

Systemic Administrative Failure, Constitutional Torts, and the Criminalization of Identity: An Exhaustive Analysis of Landry v. His Majesty the King

1. Introduction and Jurisprudential Context

The intersection of administrative data management, constitutional rights, and law enforcement accountability forms the foundation of an exceedingly complex jurisprudential dispute currently documented in Canadian civil litigation. The case of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry versus His Majesty the King in Right of Canada (representing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) centers on a catastrophic divergence between judicial reality and administrative record-keeping. In October 2016, criminal charges against the Plaintiff were formally withdrawn in the Provincial Court of New Brunswick; however, due to an admitted administrative failure, these charges were recorded and maintained as active convictions within the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) and the Police Reporting and Occurrence System (PROS) for approximately seven years.

This systemic error catalyzed a severe feedback loop of criminalization. The Plaintiff alleges that the persistence of a false record characterizing her as a violent sexual offender led to cascading constitutional violations, including arbitrary detention, denied bail, coerced guilty pleas, and the subjection to psychiatric committals that amounted to unlawful conversion therapy. The resulting litigation involves a draft Statement of Claim demanding \$50,000,000.00 in damages for negligence, misfeasance in public office, and breaches of Sections 7, 11(d), and 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Concurrently, the Plaintiff has served formal notice to the Prime Minister's Office and the Minister of Justice of an escalated \$1 Billion claim encompassing demands for sweeping systemic reforms.

Furthermore, the dispute highlights a deep procedural deadlock between federal oversight bodies, notably the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC) and the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC), regarding statutory limitation periods and jurisdictional responsibility. This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the factual matrix, the theoretical legal frameworks, the damages models, and the broader systemic implications of the Landry case. It examines how data integrity within national policing databases dictates the liberty interests of marginalized citizens and evaluates the tenability of the "Continuing Tort" doctrine in overcoming administrative time-bars.

2. The Factual Matrix and the Originating Incident

The chronological narrative of this dispute is defined by an initial localized conflict that rapidly escalated due to institutional mishandling and alleged transphobic bias. The origin of the

cascading legal failures can be traced back to January 2016 in Moncton, New Brunswick.

2.1 The 2016 Allegations and Judicial Disposition

In January 2016, the Plaintiff, Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry (then legally known as Jean-Yves Landry prior to a formal name change), became the subject of two distinct criminal complaints. The first involved allegations by neighbors, identified in the evidentiary record as Heather Saulnier and Harry Geldart. These individuals alleged that the Plaintiff was committing an "indecent act" by masturbating in a public place at a residence on McKenzie Street, prompting charges under Section 173(1)(b) of the Criminal Code. The Plaintiff has categorically and consistently denied these allegations, asserting she had merely stepped outside her residence to smoke a cigarette. The Plaintiff characterizes this complaint as a malicious "swatting" incident motivated entirely by transphobic animus, highlighting that a third individual, Brandy McDonald, had previously engaged in disputes regarding the Plaintiff's gender identity.

Concurrently, the rumor mill generated by these false allegations catalyzed a secondary confrontation. The Plaintiff's ex-partner, Patricia Scott, allegedly believing the fabricated claims propagated by the neighbors and the responding law enforcement officers, initiated a physical altercation. When the Plaintiff attempted to summon assistance, Scott reportedly contacted the police and falsely claimed the Plaintiff was the aggressor, resulting in an assault charge under Section 266 of the Criminal Code. The Plaintiff maintains that her actions during this incident were purely defensive maneuvers against a physical attack and that she fled to escape injury. The critical judicial turning point occurred on October 31, 2016. Assessing the evidentiary deficiencies, the lack of substantiating video evidence despite claims to the contrary by the complainants, and the fact that Patricia Scott recanted her assault allegations in court, the Crown prosecutor, Eric Lalonde, formally withdrew the charges before Judge Jolene M. Richard in the New Brunswick Provincial Court. The withdrawal of charges under Canadian criminal procedure restores the accused to a position of legal innocence, terminating the peril of conviction and necessitating the immediate updating of all associated police records to reflect the non-conviction outcome.

2.2 The Mechanics of the CPIC and PROS Data Failure

Despite the explicit judicial ruling confirming the withdrawal of the charges, the disposition was not accurately transmitted to the RCMP's internal records management system (PROS) or the national Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) database. For the subsequent 2,555 days (spanning from late 2016 to mid-2023), the Plaintiff's criminal record falsely indicated guilty pleas and active convictions for both the Indecent Act and the Assault charges.

