



King Sean, House von Dehn <gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com>

---

## Von Dehn v. OW, 2505-03340 (East -- Ottawa-Carleton), Further to the pre-hearing on June 17, 2025

2 messages

---

**Baker, Geoffrey (He/Him) (MCCSS)** <Geoffrey.Baker@ontario.ca>

Thu, Jun 26, 2025 at 5:19 PM

To: "@MAG-G-COR-SBT-Registrar (MAG)" <SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca>

Cc: "Mbuyi, Madeleine (MAG)" <Madeleine.Mbuyi@ontario.ca>, "Forget, Caroline" <caroline.forget@ottawa.ca>, "King Sean, House von Dehn" <gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com>

Registrar Cervený,

1. I do not believe that Member Curran has issued a Case Management Ruling yet following the pre-hearing dated June 17, 2025.
2. In light of the Appellant's behaviour at that pre-hearing and in light of his numerous emails since then, such as the one below where he is threatening legal action and Law Society of Ontario complaints, I hope the Tribunal will consider whether Rule A8.2 of the Common Rules of Procedure applies: "Where the tribunal finds that a person has persistently...conducted a proceeding in a vexatious manner, the tribunal may find that person to be a vexatious litigant and dismiss the proceeding as an abuse of process for that reason."
3. I do not know if there is a prior Tribunal Decision to rely on because I have never before witnessed an Appellant who is so clearly intent on personally offending each participant in the proceedings and who has no concern whatsoever for following Rule A7.1: "All persons participating in proceedings before or communicating with the tribunal must act in good faith and in a manner that is courteous and respectful of the tribunal and other participants in the proceeding."
4. My understanding is that the issue in dispute is the Administrator's decision to reduce the Appellant's medical travel benefits to fall in line with a lower priced transit pass in the City of Ottawa.
5. However, the Appellant continues to make allegations of criminal acts that have no place in these proceedings.
6. Perhaps Member Curran will set some guidelines for the upcoming hearing(s), short of dismissing the proceedings altogether.
7. I note, for example, that the Appellant has posted his personal recording of the pre-hearing on his blog, contrary to the Tribunal's rules.

8. The only way to prevent that from happening in the future is to perhaps reschedule the matter to an in-person hearing.

Yours truly,

**Geoff Baker (he/him/his)**

Senior Counsel | Legal Services Branch/MCCSS

Ministry of the Attorney General | Ontario Public Service

437-215-6522 | [geoffrey.baker@ontario.ca](mailto:geoffrey.baker@ontario.ca)

Floor 17

[56 Wellesley Street West](#)

[Toronto ON M5S 2S3](#)

**Ontario** 

*Taking pride in strengthening Ontario, its places and its people*

---

**From:** King Sean, House von Dehn <[gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com](mailto:gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 1:44 PM

**To:** @MAG-G-COR-SBT-Registrar (MAG) <[SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca](mailto:SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca)>; Ryan, Padraic (MAG) <[Padraic.Ryan@ontario.ca](mailto:Padraic.Ryan@ontario.ca)>; Baker, Geoffrey (He/Him) (MCCSS) <[Geoffrey.Baker@ontario.ca](mailto:Geoffrey.Baker@ontario.ca)>; Killick, Brian (MAG) <[Brian.Killick@ontario.ca](mailto:Brian.Killick@ontario.ca)>; Mbuyi, Madeleine (MAG) <[Madeleine.Mbuyi@ontario.ca](mailto:Madeleine.Mbuyi@ontario.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: SBT 2505-03340 - Notice of Complaint to the Law Society of Ontario Criminal Malfeasance

**CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.**

\*Please note:

This applies to Adrienne Curran, LSO 66599O, Geoffrey Thomas Baker, LSO 43218D, and Brian Matthew Killick, LSO 67342I

Thank You (I forgot to include Geoffrey in the first email). I'll be filing My complaint this weekend if You do not reach out to let Me know that You Wish to resolve this amicably and without further contempt for the Rule of Law and Your fiduciary obligations to Canada's People. I Will consider filing private, criminal prosecutions against each of You early next week if I do not hear from You.

Thanks again, have a lovely day!

King Sean, House von Dehn,  
Hand of Stephen,  
The Kingdom of Heaven Found a Sean

On Thu, Jun 26, 2025 at 1:39 PM King Sean, House von Dehn <[gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com](mailto:gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Registrar,

Attention Brian Matthew Killick and Adrienne Curran.

