



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

von Dehn v. OW, 2505-03340, Pre-Hearing Videoconference

2 messages

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

Tue, Jun 17, 2025 at 11:48 AM

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

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

Registrar Cervený,

1. I can confirm that I will be in attendance at the pre-hearing this afternoon on behalf of the Director of Ontario Works to consider whether the appeal needs to be bifurcated into two stages.
2. Bifurcation is necessary if an Appellant is challenging a decision by the Administrator that affects the quantum of assistance or his eligibility for assistance (section 26(1) of the Ontario Works Act) and, additionally, he is saying that the provisions that were applied by the Administrator to the facts of his case, violate his Code rights.
3. In a case like that, we argue that Stage One should consider the merits of the case (did the Administrator make the correct decision by applying the law to the facts) and if the appeal is dismissed at that stage, then the proceedings would move to a Stage Two hearing, to consider whether the provisions themselves are discriminatory.
4. All notices of Human Rights Code claims are served on me and they are also copied to the Constitutional Law Branch (CLB) because sometimes appeals are bifurcated and the CLB lawyers get involved later on in the Stage Two hearing to defend impugned legislation and regulations.
5. However, I always attend the pre-hearings on my own and later communicate with CLB if I need its assistance.
6. Today, we need to hear from the Appellant about the nature of his claims before we can determine if the appeal needs to be bifurcated.
7. So far, despite the Appellant's numerous emails, it is not clear to me that he is in fact challenging a denial decision of the Administrator that falls within the scope of the Tribunal, let alone whether human rights issues should be dealt with in a bifurcated appeal.
8. It is a well-established legal principle that if there is no jurisdiction for the appeal to begin with, then the Tribunal cannot hear a related Code claim at all.
9. Our position is that the Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to deal with criminal matters, breach of contract matters, or constitutional matters (s. 67(2) of the Ontario Works Act) and it has no authority to order the payment of damages.

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

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>

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 11:14 AM

To: @MAG-G-COR-SBT-Registrar (MAG) <SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca>; CLBSUPPORT <CLBSUPPORT@ontario.ca>; Ryan, Padraic (MAG) <Padraic.Ryan@ontario.ca>; Baker, Geoffrey (He/Him) (MCCSS) <Geoffrey.Baker@ontario.ca>; Forget, Caroline <caroline.forget@ottawa.ca>

Subject: Re: SBT 2505-03340 Pre-Hearing Videoconference.

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

Dear Registrar,

Is it the Constitutional Law Branch of MOJAG? Are You going to tell Me again that You don't have the jurisdiction or authority to put a stop to the criminal breaches of Trust perpetrated by the Administrator in violation of the contracts they've Signed and promised to Honour? The SBT is not NEGLIGENT for allowing the harm to continue until the date of the pre-hearing conference or hearing date in NOVEMBER? Is the Beneficiary expected to allow the criminal contempt of the administrator to continue, or Will You do something to put the harm to a stop TODAY?

Will there be a member of the Constitutional Law Branch present, or is that Ryan Padriac? Because I believe not being protected from criminals engaged in malicious breach of Trust is a pretty clear and obvious rights violation - though it is common sense for most People and may not be 'codified' into the Human Rights Code because it would be insane to suggest that it is 'acceptable' for a Tribunal or any judicial body to allow the criminal trespasses of the public Trustee to continue.

According to Canada's Criminal Code, the Administrator and their agents are looking at fourteen years in jail for malicious breach of a Trust Instrument. I am very curious to see what You Will do to put these crimes to a stop today.

Does the Constitutional Law Branch know that You intend to allow the criminal trespasses to continue unabated until November, seriously aggravating the harm done to the beneficiary? Or Will You put these crimes to a stop today?

I look forward to hearing from You. Please make sure Madeleine Mbuyi is in attendance.

If the criminal trespasses and breaches of contract perpetrated by the administrator are not put to a stop today, I Will be filing an appeal with the divisional Court. This is notice of appeal for the incompetence of this tribunal for allowing the harm to continue for a second longer than it was reported to You.

King Sean, House von Dehn,

Hand of Stephen,

The Kingdom of Heaven Found a Sean

On Tue, Jun 17, 2025 at 11:00 AM King Sean, House von Dehn <gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com> wrote:

Are You suggesting I don't have a RIGHT to be informed and to know who Will be in attendance at this meeting and why?

