

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 25, 2013

Registered mail - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run incident. Hit and run is not an accident. **Hit and run is a criminal offence** under the section 252 of the Canadian Criminal Code; therefore, I reported it to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. As you know, in Law, assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence. Later on, I found out that my case was not an isolated one. ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation and civic duty to take my case to the Court.** Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

To launch a criminal action against ICBC, I applied to the Supreme Court registry. The person at the registry failed to tell me what legal-form is required for filing a criminal action; instead, he advised me to get legal advice. Therefore, I got in touch with the Lawyer Referral Service. Nevertheless, all the lawyers they referred, refused to give me the information I needed, even though I was willing to pay for their service. It was impossible for me to file my case without getting legal advice from the lawyers. Therefore, it is obvious that the lawyers' refusal of giving me legal advice, was tantamount to **obstruction of justice.**

I reported the issue to the Law Society. The Law Society Executive Director, Mr. Timothy McGee stated that "*the lawyers have no professional obligation to provide legal advice or service to the victims of crime.*" I asked him who had the professional obligation to provide legal service to the public; but he failed to answer my question. Therefore, I filed a civil claim (S-132382) against him to find out who has the professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime, so that criminal offenders can be brought to justice.

Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, Mr. Michael Armstrong filed a court application and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013.

At the hearing, I asked to Mr. Armstrong the following question; he was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Smith concurred with Mr. Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offenders free, as long as the Administration of Justice is NOT corrupt.

I appealed Mr. Justice Smith's decision to the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, my appeal was obstructed; because, Mr. Justice Smith did not sign his order. Instead, Mr. Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Mr. Justice Smith and asked me to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean "acceptance", in legal proceedings. Furthermore, he demanded over \$5,000 from me for aborting my legal action, under the title of "court costs" based on the order he drafted, plus \$5,000 "security deposit" for appeal court costs, assuming he would defeat my appeal as well.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible for me to proceed with my appeal in the Court of Appeal, therefore, I have no choice, but appeal to your honourable status and vested power to supervise the court services. Please, help me and let me know, **how can I file a criminal action against ICBC** to restrain ICBC from supporting hit and run crime by assuming the liability of hit and run crimes and paying the damages, on behalf of the criminal offenders.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

January 13, 2014

Second request - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run incident. Hit and run is not an accident. **Hit and run is a criminal offence** under the section 252 of the Canadian Criminal Code; therefore, I reported it to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. As you know, in Law, assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence. Later on, I found out that my case was not an isolated one. ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation and civic duty to take my case to the Court.** Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

To launch a criminal action against ICBC, I applied to the Supreme Court registry. The person at the registry failed to tell me what legal-form is required for filing a criminal action; instead, he advised me to get legal advice. Therefore, I got in touch with the Lawyer Referral Service. Nevertheless, all the lawyers they referred, refused to give me the information I needed, even though I was willing to pay for their service. It was impossible for me to file my case without getting legal advice from the lawyers. Therefore, it is obvious that the lawyers' refusal of giving me legal advice, was tantamount to **obstruction of justice.**

I reported the issue to the Law Society. The Law Society Executive Director, Mr. Timothy McGee stated that "*the lawyers have no professional obligation to provide legal advice or service to the victims of crime.*" I asked him who had the professional obligation to provide legal service to the public; but he failed to answer my question. Therefore, I filed a civil claim (S-132382) against him to find out who has the professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime, so that criminal offenders can be brought to justice.

Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, Mr. Michael Armstrong filed a court application and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013.

At the hearing, I asked to Mr. Armstrong the following question; he was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Smith concurred with Mr. Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offenders free, as long as the Administration of Justice is NOT corrupt.

I appealed Mr. Justice Smith's decision to the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, my appeal was obstructed; because, Mr. Justice Smith did not sign his order. Instead, Mr. Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Mr. Justice Smith and asked me to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean "acceptance", in legal proceedings. Furthermore, he demanded over \$5,000 from me for aborting my legal action, under the title of "court costs" based on the order he drafted, plus \$5,000 "security deposit" for appeal court costs, assuming he would defeat my appeal as well.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible for me to proceed with my appeal in the Court of Appeal, therefore, I have no choice, but appeal to your honourable status and vested power to supervise the court services. Please, help me and let me know, **how can I file a criminal action against ICBC** to restrain ICBC from supporting hit and run crime by assuming the liability of hit and run crimes and paying the damages, on behalf of the criminal offenders.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



THE LAW COURTS
800 SMITHE STREET
VANCOUVER, B. C.
V6Z 2E1

January 15, 2014

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

RE: Your letter of January 13, 2014 to Chief Justice Hinkson

I am legal counsel for the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Hinkson has asked me to respond to your letter of January 13, 2014.

I understand from your letter that you were involved in a hit and run accident. You are correct that the circumstances involved in hit and run incidents may, in some instances, give rise to criminal charges and proceedings.

If criminal cases come to court, they are adjudicated in either the Provincial Court or the Supreme Court. However, the courts have no role in making the determination as to whether or not criminal proceedings will be initiated in any given case.

It is for the police to investigate criminal incidents, and for the Crown Counsel's office to determine whether or not to bring criminal charges arising out of any particular incident.

Your question as to how you can file a criminal action against ICBC, is one that calls for legal advice. Beyond providing you with the general information above, Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice.

The Court is the ultimate adjudicator of disputes and must remain impartial. Therefore it is not possible for the Court or the Chief Justice to provide legal advice to potential litigants. As such, the Chief Justice will not respond further to your inquiry.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. J. Leacock".

K. J. Leacock
Legal Counsel, BC Supreme Court

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

January 20, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

K. J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
Supreme Court of British Columbia
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Leacock,

Thanks for responding to my letters dated November 25, 2013 and January 13, 2014, on behalf of the Chief Justice Hinkson.

In my letters, I informed Justice Hinkson that **as a surviving victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime, I have a legal obligation to take ICBC to court** on the grounds of **assuming the liability of 49000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year.**

As I clearly stated, my intent was to seek help from the Chief Justice; not legal advice; because, my access to administration of justice has been obstructed by the Law Society and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith. Therefore, I am not able to file my legal action against ICBC.

You wrote me that: “.... *Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice..... the Chief Justice will not respond further to your inquiry.*”

Obviously, you misunderstood the reason for my request from the Chief Justice or you were not aware of the following requirements of Law:

1. **As an ordinary citizen**, the Chief Justice and you have a legal obligation to help me to bring my offender to justice; otherwise, it is impossible to prevent hit and run crime.
2. **As a lawyer and an officer of courts**, the Chief Justice and you have professional obligation to give me assistance so that I can have access to administration of justice.
3. **As Chief justice**, Mr. Hinkson has a duty to ensure that the Supreme Court of British Columbia operates according to the rules of the Supreme Court and see justice service is available for everyone.

I would like to meet with you to discuss the legal consequences of obstructing justice and turning blind eye to hit and run crime that inflicts 49000, kills 10, injures and cripples 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Cc. Chief Justice

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

February 11, 2014

Second request. PUBLIC DOCUMENT

K. J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
Supreme Court of British Columbia
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Leacock,

Thanks for responding to my letters dated November 25, 2013 and January 13, 2014, on behalf of the Chief Justice Hinkson.

In my letters, I informed Justice Hinkson that **as a surviving victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime, I have a legal obligation to take ICBC to court** on the grounds of **assuming the liability of 49000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year.**

As I clearly stated, my intent was to seek **help** from the Chief Justice; not legal advice; because, my access to administration of justice has been obstructed by the Law Society and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith. Therefore, I am not able to file my legal action against ICBC.

You wrote me that: “.... *Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice..... the Chief Justice will not respond further to your inquiry.*”

Obviously, you misunderstood the reason for my request from the Chief Justice or you were not aware of the following requirements of Law:

1. **As an ordinary citizen**, the Chief Justice and you have a legal obligation to help me to bring my offender to justice; otherwise, it is impossible to prevent hit and run crime.
2. **As a lawyer and an officer of the courts**, the Chief Justice and you have professional obligation to give me assistance so that I can have access to administration of justice.
3. **As Chief justice**, Mr. Hinkson has a duty to ensure that the Supreme Court of British Columbia operates according to the rules of the Supreme Court and see justice service is available for everyone.

I would like to meet with you to discuss the legal consequences of obstructing justice and turning blind eye to 49000 counts of hit and run crime that kills 10, injures and cripples 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Cc. Chief Justice

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

March 5, 2014

Third request - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run incident. Hit and run is not an accident. **Hit and run is a criminal offence** under the section 252 of the Canadian Criminal Code; therefore, I reported it to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. As you know, in Law, assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence where criminal offender is identified. Later on, I found out that my case was not an isolated one. ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation and civic duty to take my case to the Court.** Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

To launch a criminal action against ICBC, I applied to the Supreme Court registry. The person at the registry failed to tell me what legal-form is required for filing a criminal action; instead, he advised me to get legal advice. Therefore, I got in touch with the Lawyer Referral Service. Nevertheless, all the lawyers they referred, refused to give me the information I needed, even though I was willing to pay for their service. It was impossible for me to file my case without getting legal advice from the lawyers. Therefore, it is obvious that the lawyers' refusal of giving me legal advice, was tantamount to **obstruction of justice.**

I reported the issue to the Law Society. The Law Society Executive Director, Mr. Timothy McGee stated that "*the lawyers have no professional obligation to provide legal advice or service to the victims of crime.*" I asked him who had the professional obligation to provide legal service to the public; but he failed to answer my question. Therefore, I filed a civil claim (S-132382) against him to find out who has the professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime, so that criminal offenders can be brought to justice.

Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, Mr. Michael Armstrong filed a court application and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013.

At the hearing, I asked to Mr. Armstrong the following question; he was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Smith concurred with Mr. Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offenders free, as long as the Administration of Justice is NOT corrupt.

I appealed Mr. Justice Smith's decision to the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, my appeal was obstructed; because, Mr. Justice Smith did not sign his order. Instead, Mr. Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Mr. Justice Smith and asked me to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean "acceptance", in legal proceedings. Furthermore, he demanded over \$5,000 from me for aborting my legal action, under the title of "court costs" based on the order he drafted, plus \$5,000 "security deposit" for appeal court costs, assuming he would defeat my appeal as well.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible for me to proceed with my appeal in the Court of Appeal, therefore, I have no choice, but appeal to your honourable status and vested power to supervise the court services. Please, help me and let me know, **how can I file a criminal action against ICBC** to restrain ICBC from supporting hit and run crime by assuming the liability of hit and run crimes and paying the damages, on behalf of the criminal offenders.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

March 5, 2014

Third request - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

K. J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
Supreme Court of British Columbia
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Leacock,

Thanks for responding to my letters dated November 25, 2013 and January 13, 2014, on behalf of the Chief Justice Hinkson. Nevertheless, I have not received any response to my letter dated February 11, 2014.

In my letters, I informed Justice Hinkson that **as a surviving victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime, I had a legal obligation to take ICBC to court** on the grounds of **assuming the liability of 49000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year.**

As I clearly stated, my intent was to seek **help** from the Chief Justice; not legal advice; because, my access to administration of justice has been obstructed by the Law Society and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith. Therefore, I am not able to file my legal action against ICBC.

You wrote me that: “.... *Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice..... the Chief Justice will not respond further to your inquiry.*”

Obviously, you misunderstood the reason for my request from the Chief Justice or you were not aware of the following requirements of Law:

1. **As an ordinary citizen**, the Chief Justice and you have a legal obligation to help me to bring my offender to justice; otherwise, it is impossible to prevent hit and run crime.
2. **As a lawyer and an officer of the courts**, the Chief Justice and you have professional obligation to give me assistance so that I can have access to administration of justice.
3. **As Chief justice**, Mr. Hinkson has a duty to ensure that the Supreme Court of British Columbia operates according to the rules of the Supreme Court and see justice service is available for everyone.

I would like to meet with you to discuss the legal consequences of obstructing justice and turning blind eye to **assuming the liability of 49000 counts of hit and run crime** that kills 10, injures and cripples 2200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Cc. Chief Justice

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

March 25, 2014

Final request - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run incident. Hit and run is not an accident. **Hit and run is a criminal offence** under the section 252 of the Canadian Criminal Code; therefore, I reported it to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. As you know, in Law, assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence where criminal offender is identified. Later on, I found out that my case was not an isolated one. ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I HAVE A LEGAL OBLIGATION AND CIVIC DUTY TO TAKE MY CASE TO THE COURT**. Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

To launch a criminal action against ICBC, I applied to the Supreme Court registry. The person at the registry failed to tell me what legal-form is required for filing a criminal action; instead, he advised me to get legal advice. Therefore, I got in touch with the Lawyer Referral Service. Nevertheless, all the lawyers they referred, refused to give me the information I needed, even though I was willing to pay for their service. It was impossible for me to file my case without getting legal advice from the lawyers. Therefore, it is obvious that the lawyers' refusal of giving me legal advice, was tantamount to **obstruction of justice**.