The mechanical origin of this failure has become a highly contested issue of institutional liability, characterized by conflicting official narratives that the Plaintiff argues point to a systemic cover-up. The RCMP "J" Division formally admitted to the error in a September 19, 2023, letter from Sgt. Chantal Roger, followed by a September 26, 2023, letter from Assistant Commissioner DeAnna L. Hill. These communications attributed the catastrophic data entry failure to a "municipal employee of the Codiac RCMP detachment" who allegedly failed to update the disposition field. This attribution was a transparent attempt to localize the blame outside the ranks of the federally sworn regular members of the RCMP, thereby shifting vicarious liability to the municipal government. The findings were subsequently shared with Supt. Benoit Jolette and Charles Savoie, the City Manager for municipal employees.

However, subsequent investigations revealed stark contradictions. In a formal letter dated

November 14, 2024, the City of Moncton explicitly refuted the RCMP's claim. The City conducted its own internal review and confirmed that the individual responsible for the 2016 error was not an employee of the City, but rather a Public Service Employee (PSE) of the Federal Government. This directly redirected sole vicarious liability back to the Attorney General of Canada.

To compound the administrative chaos, the Plaintiff provided evidence of an email dated September 26, 2023, from CRCC Investigator Cpl. Yanick Soucy. In this correspondence, Cpl. Soucy explicitly admitted, "I feel bad that there was a mistake made by one of our PSE back in 2016 in your case, in reference to the disposition". Despite this written admission from the lead investigator acknowledging federal culpability, the final CRCC investigation report concluded by inexplicably blaming a city employee and subsequently halting the investigation. The Plaintiff argues this contradiction demonstrates profound internal corruption and bad faith in the complaint resolution process.

Institutional Actor	Stated Position on the Origin of the CPIC Error	Implications for Liability and Legal Strategy
RCMP "J" Division	Error caused by a municipal employee at the Codiac detachment.	Attempts to shift vicarious liability to the municipality and shield federal regular members from misfeasance claims.
City of Moncton	Error caused by a Federal Public Service Employee (PSE), explicitly denying municipal involvement.	Redirects sole vicarious liability back to the federal apparatus, undermining the RCMP's primary administrative defense.
CRCC Investigator	Initially acknowledged the error was made by an RCMP PSE in written correspondence, but the final report blamed a city employee.	Demonstrates internal administrative contradictions, validating the Plaintiff's claims of a systemic cover-up and institutional bad faith.

The persistence of this record—termed the "Corrupt File" by the Plaintiff—resulted in a scenario where every law enforcement query across Canada returned a profile of a convicted, violent sexual offender. This fundamental corruption of data integrity removed the administrative veil of innocence, fundamentally altering the posture of all subsequent state interactions with the Plaintiff for nearly a decade.

3. The Feedback Loop of Criminalization and Coerced Pleas

The false CPIC entry did not exist in an administrative vacuum; it functioned as an active, aggressive agent of criminalization. The data anomaly dictated the threat assessment protocols, judicial bail decisions, and implicit biases of every state official who interacted with the Plaintiff during what the evidentiary record terms the "Lost Years" (2016–2023).

3.1 Impact on Threat Assessments and Institutional Credibility

When law enforcement officers initiate contact with a citizen, querying the CPIC database is standard operating procedure. By falsely flagging the Plaintiff—a visible transgender

woman—as a convicted violent sexual offender, the system manufactured an artificially high threat matrix. The evidence suggests this led directly to disproportionately aggressive and violent policing tactics. The Plaintiff alleges that routine interactions escalated rapidly into severe physical violence, documenting instances where officers, perceiving her as a dangerous and unstable recidivist due to the false record, subjected her to excessive force, including being "stomped," "beaten," and "choked" without any attempt at de-escalation.

Simultaneously, the false record obliterated the Plaintiff's credibility as a complainant or witness. When attempting to report ongoing harassment, physical assaults, or severe threats from third-party extremists, the intelligence provided by the Plaintiff was systematically dismissed by the state. The institutional perception, heavily skewed by the CPIC error, framed the Plaintiff as an unreliable, deviant actor, thereby nullifying the state's duty to protect her from legitimate external threats and leaving her in a state of profound vulnerability.

