

From: Chad chad@openontario.org
Subject: Medallion's Reality — ROA and EMCPA Violation Admissions
Date: 20210503 at 0252EDT
To: Mark W. Melchers melchers@cohenhighley.com
Cc: Chad chad@openontario.org, Joe Hoffer hoffer@cohenhighley.com, Denis G. Rancourt, PhD denis.rancourt@gmail.com, Rob Roberts rroberts@postmedia.com, 565 Sherbourne Place 565sherbourneplace@medallioncorp.com, George Espinola georgeespinola@medallioncorp.com, Sherbourne Site sherbournesite@medallioncorp.com, Rocco Galati rocco@idirect.com, Marshall A Swadron mas@swadron.com

Dear Mr Melchers,

Firstly, let's clarify some details so we're operating from the same groundwork:

1. Is your client is designated a "intensive support residence", or a "supported group living residence", pursuant the Services and Supports to Promote the Social Inclusion of Persons with Developmental Disabilities Act, 2008?
2. Is your client designated a "home for special care" within the meaning of the Homes for Special Care Act?
3. Is your client a designate "long-term care home" within the meaning of the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007?
4. Is your client a "psychiatric facility" within the meaning of the Mental Health Act?
5. Is your client a "correctional institution" within the meaning of the Ministry of Correctional Services Act?
6. Or is your client in any such similar form, a designate "facility" within the cope and meaning of Health Protection and Promotion Act, R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER H.7?

I look forward to your answer to those questions.

However, upon cursory overview, it's readily apparent that Medallion Corporation (your client) and its agents (which includes you) are eager to deploy false testimony against persons domiciled in leased residences at 565 Sherbourne St. In Para 2 of your client's statement, they admit that I am "...exempt from the requirement to wear a face mask, but [have] been advised that [I am] still required to adhere to other COVID-19-related protocols that are in place in the residential complex..."

Yet in Para 3, your client admits to its encouraging its staff **RESTRICTING MY ACCESS TO FACILITIES** on account of offensive or threatening facial nudity. Your client's statement admits to its cleaner being on the elevator with another female, who exited the elevator at the lobby. The statement testifies that I attempted to use the elevator, but the agent of your client told me that "[I] could not enter the elevator with her because [I] was not wearing a mask or face covering".

After this incident, it is quite evident that I was emotionally traumatized by being treated like an inferior class of human, by not even being afforded the human right of existing in the same facility as your client's agent. So your client, rather than inquiring how I was injured and/or traumatized by its agents and how it could prevent the occurrence of such trauma in the future, made sure to serve me with an Eviction Notice by 2 security contractors who informed me that I was being recorded on the afternoon of Friday, April 30th, 2020. More trauma, right?

Any reasonable party would understand that the "separate but equal" doctrine has been thoroughly trounced since the beginning of the unravelling with *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), but I'm sure you could find other explanations such as the [Separate But Equal Wiki](#) or anything about the much lauded "Rosa Parks" precedent. I have no idea what our equivalent up here in Canada is, but I'm sure we'll find out.

You have admitted that your client is encouraging discrimination against the bare-faced, and has furthermore cited the concerns of a hypochondriac tenant as grounds to evict another tenant. Did you honestly tell your client how this is probably going to play out, especially given our well-documented history? Have you explained to

your client that denying the legal and lawful activities a tenant who is not a ward of the state, or lodged at a correctional institution, psychiatric facility, or other such designate facility? It is legal and lawful to assert one's legal rights, is it not?

In all honesty, you should direct your client to immediately produce and disclose your alleged video footage that justifies your client treating me like a stray dog, homeless individual, or otherwise which not entitled to the lawful use of the residential facilities at 565 Sherbourne St. I'm not really surprised that your client is reckless enough to attempt to qualify its persecution and eviction of two tenants for being bare-faced peasantry with actual admissions of it violating the RTA, the ROA, the EMCPA, and well-established common-law.