You have both asserted that You do not have any legal, lawful, moral or ethical obligation to put the federal crimes of the Administrator to a stop, or to report the crimes to the appropriate authorities to protect the Beneficiary from further criminal harm and breach of Trust.

This *opinion* and *perspective* is patently *incorrect and unreasonable*, as every One in Canada has duty and an obligation as a member of the public to report a crime when they witness one in progress. That is what an *Honourable* citizen would do. You are not Acting in Honour.

This is a very straightforward appeal. The Ontario Works administrator does not believe Canada's Criminal Code is binding upon them for breaching contracts they have agreed to Honour as they continue to trespass upon a Trust Instrument on file with MOJAG with *malicious intent* to antagonize and aggravate the harm done to the Beneficiary.

The Administrator does not appear to be forthcoming with their copies of contracts they've Signed for the Beneficiary, and this is done with malicious intent to prolong the Beneficiary's agony and mental anguish. The contempt demonstrated by the Administrator REFUSING to provide the documents requested is contempt for this Tribunal and a Breach of Trust because they have a legal and lawful obligation to be transparent with the Beneficiary about what documents they have on file for him whether he has an appeal before this Tribunal or not! This is just one example of how this Tribunal ENCOURAGES the Administrator to Act with such contempt - You allow it with impunity! Ontario Works does not obtain documents for the Beneficiary's case file so that they can be ignored or used as a means of exploiting the Beneficiary and causing him harm!

If the resolution officer would just compel the Administrator to be honest and forthcoming in their submissions, the Matter would already be resolved and the Beneficiary would have his remedy (because it shouldn't take more than for this Tribunal to advise the Administrator that Canada's Criminal Code and the Trustee Act of Ontario are binding upon them).

A lawyer's duty is to the Courts and the public, then to their client. If there is ever a conflict of interest, the former takes precedence over the latter. The Rule of Law comes first, Your client's desire to avoid criminal liability comes second.

#### Criminal breach of contract

- **422 (1)** Every one who wilfully breaks a contract, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the probable consequences of doing so, whether alone or in combination with others, will be
  - **(a)** to endanger human life,
  - **(b)** to cause serious bodily injury,
  - **(c)** to expose valuable property, real or personal, to destruction or serious injury,
  - **(d)** to deprive the inhabitants of a city or place, or part thereof, wholly or to a great extent, of their supply of light, power, gas or water, or
  - **(e)** to delay or prevent the running of any locomotive engine, tender, freight or passenger train or car, on a railway that is a common carrier,

is guilty of

- **(f)** an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or
- **(g)** an offence punishable on summary conviction.

- **Criminal breach of trust**

**336** Every one who, being a trustee of anything for the use or benefit, whether in whole or in part, of another person, or for a public or charitable purpose, converts, with intent to defraud and in contravention of his trust, that thing or any part of it to a use that is not authorized by the trust is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term ***not exceeding fourteen years***.

- R.S., c. C-34, s. 296

King Sean of House von Dehn has advised the Administrator that he Will forgive the criminal charges if the Administrator Acts with Honour and integrity. If the Administrator requires Me to PROVE their criminal conduct beyond the obvious fact that the Administrator is breaching the Trust of the Beneficiary RIGHT NOW by failing to provide the documents upon request,

they should each be charged to the fullest extent of Canadian Law and aggravated circumstances must be considered at the time of sentencing. Failing to do so is a breach of Trust and contempt for this Tribunal.

Considering the Administrator is guilty of four counts of breach of contract and breach of Trust for malicious trespass upon the Trust Instrument and Trust Declaration for *seven years*, the aggravated factors to be considered at the time of sentencing are *extensive*.

If the Administrator does not Wish to resolve in Good faith and Wishes to go to a hearing to dispute these charges, they should be tried in a criminal court, as should Madeleine Mbuyi for gross criminal malfeasance aggravating harm to a Beneficiary as a 'resolution' officer. Madeleine Mbuyi does not appear to have any legal license (which is not surprising considering the degree of negligence and criminal malfeasance so far demonstrated).

Otherwise, it is My position that the Law Society of Ontario does not encourage lawyers to support the criminal Acts of their clients and help them to cover them up to avoid accountability, which is where the City of Ottawa's liars posing as lawyers seem to believe their loyalties lie.