3.2 Constructive Coercion and the Subversion of the Judicial Process

Between 2016 and 2019, the Plaintiff accrued a series of new, secondary charges, including a dozen mischief charges, drug possession (cannabis, prior to legalization), and "joyriding". The etiology of these charges is deeply intertwined with the false CPIC record and the state's failure to provide equal protection. The Plaintiff characterizes her actions—such as removing obstructed license plates from vehicles violating the New Brunswick Motor Vehicle Act—as acts of civil resistance and self-defense executed in a vacuum of legitimate police support.

However, the most severe constitutional injury occurred during the judicial processing of these secondary charges. During bail hearings, the Crown heavily relied upon the uncorrected, falsified criminal history to argue forcefully against pre-trial release. The presence of "prior" convictions for sexual and violent offenses rendered the prospect of securing bail practically impossible, ensuring the Plaintiff was subjected to prolonged, punitive periods of remand. The Plaintiff estimates she spent approximately three years (1,095 days) in pre-trial remand or incarceration directly caused by the state's reliance on the false CPIC record.

Faced with the terrifying reality of indefinite pre-trial detention in male correctional facilities—a notoriously high-risk, violently transphobic environment for transgender women—the Plaintiff was subjected to extreme psychological pressure characterized as "constructive coercion". To escape the immediate physical danger, violence, and total isolation of remand, the Plaintiff capitulated and entered guilty pleas to the secondary charges. The evidence argues that these pleas were legally unsafe and wholly involuntary, born out of the duress manufactured by the state's reliance on its own falsified data. The Plaintiff asserts actual innocence in these secondary matters, framing her actions as necessary survival tactics, and is actively citing Section 696.1 of the Criminal Code to seek a federal review of these convictions as egregious miscarriages of justice.

4. The Weaponization of Psychiatric Institutionalization and Conversion Therapy

A highly disturbing dimension of the factual record involves the intersection of the false CPIC data with psychiatric institutionalization and medical misconduct. The Plaintiff was repeatedly detained against her will in psychiatric wards and carceral medical units, including the Restigouche Hospital Centre, the Moncton City Hospital, and Medical Isolation Jail Cell 113 at

the Shediac Correctional Facility.

4.1 Systemic Failures at the Restigouche Hospital Centre

The Plaintiff's committal to the Restigouche Hospital Centre (RHC) is particularly notable given the facility's well-documented history of systemic abuses. Independent OSINT reports and public declarations corroborate that during the 2016-2019 period, the RHC operated under antiquated models of care characterized by a total breakdown of safety protocols. The facility failed to adequately segregate the general patient population from high-risk forensic offenders, creating an inherently dangerous environment. The 2019 "Failure to Protect" report issued by the New Brunswick Ombudsman confirmed widespread instances of medical negligence, the use of excessive force, and institutional violence at the RHC. This systemic failure culminated in a \$17 million class-action settlement for former residents who suffered physical or sexual assault at the facility, validating the Plaintiff's claims that her detention there exposed her to profound, objective danger.

4.2 Pathologization and Illegal Conversion Therapy

The Plaintiff alleges that her gender identity was weaponized in conjunction with the false "indecent act" record to justify these involuntary committals. Police and medical professionals, including a specifically named psychiatrist, Dr. Ralph Holly, allegedly utilized the false sexual offender tag to pathologize her behavior and identity. Instead of recognizing her distress as a legitimate, trauma-informed reaction to relentless state persecution and false accusations, the medical establishment characterized her as a "psychopath in denial". The Plaintiff is actively seeking the retrieval of Medical File 918133331, which she asserts will prove that the false criminal record was unlawfully shared with and relied upon by medical staff to justify her detention.

Most critically, while incarcerated and institutionalized, the Plaintiff was subjected to conditions that legally and clinically constitute conversion therapy. Evidence indicates that medical professionals, influenced by the false criminal history and overt transphobic bias, forced the Plaintiff to cease her life-saving, gender-affirming hormone therapy. The Plaintiff endured total isolation, the explicit denial of her chosen name, and profound psychological abuse wherein she was told to "shut up and go back to my cell like a crazy convict" when requesting medical care. Under the 2022 amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada (Sections 320.101-104), conversion therapy is strictly defined as any practice, treatment, or service designed to repress or reduce non-cisgender gender identity or expression, and is established as a severe criminal offense. The Plaintiff's treatment—involving forced medical detransition under penal duress, profound isolation, and ideological coercion—aligns perfectly with the statutory definitions of these prohibited, harmful practices. Furthermore, leading medical and social work organizations, including the Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) and the New Brunswick Association of Social Workers (NBASW), have explicitly condemned these practices, noting they cause severe depression, anxiety, social isolation, and suicidality. The Plaintiff's subjection to these practices within state-funded psychiatric and penal institutions represents a profound violation of both domestic law and international human rights frameworks.

