomas**

[5] A first issue is that Mr. Temple has been illegally conducting the practice of law. The transcript of the May 3, 2023 hearing clearly shows Ms. Thomas initially interacted with the Applications Judge, but then an unidentified person, who appears to be Mr. Temple, essentially took over, advancing abusive pseudolegal arguments and claims, and demanding an “invoice” to establish the outstanding debt. I note at this point that Manulife had filed several Affidavits, established the mortgage contract and debts, and judgment had issued on these conclusions. In short, this Court had thus already confirmed Ms. Thomas’ legal liability and quantum of debts. Attempting to re-argue these points was a collateral attack on prior unappealed court decisions.

[6] When Applications Judge Summers granted an adjournment so that Ms. Thomas could provide a full redemption payment of the mortgage debt via funds from a “private investor”, it was Mr. Temple who then strenuously argued that more time would be required, on the basis of vague claims of business and travel activities. Ms. Thomas did not in any way directly participate in the latter half of this hearing. Functionally, Mr. Temple was acting as Ms. Thomas’ in-court representative.

[7] At the June 14, 2023 hearing, Mr. Temple speaks on behalf of the Defendant, self-identifying as “Peter from the family Temple”, rejecting he is “Peter Temple”. Similarly, Ms. Thomas self-identifies as “Shelley from the family Thomas”. After Counsel for Manulife completes her submissions, Ms. Temple is asked to speak. Instead, this exchange follows:

Mr. Temple: I – I am making a special limited appearance representing the defendant, which appears to be the birth certificate of Shelley.

Applications Judge Smart: Uh-huh. Are you a lawyer?

Mr. Temple: Uh-huh, no, I'm not.

Applications Judge Smart: Okay. You realize that that would be an offense under the *Legal Profession Act*?

Mr. Temple: An offence?

Applications Judge Smart: Under the *Legal Profession Act*.

Mr. Temple: Well, I'm not part of the legal profession.

Applications Judge Smart: That is right. That is why you cannot speak. Ms. Thomas, what have you got to say?

[8] Mr. Temple then repeatedly interrupts as Applications Judge Smart attempts to obtain submissions from Ms. Thomas. Mr. Temple continues to be the only one who responds to Applications Judge Smart, despite being cautioned that his doing so is prohibited and illegal. Mr. Temple repeatedly demands “an invoice”, threatening a “counterclaim” and an appeal. When the Applications Judge attempts to explain the steps forward, Mr. Temple replies that is “... not sufficient to me ... and it's not sufficient to Shelley ...”.

[9] Throughout this hearing Mr. Temple is the only person to make any substantive statements on behalf of the Defendant. Ms. Thomas is present, but not an active participant. I have no difficulty in concluding, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Temple, an admitted non-lawyer, was operating as the litigation representative of Ms. Thomas during these appearances before the Court of King's Bench of Alberta. Mr. Temple was cautioned by Applications Judge Smart that his actions were illegal, and yet Mr. Temple continued.

[10] Similarly, Mr. Temple is explicit in the May 25, 2023 JUDICIAL COMPLAINT that he is representing Ms. Thomas.

[11] He signs the JUDICIAL COMPLAINT in this manner:

Sincerely,

[signature]

Peter Temple

Television Producer

Representing Shelley, of the family Thomas

WITHOUT PREJUDICE, UCC1-308

[12] In this document Mr. Temple also is explicit that he is not a lawyer:

I've been a businessman (running multiple businesses) over forty-four years. I spent three years as a professional trainer across Canada and the northern United States (for Rockwell University in the US) training executives in the proper use of grammar.

[13] I find as fact and law that Mr. Temple has appeared at the Court of King’s Bench of Alberta and illegally acted as Ms. Thomas’s litigation representative. That fact is a reason to take steps to control litigation by this person. However, that is only part of the problem.

### **B. OPCA Concepts and Arguments**

[14] As previously indicated, Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple have advanced well-known and universally rejected OPCA arguments and schemes, including Strawman Theory. Strawman Theory is a false belief that individuals have two linked halves or parts. One is a physical “flesh and blood” human, the other half is an incorporeal doppelganger, commonly called the “Strawman”, or a “legal person”. Pseudolaw litigants and promoters claim that governments, courts, and Canadian law have no application to the flesh and blood human, but only to the Strawman. People are purportedly not born with a Strawman, but rather the Strawman is attached to humans via birth documentation, which is a contract. Then contractual authority chains through the Strawman to the human.