If You Will not advise Your clients to cease and desist their criminal breach of contract and Trust, I believe You should be held accountable for aiding and abetting their crimes because Your negligence with respect to the counsel You are providing to the Administrator is both criminal and harmful to the Beneficiary.

This letter Will be included with My complaint against each of You with the Law Society of Ontario. I Will be filing My complaint over the weekend against each of You. I am instructed to clearly advise You so that You have an opportunity to resolve without compelling Me to file a complaint.

Apparently, most lawyers Wish to avoid a complaint to the Law Society of Ontario and Will attempt to resolve the Matter. I presume this only applies to Honourable individuals who are not supporting criminal clients, but I figured I would do You the decency of advising You in the event You Wish to avoid a complaint and potentially the loss of Your license for this degree of criminal malfeasance. Pleading ignorance is not likely to serve You well.

You have until 5:00 PM tomorrow to compel the Administrator to concede to their crimes and be as King for givenness. If the Administrator starts responding to this Appeal honourably and concedes they are breaching four contracts, they can avoid criminal prosecution and I Will only be as King for civil remedy (restitution for seven years of emotional and psychological abuse under threat of economic exploitation and extortion). If not, I believe

You should all be fired, lose Your license and never be allowed to work in law or the public sector ever again in addition to whatever charges You are liable for under Canada's Criminal Code.

These are federal, indictable offenses. Please also be advised, I may also consider private, criminal prosecution against each of You in Your personal, private capacity.

Thank You very kindly for Your time, have a wonderful Thursday afternoon.

Blessings,

King Sean, House von Dehn,  
Hand of Stephen,  
The Kingdom of Heaven Found a Sean

---

**King Sean, House von Dehn** <gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 26, 2025 at 7:38 PM

To: "Baker, Geoffrey (He/Him) (MCCSS)" <Geoffrey.Baker@ontario.ca>

Cc: "@MAG-G-COR-SBT-Registrar (MAG)" <SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca>, "Mbuyi, Madeleine (MAG)" <Madeleine.Mbuyi@ontario.ca>, "Forget, Caroline" <caroline.forget@ottawa.ca>

Attention Geoffrey Thomas Baker,

1. 'von Dehn' is the correct Style and Spelling of the Beneficiary's family name and it is RUDE and discourteous to address some One by anything other than their proper legal name. Please Mind the Style and Spelling of the Beneficiary's proper legal and lawful name. Further offences Will be considered intentional, antagonistic behaviour.
2. Your client, the Ontario Works Administration, is breaching *four contracts* on the Beneficiary's file with malicious intent (mens rae) to cause harm to the Beneficiary including a Trust Instrument and Trust Declaration. This is violation of Canada's Criminal Code 422(1) as cited above. That is four counts of breach of contract - do You DENY that Your client is breaching these contracts? Yes or no?
3. By failing to address these very serious charges against Your client, You are effectively 'gaslighting' and refusing to address the real issues at hand, aggravating the harm and frustration of the Beneficiary.
4. To suggest that breaching four contracts on the Beneficiary's case file and trespassing upon a Trust Instrument with malicious intent to aggravate the harm done to the Beneficiary is *frivolous or vexatious* is *infuriating and antagonistic, childish behaviour* unbecoming of Your profession.