I reported the issue to the Law Society. The Law Society Executive Director, Mr. Timothy McGee stated that "*the lawyers have no professional obligation to provide legal advice or service to the victims of crime.*" I asked him who had the professional obligation to provide legal service to the public; but he failed to answer my question. Therefore, I filed a civil claim (S-132382) against him to find out who has the professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime, so that criminal offenders can be brought to justice.

Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, Mr. Michael Armstrong filed a court application and Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013.

At the hearing, I asked to Mr. Armstrong the following question; he was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Smith concurred with Mr. Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offenders free, as long as the Administration of Justice is NOT corrupt.

I appealed Mr. Justice Smith's decision to the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, my appeal was obstructed; because, Mr. Justice Smith did not sign his order. Instead, Mr. Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Mr. Justice Smith and asked me to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean "acceptance", in legal proceedings. Furthermore, he demanded over \$5,000 from me for aborting my legal action, under the title of "court costs" based on the order he drafted, plus \$5,000 "security deposit" for appeal court costs, assuming he would defeat my appeal as well.

Under the circumstances, it is impossible for me to proceed with my appeal in the Court of Appeal, therefore, I have no choice, but appeal to your honourable status and vested power to supervise the court services. Please, help me and let me know, **how can I file a criminal action against ICBC** to restrain ICBC from supporting hit and run crime by assuming the liability of hit and run crimes and paying the damages, on behalf of the criminal offenders.

If I cannot hear from you by April 15, I will file a legal action against you.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethicsfirst.ca

APR 22 2014

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Between  **Ron Korkut**

, Plaintiff

And

Christopher E. Hinkson,

, Defendant

NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM

This action has been started by the Plaintiff for the relief set out in Part 2 below. If

you intend to respond to this action, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim on the Plaintiff. If

you intend to make a counterclaim, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 and a counterclaim in Form 3 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim and counterclaim on the Plaintiff and on any new parties named in the counterclaim.

JUDGEMENT MAY BE PRONOUNCED AGAINST YOU IF YOU FAIL to file the response to civil claim within the time for response to civil claim described below.

Time for response to civil claim

A response to civil claim must be filed and served on the plaintiff,

- (a) if you reside anywhere in Canada, within 21 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (b) if you reside in the United States of America, within 35 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (c) if you reside elsewhere, within 49 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you, or
- (d) if the time for response to civil claim has been set by order of the court, within that time.

CLAIM OF THE PLAINTIFF

Part 1: STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. INCIDENT: Stewart Taylor hit the Plaintiff's car and ran away, on Pattullo Bridge, March 31, 2009. The Plaintiff lost the control of his car, after three impacts, his car was totally destroyed. The Plaintiff was very lucky to survive the collision; because, he was driving on the left lane and his car did not skid into the oncoming traffic. Stewart Taylor was caught, but not arrested or prosecuted; because, **ICBC assumed the liability of the HIT and RUN CRIME Stewart Taylor committed.** Even though ICBC was 100% liable for the incident, ICBC representative **Mr. Jason Gray** refused to pay non-pecuniary damages of the Plaintiff. Later on, the Plaintiff found out that, **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and maim 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year.** (ICBC quick-statistics)
2. THE PLAINTIFF'S DUTY TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST CRIME: As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, the Plaintiff has a legal obligation to take legal action against ICBC; because, it is impossible to prevent crime, if victims fail **to take legal action** against their offenders.
3. OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE: The Plaintiff contacted with the Court registry to file his legal action. Nevertheless, the registry declined to give him the name of the legal form required to file criminal cases. Therefore, the Plaintiff consulted with ten lawyers referred by the Lawyer Referral Service. All of the ten lawyers declined to give him the name of the legal-form necessary for filing criminal cases, despite the Plaintiff was willing to pay for their service. For lawyers, **withholding legal information necessary for launching legal action is tantamount to obstruction of justice;** because, the lawyers are the only professionals who are knowledgeable and qualified to provide legal service to the public. That obligation is also clearly stated in the Canons of Legal Ethics. **"A lawyer should make legal services available to the public** in an efficient and convenient manner that will command respect and confidence.."
4. LAW SOCIETY AND LAWYERS' OBLIGATIONS: Before filing disciplinary actions against those ten lawyers, the Plaintiff decided to find out if the Law Society was willing to investigate his complaint about the professional obligations of the lawyers. Therefore, he wrote a letter to **David J. Bilinsky** on April 3, 2012 and asked him if the lawyers had professional **obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime.** Nevertheless, he did not answer the Plaintiff's question. After a series of letters, on May 21, 2012, **Jack Olsen**, Ethics, stated that the Lawyers

do not have obligation to provide legal service to the public. His statement was conclusive that the Law Society had no intention to investigate the Plaintiff's complaint.

5. OFFICIAL DENIAL OF LAWYERS DUTY TO PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICE: To resolve the issue administratively, the Plaintiff proceeded in hierarchical order. After nine months of communication, the Law Society Executive Director, **Mr. Timothy E. McGee** confirmed that the lawyers of British Columbia had **no obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime**, in his letter dated January 8, 2013. The Plaintiff asked him who had that obligation; but, he failed to respond.

6. LEGAL ACTION AGAINST TIMOTHY E. MCGEE: To find out who has legal obligation to provide legal service to the public, the Plaintiff filed a legal action against Timothy E. McGee. Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, **Mr. Michael Armstrong** filed a court application and **Mr. Justice Nathan Smith** dismissed the Plaintiff's case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013, without any tangible reason or authority.

At the hearing, the Plaintiff asked to Mr. Armstrong the following question. He was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Nathan Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

7. THE REASON FOR DISMISSAL: Mr. Justice Nathan Smith concurred with Mr. Armstrong's argument and decided that ICBC had an obligation to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay criminal damages on behalf of criminal offenders, where criminal offenders were identified, under the Insurance Vehicle Act C.231. Nevertheless, there is no provision in the Act that entitles ICBC to assume the liability of hit and run crimes and pay the damages on behalf of the criminals, where offenders are identified. It is impossible to have such a provision in the Act; because, **it is impossible to assume the liability of a criminal offence and let the criminal offenders free**, as long as the Law is enforced effectively.

8. JUSTICE FAILS TO SIGN HIS ORDER: The Plaintiff appealed Mr. Justice Smith's decision to the Court of Appeal. Nevertheless, the Plaintiff's appeal was obstructed; because, Mr. Justice Smith **did not sign his order**. Instead, Mr. Armstrong drafted an order on behalf of Mr. Justice

Smith and asked the Plaintiff to sign it; arguing that signing a document does not mean “acceptance”, in legal proceedings. Furthermore, he filed another application to compel the Plaintiff to pay court costs of \$6165.77, before the appeal and demanded \$5,000 “security deposit” for appeal court costs, assuming he would abort the Plaintiff’s appeal, as well.

9. COMPLAINT TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE: Since the Plaintiff was not able to proceed with his appeal in the Court of Appeal, he had no choice, other than reporting this issue to the Chief Justice, **Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson** and seeking help. He wrote four letters dated: Nov. 25, 2013, Jan. 13, 2014, Mar. 5, 2014 and Mar. 25, 2014. The Plaintiff raised the following issues to the attention of the Chief Justice:

1. LEGAL CHICANERY: Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed the Plaintiff’s legal action without any tangible reason or applicable authority, knowing that the Plaintiff had a legal obligation to bring ICBC to justice; because ICBC assumes **the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure 2,200 people every year, in British Columbia.**

2. OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE: Since the decision of Mr. Justice Nathan Smith was questionable, **he did not sign his dismissal order.** Instead, Mr. Michael Armstrong attempted to mislead the Plaintiff to sign Mr. Justice Nathan Smith’s order. Since, the Plaintiff is not a fool to sign an unauthorized decision made against him, he did not sign it; therefore, his appeal was obstructed.

3. IMPROPER COURT PROCEDURE: Upon Mr. Michael Armstrong’s application, Master Dennis Tokarek signed a “Certificate of Costs” without printing his name on the legal document. The Plaintiff attempted to confirm the signature, but Master Tokarek failed to confirm his signature, in writing.

10. FAILURE TO RESPOND: It is common sense that, the Chief Justice is responsible for supervising court services and ensure that court services are provided to the public within reason. Nevertheless, he failed to respond to the Plaintiff’s complaint. Instead, K. J. Leacock wrote a letter to the Plaintiff, dated January, 15, 2014. He interpreted the Plaintiff’s complaint as a “*request of legal advice*” and he stated that: “Chief Justice Hinkson is not able to provide you with any advice. will not respond further to your inquiry.” Therefore, the Plaintiff filed this case against the Chief Justice, on the grounds of breach of duty.

11. SUMMARY:

1. The Plaintiff, as a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime, has a right and legal obligation to bring his offender, ICBC to justice.
2. The lawyers, members of the Law Society, declined to provide legal service to the Plaintiff. Therefore, the Plaintiff's access to justice was obstructed.
3. The Law Society declined to resolve the issue.
4. The Plaintiff filed a legal action against the Law Society Executive Director, Mr. Timothy E. McGee to find out who is responsible for providing legal service to the public.
5. Mr. Justice Nathan Smith dismissed his case and did not sign his dismissal order. Therefore, the Plaintiff was not able to appeal Mr. Justice Nathan Smith's decision.
6. The Plaintiff complained to the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice ignored his complaint.

Part 2: JUDGMENT REQUESTED

1. IS IT LAWFULL for Mr. Justice Nathan Smith to dismiss the Plaintiff's legal action knowing that the legal action was a necessary step to bring his offender, ICBC to justice, on the grounds of assuming the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10 and injure 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year?

2. IS IT LAWFUL for Mr. Justice Nathan Smith to obstruct the Plaintiff's appeal by declining to sign his Order?

3. IS IT LAWFUL for Master Dennis Tokarek to sign a "certificate of costs" to force the Plaintiff to pay court costs before his appeal, without printing his name on the document and decline to confirm his signature in writing?

4. IS IT A LAWFUL for the Chief Justice to overlook the Plaintiff's complaints listed above, about the conduct of the staff working under his supervision?

Part 3: RELIEF SOUGHT

1. IF THE CHIEF JUSTICE IS NOT LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE for supervising the staff working under his supervision and correct their wrong actions, the Plaintiff requests a reasonable answer to the following question:

Who is legally responsible for supervising the staff working under the supervision of the Chief Justice, Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson and correct their wrong?

2. IF HE IS RESPONSIBLE: The Plaintiff request an order to direct the Chief Justice to fulfill his duty to supervise the Court Services and address the Plaintiff's complaint about improper court procedures.

Part 4: LEGAL BASIS

Hit and run incident is NOT an ACCIDENT; it is a CRIMINAL OFFENCE under the section 252 of the **Criminal Code of Canada**.

ICBC inflicts serious harm on the public by assuming the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that injure 2,200 and kill 10 innocent citizens every year under the name of accident insurance benefits, ICBC provides financial support to criminal offenders. It is unlawful to assume the liability of criminal offence where the offenders are identified. As a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime the Plaintiff has a legal obligation and civic duty to take his case to the Court and seek JUSTICE.

Plaintiff's address for service: Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1

E-mail address for service: ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Place of trial: Vancouver, British Columbia

The address of the registry is: 800 Smithe Street
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2E1



Date: April 22, 2014

Ron Korkut

Rule 7-1 (1) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules states:

- (1) Unless all parties of record consent or the court otherwise orders, each party of record to an action must, within 35 days after the end of the pleading period,
 - (a) prepare a list of documents in Form 22 that lists
 - (i) all documents that are or have been in the party's possession or control and that could, if available, be used by any party at trial or prove or disprove a material fact, and
 - (ii) all other documents to which the party intends to refer at trial, and
 - (b) serve the list on all parties of record.

APPENDIX

Part 1: CONCISE SUMMARY NATURE OF CLAIM:

Failure to enforce the code of professional conduct for BC.

Part 2: THIS CLAIM ARISES FROM THE FOLLOWING:

- a motor vehicle accident
- personal injury, other than one arising from a motor vehicle accident
- a dispute about real property (real estate)
- a dispute about personal property
- the lending of money
- the provision of goods or services or other general commercial matters
- an employment relationship
- a dispute about a will or other issues concerning the probate of an estate
- breach of duty

Part 3:

Occupiers Liability Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 337

WADDELL RAPONI

L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

April 30, 2014

Via Email - ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry


I expect to be retained as counsel for the Honourable Chief Justice Hinkson in your proceeding filed in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Vancouver Registry, No. S-143080, in the very near future.

Please do not take any further steps in your action without notice to me,

Thank you.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI

per:  John Waddell, Q.C.

JW/ja

WADDELL RAPONI

L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

May 16, 2014

Via Email – ron@ethicsfirst.ca & Mail

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry


I enclose the filed Response of the Honourable Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. Please confirm receipt of this document on the attached copy of this letter and return the same to me by regular post or e-mail.