There are some things you just don't do, but your client thinks it's "so smart". Smart like reducing the residential water-pressure by installing a locked device which lowers the water pressure of the shower beneath regulation minimums. Or things like denying residents the use of recreational facilities (private gym) for over a year without a corresponding reduction in rent.

Your client states that it is accepting of my exemption from the "Mandatory Face Cover Policy" (Para1) yet proceeds to qualify my eviction by the fact that I "was not wearing a mask or other face covering, and attempted to enter the elevator" and your client's agent "[s]ubstantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the residential complex for all usual purposes.."

Furthermore, your client has repeatedly encouraged the abuse, shaming, and persecution of vulnerable mask-exempt tenants from the reasonable enjoyment of their lease agreement. Your client refused to put up PROPER signage until early March of 2021. This has resulted in the abusive and aggressive denial of entry to residential facilities such as the elevator persecution of individuals unable or otherwise unwilling to make a scene and defend their legal rights.

Consequently, your client has nurtured and promulgated an environment of unreasonable fear/loathing towards the nude-faced or otherwise non-compliant with the tyrannical rule of morons and brown-shirt nazis. As such, I regret to inform you that I will be counter-suing your client for its offences and abuses of the ROA, the EMCPA, the RTA, and every other Act I can dig up and make an example of your client that will loudly indicate that even rich landlord's with deep pockets who retain counsel affiliated DIRECTLY with the Law Society of Upper Canada (changed its name to LSO recently).

You can expect my Notice of Claim within 30-days, because it will probably take me time to scrounge up enough nickels and dimes to afford a reasonable lawyer, or get someone on contingency when I go after Medallion Properties for its well-document violation of tenant rights. As you are well aware, Medallion Properties has been persecuting myself and others for their exercise of facial-nudity since before the date when your client served its initial vexatious article on my person at approximately 1700EDT, on Friday October 02, 2020.

The above is worthy of note as it goes to establishing a pattern of flagrant violation of the law, bullying tenants with baseless claim founded in their own ignorance of reality. Further to the collision of contrasting realities, I draw your attention to Para 8 of your vexatious piece of toilet paper wherein your client claims that on "April 21, 2021, [I] was on an elevator with another tenant of the residential complex. [I] was not wearing a mask or other face covering and began mocking the other tenant for wearing a face mask. [I] also recited pseudoscience about masks compromising people's immune systems. The other tenant told [me] that [I] was making the other tenant's life more difficult during the pandemic. [I] then started yelling obscenities at the other tenant."

If you look at your video footage as you have submitted before the record (should be noted, if you cannot produce this at the pre-trial-hearing, you'll definitely have to worry about a Default Judgement against you) you'll see that the other tenant (who claims to be immunocompromised and fearful of dying because I don't wear a mask or other acceptable face covering denoting a willingness to submit to tyranny) approached my wife and I with the demand that we put masks on or get off the elevator, "because it's the law".

I indicated the proper signage (which I was previously threatened eviction for requesting) to the tenant where it

showed that there are exemptions to the “rule of ignorance”. Only then, after he blatantly refused to stop harassing my wife and I, did I begin to raise my voice more stridently, with gesticulations to assist in communicating with what evidently is a Stockholm’d retard who cannot read or readily comprehend the writing on the wall. The sign is LITERALLY posted on the wall, but your client has encouraged an atmosphere of fear and loathing towards the bare-faced.

As such, I am holding your client primary responsible, as they have been repeatedly given the option to rectify their behaviour. Your client has made it readily apparent that it is not agreeable to any resolution but a court-ordered settlement. So be it, c’est la vie; the game, it is afoot. May the best man without any apparent conflict of interest win.

--

Chad, Solutions Architect
Internet Security, Operations and Intelligence
Tel: +1 716-608-3531

CC: If I Cc’d you, it was intentional. We may or mayn’t speak of it, but it was intentional to provide for every amicable resolution to Medallion Corporation’s being a demonstrably repeat offender of disregarding the ROA, the EMCPA, the RTA, and well established common law.