[15] Documents and in-court statements by Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple are obvious indications these individuals are engaged in pseudolaw Strawman Theory:

- 1) Referring to themselves with an atypical name structure, “Peter from the family Temple” and “Shelley from the family Thomas”, which are “human” names, in contrast to “Shelley Thomas”, who is a ”LEGAL FICTION”, and a birth certificate.
- 2) That Ms. Thomas is not the Defendant, instead that is her birth certificate. Ms. Thomas is appearing in Court as the representative of her birth certificate:

The original claim by the plaintiff was filed against Shelley's birth certificate, (her CESTUI QUE VIE TRUST). The TRUST is the defendant. Since it can't speak for itself, Shelley is in court as a living woman, the beneficiary for that trust, representing that trust. The trust does not own property; it exists only as a financial bond. Yet, there is an attempt to unlawfully steal her property to satisfy a mortgage contract.

At the July 11, 2023 appeal hearing Ms. Thomas repeatedly states she is not the appellant – that is her birth certificate – and Ms. Thomas is the birth certificate’s legal representative.

- 3) Ms. Thomas makes the false claim that two legal systems are in play, and she is subject to a different “Common Law”:

A meeting of the minds occurs between living men/women in lawful matters (Common Law jurisdiction), and between legal fiction actors in legal matters (Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction). A contract must be either Lawful or Legal.

- 4) Ms. Thomas rejects the authority of Manulife, because that is a “legal fiction entity”, that only can have authority via contract.
- 5) Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple claim this Court has no authority over Ms. Thomas, “a living woman”, unless the Court has a contract with Ms. Thomas.

- 6) Canada and Alberta are only corporations, “[b]oth the PROVINCE OF ALBERTA and CANADA INC are foreign corporations registered in the EDGAR database in Washington, DC. ...”, not governments, and so have no authority over Ms. Thomas and her property, except via a contract, and none such exists.
- 7) Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple claim that the mortgage funds were never loaned by Manulife, but instead originate from a secret bank account affiliated with Mr. Thomas’ Strawman birth certificate “Trust”, a “cestui que vie trust”, and “Shelley has already stated that the bank borrowed from her”:

I have NOT admitted to borrowing money from the bank ... How can I? Banks do not loan their own money by law. They are the borrowers; they are in the business of buying securities, well-known in the financial community.

[16] These same Strawman Theory motifs appear in documents that Ms. Thomas used to attempt to defeat the foreclosure, see for example Appendix “A”.

[17] Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple’s use of Strawman Theory pseudolaw creates the presumption that their actions in relation to the *Foreclosure Action* are in bad faith, and for abusive, ulterior purposes: *Fiander v Mills* at paras 37-40; *Rothweiler #2* at paras 6-21; *Unrau #2* at para 180.

[18] Other indicia of the pseudolaw character of this proceeding includes:

- 1) reliance on latin maxims of law as absolute and binding legal principles, that Associate Chief Justice Rooke rejected in *Rothweiler v Payette*, 2018 ABQB 399 at para 49 as having “... as much binding authority and intellectual merit as fortune cookies ...”;
- 2) claims that a contract must have a “wet ink signature”, so that all electronic form contracts are not legal and binding, but are instead “fraud” (reviewed as false in *Royal Bank of Canada v Anderson*, 2022 ABQB 525 at para 33);
- 3) reference to irrelevant or non-existent legislation, including:
  - the US *Uniform Commercial Code*, that I note is not actually legislation, but rather a model text that has been used to guide legislation enacted in certain US jurisdictions;
  - the “1871 Maritimes Act”, that I could not identify to exist or have existed in Canada, or, apparently, any other country; and
  - the UK *Cestui Que Vie Act*, (1666) c 11 18, and 19 Cha 2 that addresses the estates of persons who are lost at sea, that is not part of Canadian law.

[19] Some comment here is warranted about the UK *Cestui Que Vie Act*, since this legislation and “cestui que vie trusts” are frequently referenced in pseudolaw materials, but, to date, no Canadian court appears to have directly addressed why this legislation is meaningless. Spurious claims based on the purported application of this UK legislation in the US have been repeatedly rejected as false and abusive Sovereign Citizen concepts: e.g., *United States v Nissen*, 555 F Supp 3d 1174, 1182 (DNM 2021); *Ammon v United States*, 142 Fed Cl 210, 216, appeal

dismissed, No 19-1759 (Fed Cir 21 June 2019); *Wood v United States*, Fed CI No 22-721C (21 July 2022).