I have instructions to bring on an application to have your claim dismissed as soon as possible. Please confirm whether you are available to appear for such an application on either June 11th or 24th, 2014.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI


per: John Waddell, Q.C.
JW/lb
Encl. - Response
cc. Client



No. S-143080
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON

DEFENDANT

RESPONSE TO CIVIL CLAIM

Filed by: The Honourable Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia,
Christopher E. Hinkson (the "Defendant")

Part 1: RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM FACTS

Division 1 — Defendant's Response to Facts

1. The facts alleged in paragraphs none of Part 1 of the Notice of Civil Claim are admitted.
2. The facts alleged in paragraphs 1 through 11 of Part 1 of the Notice of Civil Claim are denied.
3. The facts alleged in paragraphs none of Part 1 of the Notice of Civil Claim are outside the knowledge of the Defendant.

Division 2—Defendants' Version of Facts

Division 3 — Additional Facts

Part 2: RESPONSE TO RELIEF SOUGHT

1. The Defendant consents to the granting of the relief sought in none of the paragraphs of Part 2 of the Notice of Civil Claim.
2. The Defendant opposes the granting of the relief sought in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 2 and Part 3 of the Notice of Civil Claim.
3. The Defendant takes no position on the granting of the relief sought in none of the paragraphs of Part 2 of the Notice of Civil Claim.

Part 3: LEGAL BASIS

1. Under the *Supreme Court Act*, RSBC 1996, c.443, S. 2(3), the Defendant has responsibility for the administration of the Judges of Court.
2. Section 3 of the *Supreme Court Act* (supra) provides that the Defendant, as well as the Associate Chief Justice and Judges has all the powers, rights, incidents, privileges, and immunities of a Judge of a superior court of record, and all of their powers, rights, incidents, privileges and immunities that on March 29, 1870 were vested in the Chief Justice and the other Justices of the Court.
3. Complaints about the conduct of a Judge in a Superior Court must be dealt with pursuant to S. 63 of the *Judges Act*, RSC, 1985 c. J-1.
4. Under S. 63 of the *Judges Act* (supra), inquiries concerning Judges must be conducted by the Judicial Council of Canada.
5. The Plaintiffs Claim:
 - a. Discloses no reasonable claim;
 - b. Is unnecessary, scandalous, frivolous or vexatious; and
 - c. Is otherwise an abuse of the process of the Court.

All within the meaning of Rule 9-5 of the Supreme Court Civil Rules

6. The Defendant seeks an Order that the proceeding be dismissed with costs of the application to be paid by the Plaintiff as special costs.


Defendant's address for service: Waddell Raponi
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria, BC V8W 1T4

Fax number address for service (if any): 250-385-2012

Rule 7-1(1) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules states:

E-mail address for service (if any): NONF

Dated: May **14**, 2014



Signature of lawyer for the Defendant
John D. Waddell. Q.C.

(1) Unless all parties of record consent or the court otherwise orders, each party of record to an action must, within 35 days after the end of the pleading period,

(a) prepare a list of documents in Form 22 that lists

(i) all documents that are or have been in the party's possession or control and that could, if available, be used by any party at trial to prove or disprove a material fact, and

(ii) all other documents to which the party intends to refer at trial, and

(b) serve the list on all parties of record.

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

May 19, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry

As a surviving victim of a potentially fatal hit and run incident, I have a legal obligation and civic **duty to bring my offender to JUSTICE**. Hit and run is not an ordinary accident; but, it is a criminal offence.

I have been struggling to bring, my offender-in-law, ICBC to JUSTICE for five years. Within the last five years, ICBC assumed the liability of $49,000 \times 5 = 245,000$ hit and run crimes and provided financial benefits to the criminal offenders under the name of "*accident insurance*". As exemplified in my case, ICBC pays the damages criminal offenders cause, even they are identified. For a reasonable person, providing financial benefits to hit and run offenders, *under any name*, is not a deterrent, but an encouragement for hit and run crime.

As a result of those 245,000 hit and run crimes, 50 innocent citizens of British Columbia lost their lives; 11,000 people were injured and some of them crippled to suffer for the rest of their lives.

In your letter dated, May 16, 2014, you stated that you would bring an application to have my claim dismissed as soon as possible. In my opinion, such an application is not necessary, if you can answer the following question:

Who, in the Province of British Columbia, has the responsibility to address the issue of *obstruction of justice* to a member of the public who has been trying to bring his offender to JUSTICE for five years?

Nevertheless, if you, being a minister of JUSTICE and an officer of the Courts, willing to abort this case; please, arrange a date in July for your application.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

WADDELL RAPONI
L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

June 3, 2014

Via Email - ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V50 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry

Enclosed please find our Notice of Application filed May 30, 2014.

The Application is scheduled for June 24, 2014. Kindly acknowledge delivery of same on the attached copy of this letter and return it to my office at your earliest opportunity.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI



~~for~~ per: John Waddell, Q.C.
JW/lb
Encl. - Notice of Application
cc. Client



No. 8-143080
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF/RESPONDENT

AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON

DEFENDANT/APPLICANT

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

(Rule 22-3 of the Supreme Court Civil Rules applies to all forms.)

Name(s) of applicant(s): The Defendants, The Honourable Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Christopher E, Hinkson.

To: The Plaintiff, Ron Korkut

TAKE NOTICE that an application will be made by the applicant to the presiding Judge or master at the courthouse at 800 Smiths Street, Vancouver, British Columbia on June 24, 2014 at 9:45 a.m. for the order(s) set out in Part 1 below,

Part 1: **ORDER(S) SOUGHT**

1. That the within proceeding be dismissed with costs of the Application to be paid by the Plaintiff as special costs.

Part 2: **FACTUAL BASIS**

(Using numbered paragraphs, set out a brief summary of the facts supporting the application.)

- 1 The relief sought in this Application does not depend on a factual basis,

(If any party sues or is sued in a representative capacity, identify the party and describe the representative capacity.)

Part 3: LEGAL BASIS

- 1, Under the *Supreme Court Act*, RSBC 1996, c,443, S. 2(3), the Defendant has responsibility for the administration of the Judges of Court,
2. Section 3 of the *Supreme Court Act* (supra) provides that the Defendant, as well as the Associate Chief Justice and Judges has all the powers, rights, incidents, privileges, and' immunities of a Judge of a superior court of record, and all of their powers, rights, incidents, privileges and Immunities that on March 29, 1870 were vested in the Chief Justice and the other Justices of the Court.
- 3 Complaints about the conduct of a Judge in a Superior Court must be dealt with pursuant to 8. 63 of the *Judges Act*, RSC, 1985 c. J-1.
4. Under S. 63 of the *Judges Act* (supra), Inquiries concerning Judges must be conducted by the Judicial Council of Canada.
5. The Plaintiff's Claim:
 - a. Discloses no reasonable claim;
 - b. Is unnecessary, scandalous, frivolous or vexatious; and
 - c. is otherwise an abuse of the process of the Court.

All within the meaning of Rule 9-5 of the Supreme Court Civil Rules

- 6, The Defendant seeks an Order that the proceeding be dismissed with costs of the application to be paid by the Plaintiff as special costs.

[Using numbered paragraphs, specify any rule or other enactment relied on and provide a brief summary of any other legal arguments on which the applicant(s) intend(s) to rely in support of the orders sought.]

1 Part 4: MATERIAL TO BE RELIED ON

[Using numbered paragraphs, list the affidavits served with the notice of application and any other affidavits and other documents already In the court file on which the applicant(s) will rely. Each affidavit included on the list must be Identified as follows: °Affidavit # [sequential number, If any, recorded In the top right hand corner of the affidavit) of [name), made [month, day, year

- 1 Notice of Civil Claim filed April 22, 2014.

The applicant(s) estimate(s) that the application will take; 1 hour.


This matter is within the Jurisdiction of a Master;

This matter is not within the Jurisdiction of a Master;

TO THE PERSONS RECEIVING THIS NOTICE OF APPLICATION: If you wish to respond to this notice of application, you must, within 5 business days after service of this notice of application or, if this application is brought under Rule 9-7, within 8 business days after service of this notice of application,

- (a) file an application response in Form 33.
- (b) file the original of every affidavit, and of every other document, that
 - (i) you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application, and
 - (ii) has not already been filed in the proceeding, and
- (c) serve on the applicant 2 copies of the following, and on every other party of record one copy of the following:
 - (i) a copy of the tiled application response;
 - (ii) a copy of each of the filed affidavits and other documents that you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application and that has not already been served on that person;
 - (iii) if this application is brought under Rule 9.7, any notice that you are required to give under Rule 9-7(9).

Dated: May 30, 2014


Signature of
 applicant lawyer for applicant
John D. Waddell, Q.C.

To be completed by the court only:

Order made

In the terms requested application in paragraphs _____ of Part 1 of this notice of application

with the following variations and additional terms:

Dated: (month, day, year]. _____

Signature of
[] Judge [] Master

APPENDIX

!The following information is provided for data collection purposes only and is of no legal effect.]

THIS APPLICATION INVOLVES THE FOLLOWING:

Application Type: _____

WADDELL RAPONI
L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

July 25, 2014

Via mail and email
ronkor51@gmail.com

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry

Enclosed please find the Order Made After application entered today, July 25, 2014.

Kindly acknowledge delivery of same on the attached copy of this letter and return it to my office at your earliest opportunity.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI

per: John Waddell, Q.C.

JW/lb

Encl. - Order

cc. Client



No. S-143080
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON

DEFENDANT

ORDER MADE AFTER APPLICATION


BEFORE) THE HONOURABLE ASSOCIATE)
) CHIEF JUSTICE CULLEN) June 24, 2014
))

ON THE APPLICATION of the Defendant Christopher E. Hinkson coming on for hearing at 800 Smithe Street, Vancouver, British Columbia on June 24, 2014 and on hearing John D. Waddell; Q.C. on behalf of the Defendant, and no one appearing for the Plaintiff on the Application although duly served.

THIS COURT ORDERS that:

1. The Plaintiff's action be dismissed;
2. The Plaintiff pay the Defendant his costs of the action and of this application;
3. The approval of the form of this Order by the Plaintiff is dispensed with.

THE FOLLOWING PARTIES APPROVE THE FORM OF THIS ORDER:



Signature of lawyer for the Defendant
John D. Waddell, Q.C.

By the Court.

Digitally signed by
Berg, Mellani

Registrar

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

July 28, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry – Order made after application.

I have received the order you signed, nevertheless the order was not signed by Justice Cullen. Please, send me the signed order.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

WADDELL RAPONI
L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

July 31, 2014

Via Email and Mail

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry I

received your letter of July 28, 2014, today.


It is not necessary for Associate Chief Justice Cullen to sign the Order. It is enough for the Registrar to do so. The entered version of the Order I sent you is the only one resulting from my client's application before A.C.J. Cullen on June 24, 2014.

I attach a copy of the transcript of my submissions to A.C.J. Cullen. I will provide you with a copy of his signed Reasons for Judgement when they are received.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI



per. John Waddell, Q.C.
JW/lb
Encls.
cc. Client

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

July 31, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry – Order made after application.

You may believe that it is not necessary to sign a **legal document**, nevertheless it is the requirement of the LAW. Please, send me the signed order.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

WADDELL RAPONI

LAWYERS

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♣
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

- LAW CORPORATION
- ◆ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
- § COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

August 1, 2014

Via Email and Mail

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry

Enclosed please find a copy of the Oral Reasons for Judgement of A.C.J Cullen received today.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI



For per: John Waddell, Q.C.
/lb

Encl.
cc. Client

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Date: 20140624
Docket: S143080
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

Ron Korkut

Plaintiff

And

Christopher E. Hickson

Defendant

Before: Associate Chief Justice Cullen

Oral Reasons for Judgment

In Chambers

The Plaintiff:

No one appeared

Counsel for the Defendant:

J.D. Waddell, Q.C.

Place and Date of Hearing:

Vancouver, B.C.
June 24, 2014

Place and Date of Judgment:

Vancouver, B.C.
June 24, 2014

[1] **THE COURT:** This is an application brought by the defendant, the Honourable Chief Justice Christopher E. Hinkson, to dismiss the proceedings brought against him by the plaintiff, Ron Korkut, in a Notice of Civil Claim filed April 22, 2014.

[2] As I understand the Notice of Civil Claim, it proceeds from a dispute that the present plaintiff had with the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia following a motor vehicle accident, which also constituted a hit-and-run, which is either a violation of the *Motor Vehicle Act* or, alternatively, a violation of the *Criminal Code* of Canada.

[3] In the course of his pursuit of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, Mr. Korkut brushed up against a number of different lawyers, including Mr. McGee of the Law Society of British Columbia, Mr. Olsen and Mr. Bilinsky of the Law Society of British Columbia, and he in due course brought an action against Mr. McGee, which, in the fullness of time, was dismissed by Mr. Justice Nathan Smith on August 2, 2013.

[4] Mr. Korkut asserts that the dismissal was done without any tangible reason or authority. However, there is no basis on the record for that assertion and it appears that, although Mr. Korkut took steps to pursue an appeal from Mr. Justice Smith's decision, he elected not to sign a draft copy of Mr. Justice Smith's order, and in the result Mr. Justice Smith was unable to sign the order and that impeded the course of the appeal.