5. Intelligence Capabilities, The Duty to Protect, and

the Neo-Nazi Threat

Beyond the confines of her own criminalization, the Plaintiff operates as the CEO of Marie Landry's Spy Shop and the Landry Industries Conglomerate, entities specializing in advanced Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) and ethical technology development. The intersection of the Plaintiff's sophisticated intelligence-gathering capabilities and her marginalized status highlights a critical, catastrophic failure in the state's fundamental "Duty to Protect."

5.1 OSINT Operations and the Discovery of the Andrew Nelson Threat

Public documentation reveals that the Plaintiff utilized advanced intelligence frameworks, denoted in the records as the "Google Espionage v1.2.1-BLACKOPS" protocol and the "Flipping Gems" methodology, to track, document, and analyze domestic extremism and systemic corruption. Her work is positioned within a broader ideological framework advocating for the Universal Declaration of Organic Rights (UDOR) and the development of sustainable bio-materials (Hempoxies) to foster a post-predatory global economic model.

Through these highly sophisticated, ethical OSINT initiatives, the Plaintiff compiled exhaustive forensic reports identifying an individual named Andrew "Christo" Nelson as a severe, active neo-Nazi threat actor operating in the New Brunswick area. The intelligence captured by the Plaintiff documented explicit, genocidal threats made by Nelson, including horrifying statements directed at the Plaintiff such as threats to "slice fillets of your flesh and drink blood," desires to "put [her] in a gas chamber," and explicit threats to track down and terrorize her family. Beyond localized harassment, Nelson's communications included genocidal advocacy against "all the gays, lesbians and trannies" and "non-whites," alongside high-level national security threats asserting that Prime Minister "Justin Trudeau is a dead man walking" and threatening the life of US President Joe Biden.

5.2 Institutional Paralysis and the Credibility Deficit

Despite submitting this highly actionable, exhaustively documented intelligence directly to the Codiac RCMP and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), the state apparatus allegedly took absolutely no meaningful action to neutralize the threat, investigate Nelson, or protect the Plaintiff. The causation for this terrifying inaction links directly back to the false CPIC record. Because the Plaintiff was flagged in national police databases as an unstable, violent sexual offender, her credibility as a reliable intelligence informant was systematically destroyed by the state's own administrative negligence.

Officers allegedly dismissed the threat dossiers entirely, with one member purportedly stating to the Plaintiff that "Nazism and swastikas were legal in Canada" before literally throwing the intelligence report in the garbage. This dynamic illustrates a profound systemic vulnerability within Canadian law enforcement: when marginalized individuals are falsely criminalized by the state, they are simultaneously and entirely stripped of state protection. The abject failure to investigate credible, documented death threats forced the Plaintiff into a state of severe hyper-vigilance and perceived necessity for self-defense. These desperate survival tactics were subsequently weaponized by the state to lay further criminal charges against her, completing a vicious cycle of victimization. Correspondence sent to the Prime Minister's Office characterizes this situation as a "total institutional failure" to address neo-Nazi threats and systemic discrimination.

6. Theoretical Legal Framework and Causes of Action

The draft Statement of Claim and the extensive legal briefings prepared by the Plaintiff advance a sophisticated, multi-tiered legal theory designed to bypass standard governmental immunities and hold the Crown fully liable. The claim relies on common law torts, the strategic deployment of the Continuing Tort doctrine, and constitutional remedies under Section 24(1) of the Charter. Furthermore, the Plaintiff has outlined 46 distinct criminal and civil charges she is evaluating for action against the individuals involved in her persecution.