[20] Historically, the *Cestui Que Vie Act* was enacted in the UK to address the disposition and status of missing persons. Sometimes pre-Confederation historical UK law may remain relevant in Canada, but that is rarely the case, because Canadian jurisdictions usually have enacted their own legislation that occupies the same field. Canadian jurisdictions have enacted their own laws that address the question of when a missing person can be declared or presumed to be dead, such as the *Presumption of Death Act*, RSBC 1996, c 444; *The Missing Persons and Presumption of Death Act*, SS 2009, c M-20.01; *Presumption of Death Act*, RSNL 1990, c P-20. In Alberta, this Court has the authority to declare a person dead pursuant to section 94(1) of the *Surrogate Rules*, Alta Reg 130/1995. Thus, the UK *Cestui Que Vie Act* has no potential application in Canada. This jurisdiction has its own laws that govern when and how people are presumed dead.

[21] Ms. Thomas' materials also indicate the influence of Romana Didulo, the purported "Queen of Canada". Queen Didulo supposedly became the head of Canada, displacing all existing government and Royal authorities, when Queen Didulo was granted that title by King Carlson of the United States, as a reward for Queen Didulo repelling a subterranean invasion of North America by the communist Chinese military.

[22] For example, Ms. Thomas makes references to the "Kingdom of Canada", and in her July 6, 2023 Affidavit attaches correspondence with Manulife that includes a "Promissory Note# 99901-10" that purports to promise payments "In Canada – Guaranteed by: The Kingdom of Canada 2021 for Canadians" and "Royal Decree #38". This Court has encountered multiple instances of persons relying on the purported authority of Queen Didulo in recent Court of King's Bench of Alberta lawsuits. A full appreciation of the unorthodox, if not bizarre, claims of Queen Didulo is outside the scope of this Memorandum of Decision, see Christine M. Sarteschi, "The Social Phenomenon of Romana Didulo" (2023) 6 International Journal of Coercion, Abuse, and Manipulation DOI: 10.54208/1000/0006/002 and Donald J Netolitzky, "New Hosts for an Old Disease: History of the Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Argument Phenomenon in Canada – Part III" (2023) 60(4) Alta L Rev 971 at 981-985. The Social Security Tribunal of Canada (*MH v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2022 SST 1035; *CK v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2022 SST 1633); *CK v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2023 SST 1083), Saskatchewan Labour Arbitrators (*Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Ltd v Unifor, Local 594*, 2023 CanLII 88216 (SK LA)), and Quebec Superior Court (*Banque De Developpment Du Canada v Dumais* (4 July 2023), Rimouski 100-17-002576-231 (Qc CS)) have also rejected Queen Didulo's authority as a pure fiction.

[23] Finally, the six packages of highly unorthodox materials received by the Court on July 13, 2023 addressed to court decision makers and clerks are of a type well known to this Court. These materials were prepared according to the pseudolaw theories of a US pseudolaw promoter, David Wynn Miller, who invented an unorthodox grammar that Miller claims is the only format for legally valid documentation: *Meads v Meads* at para 143. Miller's concepts and materials have been repeatedly rejected by courts worldwide as having no merit whatsoever, and vigilante court orders and decisions issued by Miller and his followers are a highly negative instance of abusive OPCA activity: *Knutson (Re)*, 2018 ABQB 858 at paras 18-28, 72-80.

[24] The Court of King's Bench of Alberta has rejected the six July 13, 2023 document packages pursuant to the January 21, 2019 "Revised Master Order for Organized Pseudolegal

Commercial Arguments (“OPCA”) Documents” of Moreau CJ, see *Babb v Parrish & Heimbecker Limited*, 2019 ABQB 687.

### III. Unauthorized and Abusive Court Activities by Peter Temple

[25] Mr. Temple has clearly engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, and despite being warned about that, persisted. Worse, Mr. Temple is clearly advancing pseudolaw concepts, including those that are so thoroughly denounced by Canadian and other countries’ courts that simply advancing these concepts creates a presumption of bad faith and ulterior motives.

[26] Canadian courts have an inherent jurisdiction to control who appears before the court: recently reviewed in *World Energy GH2 Inc v Ryan*, 2023 NLSC 109. The law in Canada is clear that a Court does not merely have the authority to restrict and control who acts as a legal representative of any type, but, further, that the Court has a positive obligation to ensure persons appearing before the Court are “... properly represented ...”, and “... to maintain the rule of law and the integrity of the court generally ...”: *R v Dick*, 2002 BCCA 27 at para 7. Anyone who endorses and/or applies OPCA schemes is not an appropriate litigation representative: *R v Dick*; *Scotia Mortgage Corporation v Landry*, 2018 ABQB 951; *World Energy GH2 Inc v Ryan*.