[5] Thereafter, Mr. Korkut wrote the Honourable Chief Justice Hinkson on a number of occasions and he was responded to by the law officer for the Supreme Court, informing him that neither Chief Justice Hinkson nor she was in a position to give him legal advice, and in effect advising him to seek counsel elsewhere.

[6] In the result, Mr. Korkut was dissatisfied with the response he received from the Chief Justice via the Court's law officer and so he lodged an action against the Chief Justice, essentially asserting that the Chief Justice overlooked his complaints

about the conduct of the "staff working under his supervision" and seeking, by way of relief, an answer to the question, "Who is legally responsible for supervising the staff working under the supervision of the Chief Justice Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson and correct their wrong?"

[7] I have read over the Notice of Civil Claim on a number of different occasions. and I am quite simply unable to discern any coherent basis for a cause of action.

[8] This application is brought pursuant to Rule 9-5(1) that reads as follows:

At any stage of a proceeding, the court may order to be struck out or amended the whole or any part of a pleading, petition or other document on the ground that:

- (a) it discloses no reasonable claim or defence, as the case may be,
- (b) it is unnecessary, scandalous, frivolous or vexatious,
- (c) it may prejudice, embarrass or delay the fair trial or hearing of the proceeding, or
- (d) it is otherwise an abuse of the process of the court.

and the court may pronounce judgment or order the proceeding to be stayed or dismissed and may order the costs of the application to be paid as special costs.

[9] That is what the applicant seeks in this case, although in his oral submissions to me, Mr. Waddell, I think quite fairly, modified his position with respect to costs, indicating that in view of the somewhat querulous nature of the pleadings that ordinary costs would suffice rather than special costs.

[10] This is a case that is closely akin to a case decided in 2012, styled *Graham v. The Honourable Mr. Justice Bracken*, 2012 Docket No. S14387, Duncan Registry, November 26, 2012.

[11] In that case, after considering an action brought against a Justice of this Court I concluded as follows at paras. 19 and 21:

[19] In my view, in respect of the allegations of negligence and defamation, the plaintiffs pleadings fall well short of establishing a reasonable claim and fall squarely within the definition of an unnecessary, scandalous, frivolous, or vexatious claim in the sense of being confusing, irrelevant, and without substance. The appropriate remedy for a party who

considers a case to have been wrongly decided against him is to appeal. Launching a groundless lawsuit which is bound to fail for want of any valid factual or legal foundation diverts the court from dealing with the many valid causes of action seeking hearing and resolution and represents an abuse of its process.

[21] In the circumstances, I conclude that the plaintiffs pleadings should be struck as being in violation of Rule 9-5(1)(a), (b), and (d). I am satisfied that this is one of those cases where the plaintiff respondent should not be given leave to amend his pleadings as there is nothing which I can see in the record or which I have heard from the plaintiff that is capable of altering the fact that this is an action that is bound to fail and one which represents an abuse of the court's process.

[12] Those paragraphs, in my view, are apposite to the case before me here today and I will make the same order in this case as I did in the case of *Graham v. The Honourable Justice Bracken* in 2012.

[13] I do note, parenthetically, that in the Notice of Application counsel for the defendant/applicant has indicated that under s. 63 of the *Judges Act, supra*, inquiries concerning judges must be conducted by the Judicial Council of Canada and that complaints about the conduct of a judge in a superior court must be dealt with pursuant to s. 63 of the *Judges Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. J-1, and I would refer the plaintiff to that aspect of the pleadings.

[14] Is there anything further then, Mr. Waddell?

[15] I will order costs. There will be ordinary costs.

[16] MR. WADDELL: Thank you, and if you could dispense with the need for approval of Mr. Korkut to the order?

[17] THE COURT: I will. I will make that order, as well.

"A.F. Cullen ACJ."

Associate Chief Justice Cullen

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 6, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – FINAL NOTICE

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry – Order made after application.

I have received the *transcript of your submissions* and *oral reasons for judgment*. Nevertheless, I have not received the order signed by Justice Cullen yet.

As a qualified lawyer, you are supposed to know that **judgment is not signed by a judge or justice is not a valid legal document**; it is a nullity. Therefore, I cannot appeal an un-signed judgment.

Please, send me the order signed by Justice Cullen **as required by the Law**, so that I can appeal his decision. If you fail to do so by the end of August, I have no choice, but file a legal action against you.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

WADDELL RAPONI

L A W Y E R S

JOHN D. WADDELL, Q.C. §
EUGENE RAPONI, Q.C. * ♦
NICHOLAS A. MOSKY *
HEATHER JAEB
RYAN THOMAS ASHMEAD
NICOLE C. HAMILTON

• LAW CORPORATION
♦ MEDIATOR: FAMILY & CIVIL LAW
§ COMMERCIAL MEDIATOR/ARBITRATOR

1002 WHARF STREET
VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA
CANADA V8W 1T4

TELEPHONE (250) 385-4311 FAX
(250) 385-2012

www.waddellraponi.com

Our File: 9677

WRITER'S DIRECT EMAIL: jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

August 8, 2014

Via Email and Mail

Mr. Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry

I am in receipt of your letter dated July 31, 2014, received on August 7, 2014.

If you do not accept my assurance that the Judge's signature on the Order is not required you should contact the Court Registry.

Yours truly,

WADDELL RAPONI



FOR: per: John Waddell, Q.C.
/lb
cc. Client

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 25, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Korkut v. Hinkson, S.C.B.C. Action No. S-143080, Vancouver Registry – Your email dated Aug. 25, 2014.

Mr Korkut;

I will not engage with you further on this issue. I have told you the entered Order is the properly approved issuance of Associate Chief Justice Cullen's Order. If you still don't believe me, contact the Court Registry in Vancouver. They will confirm what I am telling you.

As a lawyer, you are supposed to know that LEGAL DOCUMENTS MUST BE SIGNED by the persons who issue them. If you insist on the VALIDITY of UNSIGNED COURT ORDER, please confirm that with a signed letter.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 30, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Associate Chief Justice Austin F. Cullen
Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime. I reported the incident to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. Assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence. Therefore, my offender-in-Law is ICBC. I am not the first victim of ICBC; ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation to take my case to the Court.** Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime. I have been struggling to fulfil my duty to bring my offender-in-Law to justice for over five years.

As alleged by John D. Waddell, the Defendant's representative, you dismissed my recent case, S143080, at my absence, on June 24, 2014. I was not able to attend the hearing; because, Mr. Waddell did not give me proper notice; instead, he sent me an email. I did not take his email seriously; because, as reasonable person, I did not expect that a case intended **to prevent hit and run crime**, can be dismissed by an application. Nevertheless, Mr. Waddell claimed that he successfully aborted my case.

He sent me an *order* and a *transcript of the reasons for judgment* without any signature on them. He tried to make me believe that the court order he sent me without your signature was a valid court order. Obviously, if someone believes that an *unsigned court order* is a *valid court order*, it is a "valid court order". Nevertheless, it takes a fool to believe such a nonsense.

Therefore, I would like to confirm with you that the attached Order and the Reasons of Judgment are your decisions. If they are, please, sign those documents and mail to me.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. Court Order, Reasons for Judgment



File copy Sep. 4, 2014

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

AND:

CHRISTOPHER E. HINKSON

DEFENDANT

ORDER MADE AFTER APPLICATION


BEFORE) THE HONOURABLE ASSOCIATE	
) CHIEF JUSTICE CULLEN) June 24, 2014
))

ON THE APPLICATION of the Defendant Christopher E. Hinkson coming on for hearing at 800 Smithe Street, Vancouver, British Columbia on June 24, 2014 and on hearing John D. Waddell, Q.C. on behalf of the Defendant, and no one appearing for the Plaintiff on the Application although duly served.

THIS COURT ORDERS that:

1. The Plaintiff's action be dismissed;
2. The Plaintiff pay the Defendant his costs of the action and of this application;
3. The approval of the form of this Order by the Plaintiff is dispensed with.

THE FOLLOWING PARTIES APPROVE THE FORM OF THIS ORDER:



 Signature of lawyer for the Defendant
 John D. Waddell, Q.C.

By the Court

Digitally signed by
Berg, Mellani

Registrar

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

September 6, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Maria Littlejohn, Deputy Registrar
The Law Courts
400-800 Hornby Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mrs. Littlejohn,

I am a victim of potentially fatal **hit and run crime**. I reported the incident to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. In Law, assuming the liability of a wrong is the same as doing the wrong. Therefore, my offender-in-Law is ICBC. I am not the only victim of ICBC; because, ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of a hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation to take my offender to the Court**. Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

I needed legal advice to file a legal action against ICBC. Like any reasonable person, I believed that the lawyers had professional obligation to provide legal service to the public. Therefore, I consulted with ten lawyers referred by the Lawyer Referral Service. All of the ten lawyers declined to give me the advice I needed to file my legal action, despite I was willing to pay for their service.

Before filing disciplinary actions against those ten lawyers, I decided to find out if the Law Society would investigate my complaint by asking the following question:

Do the lawyers have professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime?

After nine months of communication with the Law Society through mail, the Law Society Executive Director, **Mr. Timothy E. McGee** stated that the lawyers of British Columbia had **no obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime**, in his letter dated January 8, 2013. I asked him who had that obligation; but, he failed to respond.

I was obliged to file a legal action against Timothy E. McGee to find out who had legal obligation to provide legal service to the public. Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, **Mr. Michael Armstrong** filed a court application and **Mr. Justice Nathan Smith** dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013, without any tangible reason or authority.

At the hearing of the application, I asked Mr. Armstrong the following question. He was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Nathan Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Nathan Smith did not sign his dismissal order. That is conclusive to the fact that his judgment was wrong and he was aware of it. Obviously, a reasonable person, who acts in good faith and within the bounds of Law, would not hesitate to sign his own decision.

Mr. Armstrong attempted to make me believe that the court order without the signature of Justice Smith was a valid court order. Obviously, no fool would believe such a nonsense and appeal an *unsigned judgment*. **That is the reason why I was not able to proceed with my appeal.**

I have been struggling with this case for over five years. Since it is impossible for me to neglect my duty to bring my offender-in-Law, ICBC to justice, I have no intention to abandon my appeal.

Believing that the Chief Justice had a duty to supervise and correct the wrong actions of the staff working under his authority, I raised this issue to the attention of the **Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson** and sought help. Nevertheless, Mr. Hinkson did not respond to my complaint. Obviously, he was comfortable with *lawyers who are reluctant to provide legal service to the public and justices who hesitate to sign their orders*. I had no choice, but file a legal action against Mr. Hinkson. Like my previous case, Justice Cullen dismissed it and **failed to sign his order**.

If you are concerned about the validity of the facts stated above, please let me know.

Since you informed about it, you may exercise your duty to report this unusual practice of Law to your supervisor.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

September 8, 2014

Second Notice - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Jill Leacock, Legal Counsel
The Law Courts
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mrs. Leacock,

Re. Your following email dated September 8, 2014.

Mr. Korkut

At the request of Associate Chief Justice Cullen, I am responding to your letter of August 30, 2014 addressed to him. On behalf of Associate Chief Justice Cullen, I confirm that the copy of the Order sent to you by Mr. Waddell is a copy of the Order made by Associate Chief Justice Cullen on June 24, 2014, and entered on July 25, 2014.

The Reasons for Judgment of Associate Chief Justice Cullen which were given orally have been assigned a neutral citation, and you may find them on the website at the following link.

[Korkut v. Hinkson 2014 BCSC 1693](#)

As this case is concluded, the Court will not be responding to any further communication from you in relation to this case, and any further correspondence will be returned.

*Jill Leacock, Legal Counsel
British Columbia Supreme Court*

I am a victim of potentially fatal **hit and run crime**. I reported the incident to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. In Law, assuming the liability of a wrong is the same as doing the wrong. Therefore, my offender-in-Law is ICBC. I am not the only victim of ICBC; because, ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year. (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of a hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation to take my offender to the Court**. Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime.

I needed legal advice to file a legal action against ICBC. Like any reasonable person, I believed that the lawyers had professional obligation to provide legal service to the public. Therefore, I consulted with ten lawyers referred by the Lawyer Referral Service. All of the ten lawyers declined to give me the advice I needed to file my legal action, despite I was willing to pay for their service.

Before filing disciplinary actions against those ten lawyers, I decided to find out if the Law Society would investigate my complaint by asking the following question:

Do the lawyers have professional obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime?

After nine months of communication with the Law Society through mail, the Law Society Executive Director, **Mr. Timothy E. McGee** stated that the lawyers of British Columbia had **no obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime**, in his letter dated January 8, 2013. I asked him who had that obligation; but, he failed to respond.

I was obliged to file a legal action against Timothy E. McGee to find out who had legal obligation to provide legal service to the public. Nevertheless, legal representative of Mr. McGee, **Mr. Michael Armstrong** filed a court application and **Mr. Justice Nathan Smith** dismissed my case with costs, on August 2nd, 2013, without any tangible reason or authority.