I look forward to hearing from You. Please be sure to provide a NAME. I am tired of this tribunal 'ghosting' Me and refusing to provide a name for the purpose of liability. Is Janet Cerveney still receiving emails for the SBT? Well, Janet, who is CLB support and why are they invited to this hearing?

I have a right to be informed of all persons and or corporations who Will be in attendance. Who is CLB support and why were they sent this email invitation to the pre-hearing conference today?

King Sean, House von Dehn,

Hand of Stephen,

The Kingdom of Heaven Found a Sean

On Tue, Jun 17, 2025 at 10:26 AM King Sean, House von Dehn <gnosticwisdom37@gmail.com> wrote:

Who is CLB Support and why were they sent a link to the pre-hearing conference?

On Tue, Jun 17, 2025 at 10:18 AM @MAG-G-COR-SBT-Registrar (MAG) <SBT.Registrar@ontario.ca> wrote:

Please note that the telephone hearing has been converted to videoconferencing as the applicant states that he does not have a telephone.



Hi there,

ZSBVideo 21 is inviting you to a
scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

One tap mobile:

Canada: [+15873281099](tel:+15873281099), [85336148378#](tel:+16473744685) or
[+16473744685](tel:+16473744685), [85336148378#](tel:+16473744685)

Meeting URL:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85336148378>

Meeting ID:

853 3614 8378

Join by Telephone

For higher quality, dial a number based on
your current location.

Dial:

+1 587 328 1099 Canada
+1 647 374 4685 Canada
+1 647 558 0588 Canada
+1 778 907 2071 Canada
+1 780 666 0144 Canada
+1 204 272 7920 Canada
+1 438 809 7799 Canada
833 958 1164 Canada Toll-free
855 703 8985 Canada Toll-free
833 955 1088 Canada Toll-free

Meeting ID:

853 3614 8378

International numbers

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

Tue, Jun 17, 2025 at 12:12 PM

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

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

Dear Registrar Cerveney,

I am going to be VERY CLEAR with both You and Mr. Baker. This is a complaint regarding the unlawful revocation of benefits according to their own contracts, the legislation of the OW Act, in violation of contracts on file for the Beneficiary, AND for suggesting the Trustee Act of Ontario does not apply to King Sean's Trust on file with MOJAG and the Administrator.

Malicious breach of a Trust Instrument is subject to fourteen years in jail. Ontario Works has been trespassing upon a Trust Instrument with impunity, claiming that the Trustee Act of Ontario DOES NOT APPLY TO THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE!!!

That is clearly and obviously a breach of Trust. The rights portion of the Appeal is for suggesting that I am not entitled to protection from criminals who are breaching a Trust Instrument on file with their office with impunity, suggesting no other lawful excuse except that the Rule of Law does not apply to the Administrator.

I believe that if My rights are not being violated, then the Administrator Will be criminally charged for their breach of Trust at the pre-hearing conference today, and the evidence Will be provided if they Wish to defend their position in a criminal court.

I would like to know why You are allowing criminal trespass upon a Trust Instrument to continue when You have a copy of the Trust Instrument on file with MOJAG.

I am accustomed to the Administrator pleading ignorance of the Rule of Law, is the Tribunal and counsel for the Administrator suggesting that it is 'okay' for the Administrator to continue pleading ignorance of the Trust Instrument they have on file for the Beneficiary?

Can I expect clear answers to any of these questions before the hearing? Does Mr. Baker understand that if he does not advise his client to cease and desist their malicious breach of Trust and pleading ignorance of the Trust Instrument, that he Will be charged with aiding and abetting their determination to aggravate the harm done to the beneficiary with malicious intent to undermine the Beneficiary's Trust.

It is the belief of the Appellant that a lawyer's duty is not to help cover for their criminal client and help them get away with their crimes, but to advise their client that their actions are criminal according to Canada's Criminal code and encourage them to

negotiate a resolution to put a stop the aggravated harm being done by prolonging the Beneficiary his remedy.

I look forward to having You answer these questions directly this afternoon.

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

I would like to know why the criminal conduct and trespass upon My Trust instrument is not subject to Canada's Criminal Code. This is what any other individual breaching some One's Trust would be subject to, but Canada's Criminal Code does not apply to Geoffrey Baker or his client?

I would like Geoffrey to explain why Canada's Criminal Code does not apply to his client, and why I am not entitled to relief from criminal trespasses upon My Trust.

This email Will be published at www.vondehnvisuals.com momentarily.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]