[27] It is very plain from Mr. Temple’s busybody correspondence with the Court, by his refusal to abide by instructions from the Court or respect the law in Alberta on in-court representation, and Mr. Temple’s use of OPCA concepts, that Mr. Temple is not a suitable Court representative. Given these conclusions, I make the following Orders:

1. Peter Temple is prohibited from:
  - (i) providing legal advice, preparing documents intended to be filed in Court for any person other than himself, and filing or otherwise communicating with the Court of King’s Bench of Alberta, except on his own behalf; and
  - (ii) acting as an agent, next friend, McKenzie friend (from *McKenzie v McKenzie*, [1970] 3 All ER 1034 (UK CA) and *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta Reg 124/2010, ss 2.22-2.23), or any other form of representation in proceedings, before the Court of King’s Bench of Alberta.
2. For clarity, Peter Temple is entirely prohibited from any further participation in the *Foreclosure Action*.
3. The Clerks of the Court of King’s Bench of Alberta shall refuse to accept or file any documents or other materials from Peter Temple, unless Peter Temple is a named party in the action in question.

[28] I very strongly recommend that Mr. Temple consult with a lawyer authorized by the *Legal Profession Act* before he engages in any action before any Court in Alberta.

### IV. Future Litigation By Shelley Thomas

[29] OPCA litigants are well known, if not notorious, for their initiating lawsuits, complaints, and other disciplinary proceedings to “counterattack” against governments, Courts and judges, and law enforcement, and to pursue non-existent illusionary rights: *Unrau #2* at paras 192-193. That even extends to criminal and violent activity: *Unrau #2* at paras 194-199.



[30] In this instance further litigation is not merely plausible, but has been promised by Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple. Ms. Thomas' May 3, 2023 Affidavit states "Because of this attempt at attempted theft of my rightful property I will be filing a counterclaim."

[31] At the May 3, 2023 hearing the Defendant indicates that she will seek to initiate a counterclaim, because the contract is a fraud, and instead Manulife was the one borrowing money from Ms. Thomas' "cestui que vie" trust. The May 25, 2023 JUDICIAL COMPLAINT of Mr. Temple states:

If we are unable to get relief in this matter in this manner we're prepared to file notice and follow up claim for damages against [Applications Judge Summers] for violation of our rights to a fair trial (ie, access to due process and protection by the courts from theft of property, which, as you know, are basic rights outlined in the Canadian Bill of Rights).

We're also preparing a claim against the plaintiff in a trial by jury.

[32] The July 6, 2023 Affidavit of Ms. Thomas demands \$50,000 in "... damages in the form of psychological stress over a long period of time, the violation of my right to privacy, property, and an attack on my reputation ...".

[33] There are also the six July 13, 2023 Millerese packages directed to the Court. While the contents of these documents are practically indecipherable, this Court has previously identified OPCA documents of this kind as vigilante attempts to intimidate and illegally assert claims: *Knutson (Re)*.

[34] Given these factors, I conclude that future abusive litigation in this Court by Ms. Thomas is foreseeable. On that basis, as an Administrative Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta, I Order that:

1. Any Statements of Claim, Applications, Appeals, or other documents that initiate a Court of King's Bench of Alberta process filed by Shelley M. Thomas shall include on the front page: "Attention of Associate Chief Justice K.G. Nielsen".
2. The Clerks of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta shall refuse to file any Statements of Claim, Applications, Appeals, or other documents that initiate a Court of King's Bench of Alberta process submitted by Shelley M. Thomas, unless that document includes on its front page: "Attention of Associate Chief Justice K.G. Nielsen".
3. If the Clerks of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta file any Statement of Claim, Application, Appeal, or other document that initiates a Court of King's Bench of Alberta process submitted by Shelley M. Thomas pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2, above, then the Clerks of the Court of King's Bench of Alberta shall direct that filing to Associate Chief Justice K.G. Nielsen, or his designate.

## V. Conclusion

[35] Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple are OPCA litigants who have abused the Court's processes by advancing pseudolaw claims. Mr. Temple is also an unauthorized and inappropriate representative. This Court now imposes litigation and litigant management steps in response to those conclusions.

[36] The Court shall prepare the Order giving effect to this Memorandum of Decision. Ms. Thomas' and Mr. Temple's approval of that Order is dispensed with, pursuant to the *Alberta Rules of Court*. This Memorandum of Decision and the corresponding Order may be served upon Ms. Thomas to the email address used in her court filings: [shelleybvi@gmail.com](mailto:shelleybvi@gmail.com). Mr. Temple will be served by mail to the address on his May 25, 2023 "JUDICIAL COMPLAINT". A copy of this Memorandum of Decision and Order will also be directed to counsel for Manulife.