At the hearing of the application, I asked Mr. Armstrong the following question. He was silent; instead, Mr. Justice Nathan Smith responded as follows: (Transcript, page 18)

RON KORKUT: Who has the obligation to provide legal service to the public if the lawyers have not such an obligation? Please answer this question before the court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Justice Nathan Smith did not sign his dismissal order. That is conclusive to the fact that his judgment was wrong and he was aware of it. Obviously, a reasonable person, who acts in good faith and within the bounds of Law, would not hesitate to sign his own decision.

Mr. Armstrong attempted to make me believe that the court order without the signature of Mr. Justice Smith was a valid court order. Obviously, no fool would believe such a nonsense and appeal an *unsigned judgment*. Therefore, **I was not able to proceed with my appeal.**

Believing that the Chief Justice had a duty to supervise and correct the wrong actions of the staff working under his authority, I raised this issue to the attention of the **Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson** and sought help. Nevertheless, Mr. Hinkson did not respond to my complaint. Obviously, he was comfortable with *lawyers who are reluctant to provide legal service to the public and justices who hesitate to sign their orders*. I had no choice, but file a legal action against Mr. Hinkson. Like my previous case, Mr. Justice Austin F. Cullen dismissed it and **failed to sign his order.**

I wrote a letter to Mr. Justice Cullen dated August 30, 2014 and asked him to sign his order. Instead of getting the signed order, I got the above email from you. You told me that this case was concluded.

As a Lawyer you are supposed to know that no legal action can conclude **UNLESS PRESIDING JUSTICE SIGNS HIS ORDER. AN UNSIGNED COURT ORDER IS NOT A VALID COURT ORDER.**

Please, take a look at the attached order I got from the Supreme Court Records and let me know if you can see the signature of Mr. Justice Cullen on it. If you cannot see the signature, **PLEASE** ask him to sign his order.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

October 2, 2014

Registered mail

Final notice - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

The Honourable Associate Chief Justice Austin F. Cullen
Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime. I reported the incident to RCMP. RCMP identified the offender, but did not charge him with criminal offence; because, ICBC assumed the liability of the crime. Assuming the liability of a criminal offence is the same as committing the offence. Therefore, my offender-in-Law is ICBC. I am not the first victim of ICBC; **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year.** (http://www.icbc.com/about-ICBC/news_room/icbc_stats).

As a surviving victim of hit and run crime, **I have a legal obligation to take my case to the Court.** Otherwise, if the victims do not bring their offenders to justice, it is impossible to prevent crime. I have been struggling to fulfil my duty to bring my offender-in-Law to justice for over five years.

As alleged by John D. Waddell, the Defendant's representative, you dismissed my recent case, S143080, at my absence, on June 24, 2014. I was not able to attend the hearing; because, Mr. Waddell did not give me proper notice; instead, he sent me an email. I did not take his email seriously; because, as a reasonable person, I did not expect that a case intended **to prevent hit and run crime**, can be dismissed by an application. Nevertheless, Mr. Waddell claimed that he successfully aborted my case.

He sent me an *order* and a *transcript of the reasons for judgment* without any signature on them. He tried to make me believe that the court order he sent me without your signature was a valid court order. Obviously, if someone believes that an *unsigned court order* is a *valid court order*, it is a "valid court order". Nevertheless, it takes a fool to believe such a nonsense.

Therefore, I would like to confirm with you that the attached Order and the Reasons of Judgment are your decisions. If they are, please, sign those documents and mail to me; otherwise, I will be legally obliged to file a legal action against you.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. Court Order, Reasons for Judgment

Oct. 10 2014

10:49 AM
(2 hours
ago)

Leacock, Jill

to ron

Mr. Korkut

Please see my attached letter in response to yours of October 2, 2014 regarding the order made by Associate Chief Justice Cullen on June 24, 2014 striking out your claim against Chief Justice Hinkson.

*K.J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
British Columbia Supreme Court*

2 Attachments

Ron Korkut <ronkor51@gmail.com>

1:25 PM (3
minutes
ago)

to Jill

Mrs. Leacock,

Please send me a copy of this letter and underline or highlight the words that - UNEQUIVOCALLY - obviates the necessity of signing his/her own order for a Supreme Court Justice, in PD-26 and Rule 13-1(1). If you fail to do so, I have no choice, but include your name in my statement of claim.

Ron Korkut



THE SUPREME COURT
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

THE LAW COURTS
800 SMITHE STREET
VANCOUVER, B.C.
V6Z 2E1

By [Email: ron@ethicsfirst.ca](mailto:ron@ethicsfirst.ca)

October 10, 2014

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1 N 1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Your letter of 2 October, 2014 to the Supreme Court

I am Legal Counsel for the Supreme Court. I am writing at the request of Associate Chief Justice Cullen to respond to your letter of October 2, 2014.

On June 24, 2014, Associate Chief Justice Cullen made an order dismissing the proceedings you had commenced against Chief Justice Hinkson. That application was heard in chambers. Associate Chief Justice Cullen's order striking your claim was made pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9-5(1), on the basis that the claim disclosed no reasonable cause of action. Costs were awarded against you.

When an order is made following an application in chambers, as distinct from a trial, the Court's practice is that the order is checked to ensure it coincides with the court clerk's notes; then if the order has been approved by all parties whose approval is required, the registrar then signs the order (either digitally or otherwise), affixes the seal of the Court, and enters the order. That is the process which was followed here. Your approval of the form of order was dispensed with by Associate Chief Justice Cullen. Mr. Waddell approved the form of order, the registrar checked the order, affixed the court seal and entered the order in the registry. The order is now final.

The Court's practice relating to signing and entry of orders made following an application in chambers which I have described above is set out in Practice Direction 26. I am forwarding a copy of PD 26 with this letter. I would also refer you to Supreme Court Rule 13-1(1) which deals with signing and entry of orders.

As you will see if you take the time to acquaint yourself with PD 26 and Rule 13-1(1), Associate Chief Justice Cullen's order of June 24, 2014 is valid and enforceable, and was made and entered in conformity with the governing rules of Supreme Court practice and procedure.

Yours truly,

K.J. Leacock

K. J. Leacock
Legal Counsel, BC Supreme Court



Effective Date: 2010/ 07/ 12

Number: PD- 26

Title:

Practice Direction

Orders

Summary:

This Practice Direction provides direction in relation to aspects of the process for entry of orders.

Direction:

Orders made following appearance in chambers

1. An order submitted to the registry for entry following an appearance in chambers will be checked by the registrar against the clerk's notes.
2. If the order submitted corresponds to the clerk's notes and is not otherwise questioned by the registrar, the registrar will sign and enter the order.
3. If the order submitted to the registry does not correspond to the clerk's notes or is otherwise questioned by the registrar, the order must be approved by the judge or master before the order is entered.

Orders made after a trial

4. An order made after a trial must be approved by a judge before the order is entered.

Orders made pursuant to written reasons for judgment

5. An order made following the issuance of written reasons for judgment by a judge or master, must be approved by the judge or master before the order is entered.

Desk orders

6. A draft order in respect of an application of which notice is not required is submitted to a judge or master once the registrar is satisfied that the appropriate material in support of the application has been filed. The judge or master will make the order if satisfied that the application is proper and the material is sufficient, after which the order will be entered.

Approval as to form in name of law firm not acceptable

7. An order which includes the endorsement "Approved as to Form" must be signed by the party or the lawyer for the party; an approval as to form in the name of a law firm is not acceptable.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bauman", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert J. Bauman Chief Justice

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 6, 2014

Final notice - PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Jill Leacock, Legal Counsel
The Law Courts
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mrs. Leacock,

Please send me a copy of this letter and underline or highlight the words that - UNEQUIVOCALLY - obviates the necessity of signing his/her own order for a Supreme Court Justice, in PD-26 and Rule 13-1(1). If you fail to do so, I have no choice, but include your name in my statement of claim.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



THE SUPREME COURT
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

THE LAW COURTS
800 SMITHE STREET
VANCOUVER, B.C.
V6Z 2E1

Ron Korkut

ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Your letters of October 15, 2014 and November 6, 2014

In my letter to you of October 2, 2014, I described to you in detail, the process pertaining to signing and entry of Orders. I am forwarding a further copy of that letter.

I will not be responding further to your request for information about the signing of Orders, Mr. Korkut, as you are simply refusing to accept information with which you have already been provided.

Yours truly

KJ Leacock

J. Leacock
Legal Counsel.

John Waddell

Nov. 09, 2014

3:45 PM (1
hour ago)

to me

Dear Mr Korkut;

I am seeking instructions for a response to your enquiry below. However, before I go to the effort of putting together a Bill of Costs, does your enquiry mean that you intend to pay my client's reasonable court costs? If not, is there any other reason for your question?

Thank you.

John D.Waddell, Q.C.

Lawyer, Mediator and Arbitrator

jwaddell@waddellraioni.com

Waddell Raponi

Lawyers

1002 Wharf Street

Victoria, British Columbia

Canada V8W 1T4

<http://waddellraioni.com/>

Ph: (250) 385-4311

Fax: (250) 385-2012

From: Ron Korkut [<mailto:ronkor51@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, November 09, 2014 2:33 PM

To: John Waddell

Subject: Court Costs

Ron Korkut <ronkor51@gmail.com>

Nov 9 (9 days ago)

to John

Mr. Waddell,
Please, let me know the amount of court costs?

Ron Korkut

John Waddell

3:45 PM (1 hour ago)

to me

Dear Mr Korkut;

I am seeking instructions for a response to your enquiry below. However, before I go to the effort of putting together a Bill of Costs, does your enquiry mean that you intend to pay my client's reasonable court costs? If not, is there any other reason for your question?

Thank you.

John D.Waddell, Q.C.
Lawyer, Mediator and Arbitrator
jwaddell@waddellraioni.com

Waddell Raponi
Lawyers
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria, British Columbia
Canada V8W 1T4
<http://waddellraioni.com/>
Ph: [\(250\) 385-4311](tel:(250)385-4311)
Fax: [\(250\) 385-2012](tel:(250)385-2012)

From: Ron Korkut [mailto:ronkor51@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 09, 2014 2:33 PM
To: John Waddell
Subject: Court Costs

Mr. Waddell,

You asked me a very difficult question about a very sensitive issue. Nevertheless, I would like to answer your question, if you don't mind telling me the reason for your application dated June 24, 2014 and aborting my vitally significant public interest legal action, knowing that I am a survivor of a potentially fatal hit and run crime and my offender assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 10, injure and cripple 2,200 innocent people ever year in our province.

Ron Korkut

John Waddell

7:52 AM (8
hours ago)

to me

Mr Korkut;

The Reasons for Judgement of ACJ Cullen explain why we applied to have your action against Chief Justice Hinkson struck out.

Your concerns did not provide a legal basis for a claim against the Chief Justice.

Please let me know why you asked for the amount of our claim for court costs and whether you are prepared to voluntarily pay a reasonable amount for those costs.

John D.Waddell, Q.C.

Lawyer, Mediator and Arbitrator

jwaddell@waddellraponi.com

Waddell Raponi

Lawyers

1002 Wharf Street

Victoria, British Columbia

Canada V8W 1T4

<http://waddellraponi.com/>

Ph: [\(250\) 385-4311](tel:(250)385-4311)

Fax: [\(250\) 385-2012](tel:(250)385-2012)

From: Ron Korkut [mailto:ronkor51@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 5:43 PM

To: John Waddell

Subject: Re: Court Costs

Mr. Waddell,

I am sorry but, I did not ask you the reasons for Mr. Justice Cullen dismissed my case and declined to sign his order. That is a separate issue.

I asked you the reasons for **your filing an application to abort my legal action**, knowing that I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I have been trying to bring my offender to justice for the sake of public protection, almost for five years. You were also aware of the fact that your conduct was tantamount to obstruction of justice.

The reason for my asking this question is that, in your application, **you did not cite any authority** (reason) to prove the legitimacy of **assuming the liability of hit and run crimes** where the offenders are identified. You, also failed to cite any authority to demonstrate that the Chief Justice had no obligation to respond to a member of the public complaining about wrong court procedures, such as issuing unsigned court orders and **attempting to exact money relying on unsigned court orders**.

As soon as I get a reasonable answer from you, I will answer your question.

Honestly,

Ron Korkut



THE SUPREME COURT
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

THE LAW COURTS
800 SMITHE STREET
VANCOUVER, B.C.
V6Z 2E1

November 17, 2014

Ron Korkut

ron@ethicsfirst.ca

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Your letters of October 15, 2014 and November 6, 2014

In my letter to you of October 2, 2014, I described to you in detail, the process pertaining to signing and entry of Orders. I am forwarding a further copy of that letter.

I will not be responding further to your request for information about the signing of Orders, Mr. Korkut, as you are simply refusing to accept information with which you have already been provided.

Yours truly

KJ Leacock

J. Leacock
Legal Counsel.

to Jill

Mrs. Leacock,

Thanks for clarifying the lack your intention to respond to my request. For a reasonable person, it is conclusive that there is NO STATEMENT in the PD-26 and Rule 13-1(1) that obviates the necessity of signing court orders for the justices. As you may understand, I am legally obliged to raise this issue to the attention of Administration of Justice for the protection of the Public. Law may not tolerate embezzling money from the public with an unsigned court order.