Category of Legal Action	Specific Causes or Charges	Jurisprudential / Statutory Basis
Common Law Torts	Negligence, Misfeasance in Public Office, False Imprisonment, Defamation, Intentional Infliction of Mental Suffering.	<i>Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth</i> (Duty of care for police); established tort principles for misfeasance.
Constitutional Torts	Breaches of Section 7 (Liberty), Section 11(d) (Presumption of Innocence), and Section 15 (Equality Rights).	<i>Vancouver (City) v. Ward</i> (Framework for s.24(1) damages); <i>Godbout v. Longueuil</i> .
Criminal Allegations	Perjury, Obstruction of Justice, Conversion Therapy, Assault, Hate Crimes, Destruction of Evidence.	Criminal Code of Canada (e.g., s. 320.101 for Conversion Therapy).

6.1 Negligence and the Duty of Care in Police Record-Keeping

The foundational cause of action is the tort of negligence. The establishment of this tort against law enforcement rests heavily on the Supreme Court of Canada's landmark ruling in *Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board* (2007 SCC 41). *Hill* decisively established that police are not immune from liability under the law of negligence and owe a specific, prima facie duty of care to suspects under investigation. The Supreme Court determined that the relationship between police and a suspect discloses sufficient foreseeability and proximity, recognizing that negligent policing directly and foreseeably causes profound, compensable harm to an individual's liberty, reputation, and socio-economic standing. Furthermore, the Court explicitly ruled that recognizing this duty of care does not detract from public policy goals, nor does it inhibit lawful police discretion.

Applying the rigorous *Hill* framework to the Landry case, the duty of care extends logically and necessarily beyond the active investigation phase into the administrative maintenance of the resulting criminal records. The RCMP possesses a strict, uncompromising duty to ensure that CPIC entries accurately reflect judicial outcomes. The standard of care—that of a reasonable police officer or administrative agent in similar circumstances—was unequivocally breached when the "Withdrawn" disposition was erroneously recorded as a "Guilty" conviction and left uncorrected for a staggering 2,555 days. The RCMP's September 2023 letters formally admitting to the "administrative error" serve as a de facto, insurmountable concession of this breach. The primary legal hurdle for the Plaintiff during litigation will focus on proving strict causation: demonstrating that the false CPIC entry was the proximate, "but for" cause of the subsequent bail denials, coerced pleas, psychological injury, and the destruction of her business conglomerate.

6.2 Misfeasance in Public Office and Intimidation

To elevate the claim beyond simple negligence and access aggravated and punitive damages, the Plaintiff alleges Misfeasance in Public Office. This intentional tort requires the Plaintiff to prove that public officers engaged in deliberate, unlawful conduct, or acted with reckless indifference to the law, while subjectively knowing that their actions would cause harm to the Plaintiff.

The evidentiary basis for this grave claim relies on the conduct of specific RCMP members, notably Cst. Gabriel Gallant and informant Tania Mallet. The Plaintiff asserts that Cst. Gallant engaged in severe intimidation tactics subsequent to the withdrawal of the 2016 charges. Specifically, the Plaintiff alleges that Cst. Gallant ordered her into his police cruiser, drove her across town, and explicitly stated that he "knew" she was guilty and had pleaded guilty, deliberately ignoring the judicial withdrawal of the charges. This action demonstrates a willful perpetuation of the false narrative. Furthermore, the RCMP's persistent refusal to correct the CPIC record despite repeated, desperate complaints over seven years, followed by administrative bodies callously concluding that the error had "no repercussions," is presented as incontrovertible evidence of a calculated, high-handed disregard for the truth designed solely to shield the state from liability.

6.3 Constitutional Torts and the Application of *Vancouver v. Ward*

The Plaintiff seeks substantial constitutional damages under Section 24(1) of the Charter, which allows courts of competent jurisdiction to award remedies that are "appropriate and just in the circumstances" when Charter rights are infringed. The claim identifies three primary constitutional breaches:

1. **Section 7 (Life, Liberty, and Security of the Person):** The state's use of a falsified criminal record to deny bail resulted in approximately 1,095 days of unlawful pre-trial remand, constituting an arbitrary deprivation of liberty fundamentally contrary to the principles of fundamental justice.
2. **Section 11(d) (Presumption of Innocence):** The maintenance and active use of a conviction record for an acquitted charge fatally subverted the presumption of innocence in all subsequent judicial proceedings, rendering fair trials impossible and coercing guilty pleas.
3. **Section 15 (Equality Rights):** The administrative negligence, the subsequent police harassment, and the denial of appropriate healthcare (including forced cessation of hormone therapy) were fueled by systemic transphobia, denying the Plaintiff equal protection under the law based on her gender identity.