[37] I acknowledge that Ms. Thomas and Mr. Temple are unlikely to agree with the steps imposed in this Memorandum of Decision. Mindful of the *Pintea v Johns*, 2017 SCC 23 instruction that Canadian judges shall provide information on litigation alternatives to persons not represented by lawyers, if Ms. Thomas or Mr. Temple seek to challenge steps imposed in this Memorandum of Decision, then the appropriate procedure is an appeal to the Court of Appeal of Alberta.

**Dated** at the City of Edmonton, Alberta this 11<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2023.

---

**K.G. Nielsen**  
**A.C.J.C.K.B.A.**

**Appearances:**

None.

**Appendix A: February 10, 2023 “DEMAND TO CEASE AND DESIST”**

February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Witten LLP/ANDREA M. STEEN  
Suite 2500, Canadian Western Bank Place  
10303 Jasper Avenue  
Edmonton, AB TSJ 3N6

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL  
NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

**DEMAND TO CEASE AND DESIST**

I AM Shelley Marlene Thomas, a sovereign woman in the Kingdom of Canada, registered as such in the International Court of Common Law, in the United Kingdom. I bring the following to your immediate attention and order you to cease and desist all fraudulent activities relating to any attempts of theft of the property at 16434 - 105A Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB TSP OV7 owned by Shelley Marlene Thomas.

**I claim SUI JURIS**

**I do not understand you. I do not have an international treaty with you. The STATEMENT OF CLAIM is not directed to me but to a CORPORATE legal fiction representation of my name. I have no affiliation nor knowledge of that corporate entity.**

As such, you are guilty of **FRAUD** based upon the definition in Black's Law Dictionary:

**A. fraud, n.**

1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment . • Fraud is usu. a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime.
2. A misrepresentation made recklessly without belief in its truth to induce another person to act.
3. A tort arising from a knowing misrepresentation, concealment of material fact, or reckless misrepresentation made to induce another to act to his or her detriment.
4. Unconscionable dealing; esp., in contract law, the unconscientious use of the power arising out of the parties' relative positions and resulting in an unconscionable bargain.

**B. misrepresentation, n.**

1. The act of making a false or misleading statement about something, usu. with the intent to deceive.
2. The statement so made; an assertion that does not accord with the facts. - Also termed false representation; (redundantly) false misrepresentation.

You appear to have committed this fraudulent act with intent:

1. The letter from Witten LLP was addressed to Shelley M Thomas, a living woman, obviously a deception to include notice addressed to a legal fiction corporate name that bears no relationship to the original addressee
2. The letter from Witten LLP was signed by either another corporation or dead person, ANDREA M STEEN. We are confused by this apparent attempt at deception, and as a result, this CEASE and DESIST order is directed to both CORPORATE bodies.

**You are also acting under Martial Law and may face extreme punishment for infractions against the civilian populace.** Acts of plunder, mortal violence, and mischaracterization of civilians as combatants are **all** death penalty offenses.

When you address birthright Citizens of the Kingdom of Canada, and deliberately confuse living people with corporate franchises you have named after them, you commit barratry and personage. This results in press-ganging land assets into the international jurisdiction of the sea, a crime outlawed worldwide for 200 years. **It is a recognized act of inland piracy and it carries the death penalty.**

Mischaracterizing the identity or citizenship status of a birthright Citizen of Canada is also a crime under the Geneva Protocols of 1949, Volume II, Article 3. **It also carries the Death Penalty.**

## **CEASE and DESIST IMMEDIATELY:**

Cease and Desist immediately:

- aiding and abetting the theft of a property
- sending correspondence that misrepresents my God-given name
- any contact with Shelley M. Thomas through unsigned documents or attempts to confuse, whether it be through mail, in person, telephone, email, or other electronic means. At the very least, you will be charged immediately with harassment and may warrant military involvement.

## **Seeking Remedy**

We will be filing a NOTICE OF FRAUD with the PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, the Attorney General of the Province, along with the Premier and various levels of law enforcement.

**Due to martial law having been exacted, this case is being brought to the attention of the US Military and Allied Forces. Mass arrests are currently in progress across Canada and the United States to end the corruption evident through the courts, medical, financial, and political systems.**

If you do not immediately comply with this CEASE and DESIST order, I will seek remedy through the Canadian Common Law Courts.

**This will serve as your lawful notice to cease and desist all further actions described above, effective immediately.**

Govern yourselves accordingly.

**Signed**

**Shelley Marlene Thomas**  
**Sovereign Woman**

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED, WITHOUT PREJUDICE