Ron Korkut

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 2:04 PM, Leacock, Jill <[Jill.Leacock\(@.courts.gov.bc.ca\)](mailto:Jill.Leacock(@.courts.gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Mr. Korkut

Please see my letters, attached. I will not be corresponding with you further.

*K. J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
British Columbia Supreme Court*

Ron Korkut <ronkor51@gmail.com>

3:03 PM (1
minute ago)

to Jill

Mrs. Leacock,

Thanks for clarifying the lack your intention to respond to my request. For a reasonable person, it is conclusive that there is NO STATEMENT in the PD-26 and Rule 13-1(1) that obviates the necessity of signing court orders for the justices. As you may understand, I am legally obliged to raise this issue to the attention of Administration of Justice for the protection of the Public. Law may not tolerate embezzling money from the public with an unsigned court order.

Ron Korkut

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 2:04 PM, Leacock, Jill <Jill.Leacock@courts.gov.bc.ca> wrote:
Mr. Korkut

Please see my letters, attached. I will not be corresponding with you further.

*K. J. Leacock, Legal Counsel
British Columbia Supreme Court*

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 22, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

John D. Waddell Q. C.
1002 Wharf Street
Victoria BC V8W 1T4

Dear Mr. Waddell,

Re: Your email dated November 18, 2014

In your email, you asked me:

“Please let me know why you asked for the amount of our claim for court costs and whether you are prepared to voluntarily pay a reasonable amount for those costs.”

I wrote you that I would answer your question if you answer mine:

“The reasons for **your filing an application to abort my legal action**, knowing that I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime and I have been trying to bring my offender to justice for the sake of public protection, for over five years.”

As a lawyer you are supposed to know that to dismiss a legal action, it is necessary cite an applicable **authority or a principle of Law to demonstrate the plaintiff’s grief is a result of a lawful action.**

You have not cited any authority to substantiate that the Chief Justice had no obligation to respond to a member of the public complaining about improper court procedures, such as *issuing unsigned court orders* and **attempting to exact money by using unsigned court orders.**

Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



November 26, 2014

Via Mail

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Correspondence dated November 22, 2014

I am a lawyer in the Ministry of Justice responsible for the retainer of John Waddell, Q.C. in your proceedings against Chief Justice Hinkson.

Mr. Waddell was instructed to apply to dismiss your claim against the Chief Justice because that claim was without legal merit.

In particular, there is no basis at law to bring purported public interest litigation against any judge of the court, acting in that capacity.

We are instructed to apply for an order for costs against you in a lump sum amount. The notice of application and affidavit in support will be forwarded in due course.

In the meantime, please direct any further communication to me, not Mr. Waddell.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Butler
Barrister and Solicitor

RB/cr

cc John Waddell, Q.C.

Ministry of
Justice

Legal Services Branch
Constitutional and Administrative Law

Mailing Address:
PO BOX 9280 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Location:
1001 Douglas Street
Victoria BC

Telephone: 250 356-6559
Facsimile: 250 356-9154

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 27, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Richard Butler
Ministry of Justice-Legal Services
POBOX 9280 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Dear Mr. Butler,

Re: Korkut v. Cristopher E. Hinkson, S143080

Mr. John D. Waddell informed me that he had abandoned this case; because, he was not able to cite any authority to substantiate that the Chief Justice has no obligation to respond to complaints about improper court procedures, such as *issuing unsigned court orders* and *attempting to exact money by using unsigned court orders*.

He advised me to communicate with you regarding this matter. My first question is:

Is there any possibility of **resolving this vitally important public interest legal action**, within the bounds of LAW, other than resorting to legal action?

Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Encl. Preliminary claim

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

December 1, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Richard Butler
Ministry of Justice-Legal Services
POBOX 9280 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Dear Mr. Butler,

Re: Your letter dated Nov. 26, 2014

In your letter, you did not answer my question.

I do not know who instructed you to apply for an order for costs against me; but, for prudence sake, you have to answer the following question, before proceeding.

Is it LAWFUL to apply for an order for costs by relying on a dismissal order that was not signed by the justice who allegedly issued the order; against, a victim of hit and run crime who has been struggling to bring his offender to justice for over five years?

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



December 3, 2014

By Email Attachment

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Cristopher E. Hinkson, S143080

This is further to my letter to you dated today.

Mr. Waddell has since informed me that the Order has not in fact been signed by ACJ Cullen. Rather it was approved by the registry and entered in the normal manner.

So to answer your question, my instructions are to apply to the court to settle the costs awarded under that order as a lump sum. I believe it is lawful to apply for an order for lump sum costs relying on a dismissal order, whether or not it has been signed by the justice who issued the order, provided it has been approved by the registry and entered in the normal manner. You may disagree. The judge on my proposed application will then have to decide the question. If you still disagree, your appropriate recourse would be to appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Butler
Barrister and Solicitor

RB/cr



December 3, 2014

By Email Attachment

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Cristopher E. Hinkson, S143080

I write as counsel for the Attorney General of British Columbia and Province of British Columbia in relation to the matters raised in your correspondence with Mr. Waddell.

As you know, Mr. Waddell was counsel to Chief Justice Hinkson. Mr. Waddell's involvement in this matter is ended. For clarity, I am not counsel for the Chief Justice and this letter is not written on his behalf.

This responds to your email to dated November 27, 2014, and attached unfiled notice of civil claim against Mr. Waddell, Associate Chief Justice Cullen and Ms. Leacock, as well as to your further email to dated December 1, 2014.

Dealing with your second email first, Mr. Waddell advises that the dismissal order has in fact been signed by ACJ Cullen. My instructions are to apply to the court to settle the costs awarded under that order as a lump sum. In answer to your question, I believe it is lawful to apply for an order for lump sum costs relying on a dismissal order, whether or not it has been signed by the justice who issued the order. You may disagree. The judge on my proposed application will then have to decide the question. If you still disagree, your appropriate recourse would be to appeal.

Turning to your first email, you have an established pattern of suing lawyers who seek, and judges who grant, orders you disagree with. One purpose of the rule of law, under which Canada is governed, is to bring finality to disputes. Your ongoing conduct is contrary to that principle and to the rule against vexatious litigation. You may disagree with Justice Smith's ruling in your hit-and-run case. But the law does not allow you to revisit the merits of that dispute and that ruling through a succession of further lawsuits against the officers of the court who were or may become involved.

If a judge rules against a person in a case, that does not give the person a basis to bring a lawsuit against the judge, or against the lawyer who sought the ruling. If your approach were allowed, a judge -- by making a decision one way or the other -- would in every case become


Ministry of Justice	Legal Services Branch Constitutional and Administrative Law	Mailing Address: PO BOX 9280 STN PROV GOVT Victoria BC V8W 9.17	Location: 1001 Douglas Street Victoria BC
		Telephone: 250 356-6559 Facsimile: 250 356-9154	

open to being sued by one party or the other. To avoid that absurd result, the common law has long provided judges with immunity from liability for their decisions,

As for lawyers, the law recognizes rare circumstances where, by bringing an application, lawyers may be found personally liable for costs. Those circumstances do not include where the lawyer's application is successful - that is, where the judge in the case rules in their favour on the facts and the law. Again, if that happens and the unsuccessful party disagrees, the appropriate recourse is to appeal.

If you persist in your approach, including by filing the notice of claim attached to your first email, the Attorney General will seek an order dismissing that claim and blocking you from commencing any litigation against any judicial officer or other officer of the British Columbia Supreme Court, including lawyers, previously involved in a case or matter involving you, or against her or the government, without first obtaining formal leave of the court.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Butler', written in a cursive style.

Richard Butler
Barrister and Solicitor

RB/cr

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

December 3, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Richard Butler
Ministry of Justice-Legal Services
POBOX 9280 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Dear Mr. Butler,

Re: Your letter dated Dec. 3, 2014

In your letter, you wrote me that:

1. I believe it is lawful to apply for an order for jump sum costs relying on a dismissal order, whether or not it has been signed by the justice who issued the order.

.....

2. If you persist in your approach, including by filing the notice of claim attached to your first email, the Attorney General will seek an order dismissing that claim and blocking you from commencing any litigation against any judicial officer or other officer

1. Certainly, you are entitled to believe anything you like. Nevertheless, as a lawyer, you may not use your influence to make a member of the public believe that an **unsigned court order is a valid legal document** and attempt to swindle money from the member of the public, by using an unsigned order.

2. As a surviving victim of a potentially fatal hit and run crime, **I have a natural duty and legal obligation to bring my offender to justice**. I am sure, you do understand what “duty” and “legal obligation” mean.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

December 4, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Richard Butler
Ministry of Justice-Legal Services
POBOX 9280 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Dear Mr. Butler,

Re: Your second letter dated Dec. 3, 2014

The duty of the Court of Appeal is to review **unintentional judgment errors** made by a judge in a lower court. As you may discern from my statement of claim and the reasons for judgment, it is impossible to classify Mr. Justice Cullen's conduct as an unintentional-minor error. His hesitation to sign his own judgment is a good indicative of the seriousness of his wrong; because, no reasonable person would fear to sign his own decision made in good faith.

Furthermore, it is improper for the Court of Appeal to entertain an appeal from an **unsigned judgment**.

Therefore, you may not expect me to appeal any decision based on the unsigned judgment of Mr. Justice Cullen. If you persist in proceeding in the direction of your beliefs, instead of following the rule of Law, I will be obliged to include your name in my statement of claim as well.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First



December 5, 2014

By Email and Mail

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby, BC V5G 1N1

Dear Mr. Korkut:

Re: Korkut v. Cristopher E. Hinkson, S143080

This is in response to your letter dated December 1, 2014, received today. It appears to have crossed in transit with my letters to you dated December 3, 2014.

For ease of reference, my answer to your question in is follows:

In my legal opinion, it is lawful to apply for an order for lump sum costs relying on a dismissal order, whether or not it has been signed by the justice who issued the order.

In response to your email to me dated December 4, 2014, my answer is not intended to influence you, one way or another.

If you believe it is unlawful to apply for an order for a lump sum costs in those circumstances, you can make that argument to the judicial officer before whom my application is heard. My office will give you formal notice of the application in accordance with the British Columbia *Supreme Court Civil Rules*.

If the judicial officer rules against you, and you still disagree, your recourse is to appeal Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R Butler".

Richard Butler
Barrister and Solicitor

RB/cr

Ministry of
Justice

Legal Services Branch
Constitutional and Administrative Law

Mailing Address:
PO BOX 9280 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Location:
1001 Douglas Street
Victoria BC

Telephone: 250 356-6559
Facsimile: 250 356-9154

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

December 5, 2014

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Richard Butler
Ministry of Justice-Legal Services
POBOX 9280 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Dear Mr. Butler,

Re: Your letter dated Dec. 5, 2014

If, in your opinion, it is lawful to apply for an order for lump sum costs relying on a dismissal order, whether or not it has been signed by the justice who issued the order, you may go ahead and practice what you believe is lawful.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, attempting to obtain an “order for lump sum costs” relying on an unsigned dismissal order has no merit, unless you succeed in **convincing your victim** to believe that an **order made by relying on an unsigned judgment is a valid order**.

I assure you that, I will not pay any court costs, as long as **Mr. Justice Austin F. Cullen** refuses to sign his own judgment, as required by the Law.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

July 22, 2015

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Registered mail

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

Mrs. Heidi L. McBride sent me the attached order entered on July 13, 2015. She alleged that you had made the order regarding my case S155390. I showed the order to my friends, none of them believed that you had made the order and signed it; because:

- 1. The order INFRINGES my RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender to justice and,**
- 2. Your full name was NOT printed above or below the signature.**

As you may know, court order is a significant legal document; therefore, it **must be PROPERLY SIGNED** by the person who is authorized to issue it.

For your convenience, I retyped the order, word by word and added your full name to the space allotted for authorized signature. Please, sign the attached order and send it to me within a reasonable time frame. I am sure, you will not hesitate to sign it, if you have made it **in good faith** and you believe it is consistent with the **Section 252, Criminal Code of Canada**.

Mrs. McBride told me on the phone that *you will not sign the order*. If you believe, signing your court order falls beyond your job description, I am willing to pay for this service. Please, send me the bill along with the **signed order**. Thanks, in advance.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Att'd: Order entered without proper signature,
Order to be signed.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Between:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

And:

JANICE R. DILLON

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

BEFORE (THE HONOURABLE)
(CHIEF JUSTICE HINKSON) 13 July 2015
()
()

THIS COURT, on its own motion and without a hearing, at Vancouver, British Columbia, on Monday, July 13, 2015 **ORDERS AND DECLARES THAT:**

1. The Notice of Civil Claim filed by Ron Korkut in Vancouver on July 2, 2015 in Supreme Court file No. S155390 Vancouver Registry is a nullity and is set aside as being filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 in the Supreme Court file No. S150231 Vancouver Registry.
2. No person is obliged to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim described in paragraph 1, nor to any other process or document filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 that a court registry may have inadvertently filed or received.