5. If You perceive the allegations to be false, You are effectively calling the Appellant a LIAR - and You DARE to comment on My conduct being unprofessional and discourteous while You plead ignorance of the contracts Your client is breaching?
6. The Administrator desecrated a Trust Instrument, forever damaging a Sacred, Spiritual document that is deeply personal to the Beneficiary and his life's purpose - another *federal, indictable offence*. The fact that You attempt to frame these criminal trespasses as 'frivolous and vexatious' is narcissistic, sociopathic behaviour designed to demoralize and antagonize the Beneficiary.
7. " "All persons participating in proceedings before or communicating with the tribunal must *act in good faith* and in a manner that is *courteous and respectful of the tribunal and other participants in the proceeding*." This works both Ways, Geoffrey, and if You could just be so kind as to tell Me WHY You do not believe the Administrator is subject to Canada's Criminal Code for deliberately breaching contracts and converting documents trusted to their care with intent to *defraud* in violation of his Trust, contrary to Canada's Criminal Code 336 (as cited above).
8. I am maintaining a Record of all proceedings for the purpose of government accountability. All proceedings in Canada are to be public according to the Charter (highest law in Canada) and includes, ' **Public hearing:** Section 11(d) guarantees *an open court room and the right to have the media access the courtroom to report on the proceedings*. The right to a fair trial is meant to allow *public scrutiny of the trial process* as (1) this ensures that the judicial system conducts *fair* trials, not mere show trials in which conviction is a foregone conclusion and (2) it can vindicate an accused person who is acquitted, particularly when the acquittal is surprising or shocking to the public (*Mentuck, supra* at paragraphs 53-54; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835 at page 883). The right to a public hearing is also protected by section 2(b), which protects the open court principle. For a discussion of the open court principle as it relates to publication bans or closed court proceedings see the entry on section 2(b).
9. My belief is that the Tribunal keeps their hearings private because they routinely gaslight and railroad self Presented litigants who are some of Canada's most marginalized and victimized minorities. Especially considering that You are trying to convince Me that Canada's Criminal Code does not apply to Your client, it is more important than ever to maintain a record of the criminal contempt taking place before this Tribunal, and the Administrator's inability to address the real Issue at hand - trespass upon a Trust Instrument on file with MOJAG - a federal, indictable offence, especially when perpetrated by the public Trustee for Ontario Works.
10. If the Tribunal Wishes to hear the Matter 'in person', I Will not only audio record the proceedings, but I Will maintain a video record of the proceedings as well. I believe Your determination to defend the criminal Acts of the Administrator are of critical public interest and subject to scrutiny and accountability.

11. Suggesting I am not able to maintain a public Record of all the proceeding is violating the Charter right expressed in this email which allows for 'uninhibited' publication of any judicial proceeding.
12. As far as the rights portion of this Claim is concerned, I understand You believe that Recording the proceedings is a violation of the Ontario Works *Act*, the Ontario Disability Support Program *Act*, or the Statutory Powers Procedure *Act*. This is why I am able to Record the proceedings and publish them to My Blog to maintain a public Record of the proceedings because according to the Provisions 24.1 for Charter remedy, no code, statute or Act has the force of law to violate an inherent right protected by Canada's Charter or any Internationally ratified treaty obligation, such as the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which was ratified in March of 1976 (if memory serves correct - it is certainly not 'new' legislation, and legislation any 'lawyer' Acting in Honour Will know or ought to know, as ignorance is no excuse for the Rule of Law).

Again, Geoffrey, I am going to Give You until tomorrow at 5:00 to reconsider Your reply. If You can tell Me in plain English why the Beneficiary should not be entitled to protection from criminal trespasses upon his Trust Instrument on file with the Administrator, or malicious breach of contract with intent to cause harm, I would love to hear it. Unfortunately, all You appear to be able to do is dodge My questions and gaslight the serious nature of this claim.

I consider Your last email to be extremely antagonistic and unbecoming of any legal professional. Why does Canada's Criminal Code not apply to You or the Administrator?

I look forward to hearing from You, Geoffrey and I Will make a complaint to the Law Society of Ontario and may even file private, criminal prosecution against You for Your clear and obvious attempt to gaslight the criminal malfeasance of Your client. Their actions are criminal, the only question is whether or not the criminal acts were done with intent, or in ignorance of the Law. Now that they have You as their lawyer, they can no longer plead ignorance, and You would do well to advise Your clients to apologize and Honour their contracts with Me immediately.

I am SO kind, courteous and agreeable, that despite how infuriating Your last email is, I am STILL going to Give You until tomorrow at 5:00 to reconsider Your position.

If this case is dismissed, I can guarantee You that there Will be an application to the Divisional Court for Judicial review for Your criminal contempt and antagonistic, passive aggressive, narcissistic behaviour. I've met children who



can answer questions with more competence than You have so far demonstrated in these proceedings. You have demonstrated that You CAN speak, You just don't Wish to speak to Me or address the criminal conduct of Your client.

You don't have any 'right' to express My name and Sacred calling in any other Way than it is Styled in the originating document for these proceedings. Anything else is antagonistic behaviour, an insult to Me and infuriating. Please stop the abusive, childish behaviour and address the multiple breaches of contract and breach of Trust You know Your client is guilty of.

Blessings,

King Sean, House von Dehn,  
Hand of Stephen,  
The Kingdom of **Heaven Found a Sean**

[Quoted text hidden]