Christopher E. Hinkson, Chief Justice

Signature

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

August 22, 2015

OPEN LETTER TO CHIEF JUSTICE

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

I am a victim of potentially fatal hit and run crime committed under the liability of ICBC, on May 31, 2009. Therefore, my offender was not charged with criminal offence. After researching the frequency of this incident, I discovered that **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and maim 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year.** (ICBC quick statistics). Not to mention, exacting half a billion dollars from the Public to pay the damage done by the hit and run criminals, against the will of the Public. Hit and run is a **CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada. Therefore, it is impossible to justify the legitimacy of **providing financial benefits to hit and run criminals under the name of “accident insurance benefits”, where criminal offenders are identified.**

As a surviving **victim of hit and run crime**, I have a legal obligation to take legal action against my offender-in-law, ICBC; because, it is impossible to prevent crime, if victims fail to **take legal action** against their offenders.

I have been struggling to bring my offender-in-law to justice for over six years:

1. The lawyers refused to provide me with the legal service I needed to file my case.
2. The Law Society stated that the lawyers have no obligation to provide legal service to the Public.
3. In order to find out who has the legal obligation to provide legal service to the Public, I filed a civil claim against the Executive Director of the Law Society, **Timothy McGee**.
4. Mr. Justice **Nathan H. Smith** dismissed my case with costs and refused to sign his order, as required by the Law.
5. I raised the issue to your attention. You ignored my complaint.
6. I filed a civil claim against you on the grounds of breach of duty.
7. Mr. Justice **Austin F. Cullen** dismissed my legal action without adjudicating the issue before the Court and refused to sign his dismissal order, as required by the Law.
8. I was obliged to file a legal action against Austin F. Cullen on the grounds of breach of judicial duty.
9. Madam Justice **Janice R. Dillon** dismissed my case and declared me “vexatious litigant”.
10. I filed a legal action against Janice R. Dillon. You ordered that no one has obligation to respond to my civil claim and you refused to sign your order.

As a member of the public, I am concerned with protecting the **credibility of our Administration of Justice**; because, our peaceful enjoyment of life depends on it. Likewise, I have due respect for your **Honourable** status as a Chief Justice. Nevertheless, under the circumstances, it is impossible for me to sustain my high esteem of you and your office, for the following reasons:

- 1. Knowing that I was a victim of hit and run crime** who had been struggling to bring my offender to justice for over six years, **you declared me “vexatious litigant” and obstructed my access to court services.** Now, I am not able to bring my offender to JUSTICE.
- 2. Despite my numerous attempts, you declined to sign your order PROPERLY, AS REQUIRED BY THE LAW.**

I believe, you have a misunderstanding of the LAW, your DUTY as a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia and the necessity of signing legal documents properly. Therefore, I feel obliged to **remind** you the following principles of LAW that you are supposed know and observe.

- 1. The objective of the LAW is to prevent crime and protect the Public; NOT to provide the privilege of selling compulsory accident insurance and provide financial benefits to hit and run criminals under the title of “*accident insurance benefits*”.**
- 2. Your DUTY as a Chief Justice is to supervise the Supreme Court and ensure that court services are provided to the Public. Your duty is NOT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE to a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to JUSTICE, by the way issuing unsigned court orders.**
- 3. A court order is a significant legal document; therefore, it must have an authorized signature under the full name of the justice who has made the order. Court orders without proper signature are NOT VALID and NOT ENFORCEABLE.**

Please, observe the LAW and comply with the requirements with your DUTY by signing your order dated July 13, 2015, S155390, or allow me to file a criminal action against my offender, so that I can fulfill my DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE.

Nevertheless, if you fail to respond and ignore your DUTY, I will be obliged to publicize this issue, so that the Public can **investigate** and **protect** themselves from your **malpractice of LAW**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Att’d: Order to be signed. (Page 3)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Between:

RON KORKUT

PLAINTIFF

And:

JANICE R. DILLON

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

BEFORE (THE HONOURABLE)
(CHIEF JUSTICE HINKSON) 13 July 2015
()
()

THIS COURT, on its own motion and without a hearing, at Vancouver, British Columbia, on Monday, July 13, 2015 **ORDERS AND DECLARES THAT:**

1. The Notice of Civil Claim filed by Ron Korkut in Vancouver on July 2, 2015 in Supreme Court file No. S155390 Vancouver Registry is a nullity and is set aside as being filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 in the Supreme Court file No. S150231 Vancouver Registry.
2. No person is obliged to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim described in paragraph 1, nor to any other process or document filed in contravention of the Order of Madam Justice Dillon made March 19, 2015 that a court registry may have inadvertently filed or received.

Christopher E. Hinkson, Chief Justice

Signature

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca

November 4, 2015

SECOND OPEN LETTER TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE – Registered mail

The Honourable Christopher E. Hinkson,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Chief Justice,

1. UNUSUAL BUSINES PRACTICE

I am a victim of **potentially fatal hit and run crime** committed under the *liability* of ICBC, on May 31, 2009. Therefore, my offender was NOT charged with criminal offence; even though, he was identified on the next day. After searching the frequency of hit and run crimes, I discovered that **ICBC assumes the liability of 49,000 hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and maim 2,200 innocent citizens of British Columbia, every year.** (ICBC quick statistics). Furthermore, ICBC, **forces the Public to pay** (estimated half a billion dollars) for the damages done by the hit and run criminals, by the way of selling *compulsory insurance service*. For a reasonable person, **selling insurance service**, under the threat of restricting the peoples' RIGHT to use their vehicles, cannot be associated with the LAW and JUSTICE; sales contracts - **under threat** - have **NO legal merits**.

2. HIT AND RUN IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE

Hit and run is a **CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the section 252, Criminal Code of Canada. Therefore, it is impossible to justify the legitimacy of **providing insurance benefits for hit and run criminals under the name of "accident insurance"**, where criminal offenders are identified.

3. DUTY OF VICTIMS OF CRIME

The victims of crime **MUST** take their offenders to COURT; otherwise, **it is impossible to prevent crime**. Therefore, it is my DUTY to bring my offender to JUSTICE. In order to discharge my DUTY, I have struggled to file a legal action against my offender-in-law, ICBC, for over six years. Nevertheless, the members of the Law Society and the Judiciary obstructed my access to the Court Services.

4. OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE TO VICTIMS OF CRIME

Here is the list of the OBSTRUCTIONS, I have faced, since May 2009.

1. **The lawyers refused to provide me with the legal service I needed to file legal action against my offender.** If the lawyers fail to provide legal service to the victims of crime, they cannot bring their offenders to Justice; therefore, it is impossible to prevent crime.
2. **The Law Society failed to investigate the issue. The Executive Director of the Law Society, Timothy E. McGee stated that the lawyers have no obligation to provide legal service to the victims of crime.** If the Law Society fails to enforce the rules of professional conduct, the lawyers may only provide legal service to the persons they like, and legal service may not be available for everyone.
3. **Justice Nathan H. Smith dismissed my legal action against Timothy E. McGee with costs and refused to sign his order, in compliance with the procedural norms.** If the members of the judiciary fail to enforce the Law to ensure that legal services are available for everyone - including the victims of crime - victims of crime cannot bring their offenders to Justice; therefore, it is impossible to prevent crime.
4. **Legal representative of Timothy E. McGee, Michael G. Armstrong, attempted to exact the court costs based on the unsigned - INVALID - court order.** If the members of the Law Society have no hesitation to swindle money from the victims of crime, *using unsigned court orders*, it impossible to trust the members of the Law Society.
5. **The Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson, refused to investigate my complaint regarding the enforcement of INVALID court orders.** If the Chief Justice turns blind eye to the legal chicaneries perpetrated under his supervision, it is impossible to prevent corruption in the Court Services.
6. **Justice Austin F. Cullen dismissed my legal action against the Chief Justice, without referring to any authority that relaxes the Chief Justice's DUTY to investigate unusual practice of Law in the Courts.** Therefore, he refused to sign his order, in compliance with the procedural norms. An Honourable Justice cannot be associated with dismissing the legal action of a victim of crime, *without adjudicating the issue before the Court*, and refusing to sign the dismissal order, in compliance with the procedural norms.
7. **Justice Janice R. Dillon dismissed my legal action against Austin F. Cullen and declared me "vexatious litigant".** If a member of the judiciary dismisses the legal action of a victim of crime who is struggling to bring his offender to Justice and declares him "VEXATIOUS LITIGANT", obviously, her status is NOT any better than the CRIMINAL WHO OFFENDED THE VICTIM.
8. **The Chief Justice, issued a court order stating that no person has obligation to respond to my civil claim against Janice R. Dillon and he refused to sign his order, despite my numerous requests.**

THAT IS: You have disregarded my RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender to Justice and OBSTRUCTED my access to the Court Services.

5. DUTY TO INFORM THE PUBLIC

If a **victim of crime** is not permitted to discharge his DUTY to bring his offender to JUSTICE, the victim must blow the whistle; otherwise, it is impossible to prevent crime and corruption in the Court Services. Therefore, **my present DUTY is to PUBLICIZE this legal chicanery, to PREVENT HARM TO THE PUBLIC.**

6. CONSEQUENCES OF IGNORING THE WRONG

It is prudent to CORRECT THE WRONG on sight; otherwise, it multiplies quickly and may get out of control.

7. SOLEMN REQUEST

MY LORD,

You are the LORDSHIP who is ENTRUSTED and **empowered** to supervise the Supreme Court of British Columbia; so that, the Public can seek JUSTICE in the Courts of Law.

You are the **role model** for the Public to demonstrate the necessity of adhering with the rules of **LAW** and **legal ethics**. YOUR HONOURABLE STATUS cannot be associated with helping criminals by **keeping their victims away from the Administration of Justice.**

Your DUTY is to **protect the Public** against criminals; NOT to protect criminals by restricting the victims' access to the Court Services. Therefore, your conduct is a PATENT, DELIBERATE and SERIOUS WRONG that may **bring the Administration of Justice into disrepute.**

As a member of the **Public, I solemnly request that you correct your WRONG**, for the best interest of the Pubic, - including yourself - and, PLEASE, allow me to exercise my RIGHT and DUTY to bring my offender-in-law, ICBC, to JUSTICE.
This is the requirement of the LAW.

Respectfully,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Registered mail

DECLARATION OF INDEMNITY

The Honourable **Christopher E. Hinkson**,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Hinkson,

A - THE STATEMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

1. I am a **victim of a potentially fatal hit and run crime**. Therefore, I have a **DUTY to bring my offender-in-law, ICBC to JUSTICE**; because ICBC assumed the liability of the CRIME. I have struggled to discharge my DUTY for over seven years.
2. The members of the Law Society refused to provide me with legal service I needed in order to carry out my DUTY, contradicting with the Canons of Legal Ethics 2.1-5 (c). **Lawyers' failure to provide legal service NECESSARY for the victims** is tantamount to **obstructing justice**; because, ordinary people cannot sue their offenders, on their own.
3. **Michael G. Armstrong filed a court application to dismiss my legal action**. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because dismissing the legal action of the victim is tantamount to *exonerating the offender*.
4. **Justice Nathan H. Smith** cooperated with Michael G. Armstrong and dismissed my legal action. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because it is impossible to serve JUSTICE in a Court where the lawyers and judges have no respect for victims' RIGHT and DUTY to sue their **offenders**.
5. I have struggled to resolve this legal chicanery through litigation process, for three years. Finally, you labeled me "*vexatious litigant*" and issued an order without a proper signature stating that:

"No person is obliged to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim (my claim #S155390) ...", July 13, 2015.
6. ICBC, *blatantly*, **sells insurance under the threat** of *seizing drivers licenses* and **FORCES** the innocent people to pay all the damages **reckless drivers** and **hit and run criminals** cause; even though, sale under **duress** is NOT LAWFULL.
7. ICBC **provides insurance benefits for criminal offenders**, under the cover of "*accident insurance*", including the cases where offenders are identified; even though, it is NOT LAWFULL to insure criminal offenders.
8. Since hit and run criminals are covered under the cover of "*accident insurance*", **criminal offenders are NOT PROSECUTED**. Therefore, hit and run crime is extremely **rampant** in the Province of British Columbia.

9. Every year, in British Columbia, ICBC assumes the liability of **49,000 counts of hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200** peoples;

10. ICBC **FORCES** innocent people to pay for the estimated **damages of half a billion dollars** caused by *hit and run criminals*.

B – OBVIOUS CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FACTS:

Any reasonable person can draw the following **final conclusions**:

1. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know the intent of the Law*; because, it is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of CRIME**, if he knows, *the intent of the Law is to protect victims; NOT criminal offenders*.

2. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that victims of crime had a RIGHT and DUTY to bring their offenders to JUSTICE*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **strike down a victim's case**, if he knows, *the victim has a RIGHT to sue his offender*.

3. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that hit and run was a criminal offence as per the Criminal Code of Canada, Section 252*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of hit and run crime**, if he knows, *hit and run is a criminal offence*.

4. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that lawyers could not file court applications to abort the legal actions of the victims of crime*; because such an action is tantamount to encouraging the offenders and **promote crime**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **cooperate with a lawyer who attempts to abort the legal action of a victim of crime**, if he knows, *aborting the legal action of a bona fide victim is NOT lawful*.

5. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that sale contracts under duress could not be enforced*; because they are UNLAWFUL. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss a legal action that is involved with selling insurance under duress**, if he knows that, such a business practice is **not lawful**.

6. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that a court order was a legal document that must be properly signed by the presiding justice*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **refuse to sign his order in compliance with the procedural norms**, if he knows a *court order is a significant legal document that must be signed properly*.

7. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson was *not aware of his HONOURABLE STATUS*. It is impossible for a JUSTICE to **undermine** his own reputation, if he is cognizant of his **Lordship**.

8. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that: a justice who dismisses the legal actions of the victims of crime is more dangerous OFFENDER than the persons who actually commit the crimes*.

C – MY REQUEST ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC:

As a member of the Public, I am a **natural representative** of the Public. Therefore, *on behalf of the Public*, I request, that YOU SHOULD UPGRADE YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF LAW and correct your WRONG, if you are willing to serve as **the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. Under the circumstances, it is **inappropriate** for you to act as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Please, let me know, if you will **comply** with the requirements of the **Law of the Land**.

If you fail to do so, you must understand that I will be **obliged to publicize** “**the Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**” and the pertinent legal documents, for the **protection** of the Public.

Publication of this issue may cause **irreversible damage to your reputation**. Therefore, I am obliged to notify you, that **I will not accept any responsibility for your misconduct** and duly **loss of reputation** in the process of **discharging my DUTY TO WARN THE PUBLIC AGAINST THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**; because I have given you sufficient due **notice** to correct your **wrong**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Attd. The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, index for exhibits, exhibits.
(All the legal documents will be published at www.ethicsfirst.ca and www.justsociety.info)

CC. Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister: **Jody Wilson-Raybould**, Justice Minister Canada; **Christy Clark**, Premier: **Suzanne Anton**, Justice Minister BC; **Gregor Robertson**, Mayor of Vancouver; **Bill Fordy**, RCMP; **Catherine Dauvergne**, Dean UBC; **Ralph Goodale**, Minister of Public Safety; **David MacAlister**, SFU; **E. David Crossin**, Bencher Law Society; **Josh Paterson**, BCCLA; **Harold Munro**, Editor SUN; **Natalie Clancy & Eric Rankin**, CBC.

Ron Korkut
5249 Laurel Street
Burnaby BC V5G 1N1
778 378 9009, ron@ethicsfirst.ca
www.ilaw.site, www.ethicsfirst.ca, www.justsociety.info

May 24, 2017

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Registered mail

DECLARATION OF INDEMNITY - Amended

The Honourable **Christopher E. Hinkson**,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Hinkson,

A - THE STATEMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

1. I am a **victim of a potentially fatal hit and run crime**. Therefore, I have a **DUTY to bring my offender-in-law, ICBC to JUSTICE**; because ICBC assumed the liability of the CRIME. I have struggled to discharge my DUTY for eight years.
2. The members of the Law Society refused to provide me with legal service I needed in order to carry out my DUTY, contradicting with the Canons of Legal Ethics 2.1-5 (c). **Lawyers' failure to provide legal service NECESSARY for the victims** is tantamount to **obstructing justice**; because, ordinary people cannot sue their offenders, on their own.
3. **Michael G. Armstrong filed a court application to dismiss my legal action**. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because, dismissing the legal action of the victim is tantamount to *exonerating the offender*.
4. **Justice Nathan H. Smith** cooperated with Michael G. Armstrong and dismissed my legal action. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because it is impossible to serve JUSTICE in a Court where the lawyers and judges have no respect for victims' RIGHT and DUTY to sue their **offenders**.
5. I have struggled to resolve this legal chicanery by filing three legal actions. Finally, you labeled me "*vexatious litigant*" and issued an order without a proper signature stating that:
"No person is obliged to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim (my claim #S155390)", July 13, 2015.
6. ICBC, **FORCES** diligent drivers to pay the damage of **4 billion dollars**, caused by the reckless and criminally negligent drivers, by using Law Enforcement officers. That is NOT LAWFULL; because, selling insurance product **under duress** contradicts with the rules of sales contract.
7. ICBC provides insurance benefits for reckless, **criminally negligent drivers** and **hit an run criminals**; therefore, **crash rate is extremely HIGH, 1/5 or 270,000/year. 81%** of those crashes are attributed to **criminally negligent drivers** and **hit and run criminals**.
8. In **218,000 CRIMINAL CRASHES**, every year, **240 killed, 70,000 injured** an 5-10 thousand peoples suffer for the rest of their lives, *excluding* accidental crashes. Therefore, ICBC MUST BE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE, for the protection of the PUBLIC.

B – OBVIOUS CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FACTS:

Any reasonable person can draw the following **final conclusions**:

1. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know the intent of the Law**; because, it is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of CRIME**, if he knows, *the intent of the Law is to protect victims; NOT criminal offenders*.
2. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that victims of crime had a RIGHT and DUTY to bring their offenders to JUSTICE**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **strike down a victim's case**, if he knows, *the victim has a RIGHT to sue his offender*.
3. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that hit and run was a criminal offence as per the Criminal Code of Canada, Section 252**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of hit and run crime**, if he knows, *hit and run is a criminal offence*.
4. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that lawyers could not file court applications to abort the legal actions of the victims of crime**; because such an action is tantamount to encouraging the offenders and **promote crime**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **cooperate with a lawyer who attempts to abort the legal action of a victim of crime**, if he knows, *aborting the legal action of a bona fide victim is NOT lawful*.
5. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that sale contracts under duress could not be enforced**; because they are UNLAWFUL. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss a legal action that is involved with selling insurance under duress**, if he knows that, such a business practice is **not lawful**.
6. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that a court order was a legal document that must be properly signed by the presiding justice**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **refuse to sign his order in compliance with the procedural norms**, if he knows a *court order is a significant legal document that must be signed properly*.
7. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson was **not aware** of his **HONOURABLE STATUS**. It is impossible for a JUSTICE to **undermine** his own reputation, if he is cognizant of his **Honourable Status**.
8. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did **not know that: a justice who dismisses the legal actions of the victims of crime is more dangerous OFFENDER than the persons who actually commit the crimes**.

C – MY REQUEST ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC:

As a member of the Public, I am a **natural representative** of the Public. Therefore, *on behalf of the Public*, I request, that YOU SHOULD UPGRADE YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF LAW and correct your WRONG, if you are willing to serve as **the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. Allard School of Law Faculty members are willing to help you in this regard.

Under the circumstances, it is **inappropriate** for you to act as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Please, let me know, if you will **comply** with the requirements of the **Law of the Land**.

If you fail to do so, you must understand that I will be **obliged to publicize** “**the Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**” and the pertinent legal documents, for the **protection** of the Public.

Publication of this issue may cause **irreversible damage to your reputation**. Therefore, I am obliged to notify you, that **I will not accept any responsibility for your misconduct** and for the **loss of your reputation** in the process of **discharging my DUTY TO WARN THE PUBLIC AGAINST THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**; because, I have given you sufficient due **notice** to correct your **wrong**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Note: All the legal documents are published at www.ilaw.site, www.ethicsfirst.ca, www.justsociety.info

CC. Allard School of Law Faculty members

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – Registered mail

DECLARATION OF INDEMNITY

The Honourable **Christopher E. Hinkson**,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.
800 Smithe Street
Vancouver BC V6Z 2E1

Dear Mr. Hinkson,

A - THE STATEMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

1. I am a **victim of a potentially fatal hit and run crime**. Therefore, I have a **DUTY to bring my offender-in-law, ICBC to JUSTICE**; because ICBC assumed the liability of the CRIME. I have struggled to discharge my DUTY for over seven years.
2. The members of the Law Society refused to provide me with legal service I needed in order to carry out my DUTY, contradicting with the Canons of Legal Ethics 2.1-5 (c). **Lawyers' failure to provide legal service NECESSARY for the victims** is tantamount to **obstructing justice**; because, ordinary people cannot sue their offenders, on their own.
3. **Michael G. Armstrong filed a court application to dismiss my legal action**. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because dismissing the legal action of the victim is tantamount to *exonerating the offender*.
4. **Justice Nathan H. Smith** cooperated with Michael G. Armstrong and dismissed my legal action. His conduct was NOT LAWFUL; because it is impossible to serve JUSTICE in a Court where the lawyers and judges have no respect for victims' RIGHT and DUTY to sue their **offenders**.
5. I have struggled to resolve this legal chicanery through litigation process, for three years. Finally, you labeled me "*vexatious litigant*" and issued an order without a proper signature stating that:

"No person is obliged to respond to the Notice of Civil Claim (my claim #S155390) ...", July 13, 2015.
6. ICBC, *blatantly*, **sells insurance under the threat of seizing drivers licenses** and **FORCES** the innocent people to pay all the damages **reckless drivers** and **hit and run criminals** cause; even though, sale under **duress** is NOT LAWFULL.
7. ICBC **provides insurance benefits for criminal offenders**, under the cover of "*accident insurance*", including the cases where offenders are identified; even though, it is NOT LAWFULL to insure criminal offenders.
8. Since hit and run criminals are covered under the cover of "*accident insurance*", **criminal offenders are NOT PROSECUTED**. Therefore, hit and run crime is extremely **rampant** in the Province of British Columbia.

9. Every year, in British Columbia, ICBC assumes the liability of **49,000 counts of hit and run crimes that kill 8, injure and cripple 2,200** peoples;

10. ICBC **FORCES** innocent people to pay for the estimated **damages of half a billion dollars** caused by *hit and run criminals*.

B – OBVIOUS CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FACTS:

Any reasonable person can draw the following **final conclusions**:

1. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know the intent of the Law*; because, it is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of CRIME**, if he knows, *the intent of the Law is to protect victims; NOT criminal offenders*.

2. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that victims of crime had a RIGHT and DUTY to bring their offenders to JUSTICE*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **strike down a victim's case**, if he knows, *the victim has a RIGHT to sue his offender*.

3. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that hit and run was a criminal offence as per the Criminal Code of Canada, Section 252*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss the legal action of a victim of hit and run crime**, if he knows, *hit and run is a criminal offence*.

4. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that lawyers could not file court applications to abort the legal actions of the victims of crime*; because such an action is tantamount to encouraging the offenders and **promote crime**. It is **impossible** for a justice to **cooperate with a lawyer who attempts to abort the legal action of a victim of crime**, if he knows, *aborting the legal action of a bona fide victim is NOT lawful*.

5. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that sale contracts under duress could not be enforced*; because they are UNLAWFUL. It is **impossible** for a justice to **dismiss a legal action that is involved with selling insurance under duress**, if he knows that, such a business practice is **not lawful**.

6. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that a court order was a legal document that must be properly signed by the presiding justice*. It is **impossible** for a justice to **refuse to sign his order in compliance with the procedural norms**, if he knows a *court order is a significant legal document that must be signed properly*.

7. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson was *not aware of his HONOURABLE STATUS*. It is impossible for a JUSTICE to **undermine** his own reputation, if he is cognizant of his **Lordship**.

8. Chief Justice, Christopher E. Hinkson did *not know that: a justice who dismisses the legal actions of the victims of crime is more dangerous OFFENDER than the persons who actually commit the crimes*.

C – MY REQUEST ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC:

As a member of the Public, I am a **natural representative** of the Public. Therefore, *on behalf of the Public*, I request, that YOU SHOULD UPGRADE YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF LAW and correct your WRONG, if you are willing to serve as **the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia**. Under the circumstances, it is **inappropriate** for you to act as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Please, let me know, if you will **comply** with the requirements of the **Law of the Land**.

If you fail to do so, you must understand that I will be **obliged to publicize** “**the Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia**” and the pertinent legal documents, for the **protection** of the Public.

Publication of this issue may cause **irreversible damage to your reputation**. Therefore, I am obliged to notify you, that **I will not accept any responsibility for your misconduct** and **duly loss of reputation** in the process of **discharging my DUTY TO WARN THE PUBLIC AGAINST THE CORRUPTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**; because I have given you sufficient due **notice** to correct your **wrong**.

Sincerely,

Ron Korkut
Ethics First

Attd. The Report of Corruption in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, index for exhibits, exhibits.
(All the legal documents will be published at www.ethicsfirst.ca and www.justsociety.info)

CC. Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister: **Jody Wilson-Raybould**, Justice Minister Canada; **Christy Clark**, Premier: **Suzanne Anton**, Justice Minister BC; **Gregor Robertson**, Mayor of Vancouver; **Bill Fordy**, RCMP; **Catherine Dauvergne**, Dean UBC; **Ralph Goodale**, Minister of Public Safety; **David MacAlister**, SFU; **E. David Crossin**, Bencher Law Society; **Josh Paterson**, BCCLA; **Harold Munro**, Editor SUN; **Natalie Clancy & Eric Rankin**, CBC.