The application of *Vancouver (City) v. Ward* (2010 SCC 27) is central to validating the financial quantum of the claim. In *Ward*, the Supreme Court confirmed that Charter damages are functionally justified if they serve three distinct purposes: compensating the victim for personal losses (including deprivation of liberty, humiliation, and psychological trauma); vindicating the specific rights that were breached to prevent them from being "whittled away by attrition"; and deterring future rights-breaching conduct by the state. The Plaintiff's reliance on the *Ward* framework aims to secure a quantum that accurately reflects the sheer severity of a multi-year deprivation of liberty caused by systemic data negligence and institutional transphobia.

7. Administrative Oversight and the Jurisdictional

Deadlock

The Landry case exposes a severe regulatory vacuum and bureaucratic dysfunction between Canada's primary civilian oversight bodies. The Plaintiff has been subjected to a Kafkaesque "ping-pong" defense, whereby federal agencies utilize procedural technicalities and contradictory findings to avoid adjudicating the substantive human rights and negligence claims.

7.1 The CRCC and CHRC Procedural Warfare

The Plaintiff initiated concurrent, paired investigations with the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission (CRCC file #2023-2623) and the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC file #2023-0331). The RCMP's defense strategy relied entirely on invoking statutory limitation periods to orchestrate a jurisdictional deadlock.

Regarding the CHRC complaint, the RCMP invoked Section 41(1)(e) of the Canadian Human Rights Act, arguing that because the initial data entry error occurred in 2016, the complaint fell outside the standard one-year limitation period. Furthermore, they utilized Section 41(1)(b) to argue that the matter was more appropriately handled by the CRCC under the RCMP Act. Conversely, the CRCC investigations either closed files citing similar time constraints (e.g., file 2023-2664) or abruptly halted their probes by concluding that a municipal employee, rather than an RCMP member, was at fault—a conclusion that explicitly contradicted both the CRCC investigator's own prior emails and the City of Moncton's formal denial.

This administrative attrition culminated on June 13, 2025, when the CHRC issued a highly contentious "Report for Decision". The CHRC recommended not dealing with any allegations predating July 31, 2022, labeling them "out-of-time" and legally severing them from the ongoing harm. Shockingly, the report also recommended designating the allegations regarding the RCMP's failure to update police records and recognize the Plaintiff's transgender status as "frivolous," arguing a lack of facts linking the data error to discriminatory conduct on prohibited grounds.

The Plaintiff fiercely contested this decision in a 15-page rebuttal filed on July 1, 2025, arguing that the CHRC fundamentally misunderstood the continuous and discriminatory nature of the harm. Following this, the Plaintiff declared the mandated mediation process a failure on July 14, 2025, stating "WE DO NOT HAVE AN AGREEMENT," and finalized preparations for Federal Court litigation.

7.2 Defeating the Time-Bar: The Continuing Tort Doctrine and Discoverability

To defeat the state's reliance on strict limitation periods and the CHRC's attempt to dismiss the 2016 origins of the case, the Plaintiff's legal theory advances two robust common law principles: the Discoverability Principle and the Continuing Tort Doctrine.

The **Discoverability Principle** dictates that a statutory limitation period does not commence until the plaintiff discovers, or ought reasonably to have discovered by exercising due diligence, the material facts giving rise to the cause of action (including the identity of the tortfeasor). The Plaintiff argues persuasively that while the initial erroneous data entry occurred in 2016, the full scope of the institutional cover-up, the exact mechanics of the error, and the formal admission of the RCMP's culpability did not manifest until the receipt of the September 2023 correspondence. Therefore, the clock for filing civil claims against the Crown should legally toll from 2023, not

2016.

More powerfully, the **Continuing Tort Doctrine** addresses harms that are not singular historical events but ongoing, persistent violations. Jurisprudence establishes that where tortious conduct is continuous—such as a continuous trespass, an ongoing nuisance, or the daily maintenance of a false imprisonment—a fresh cause of action arises *de die in diem* (day by day). The Plaintiff argues that the systemic discrimination and gross negligence did not occur solely as a static event in October 2016. Rather, every single day the false CPIC record remained active in the national database, and every distinct instance where that record was accessed by police or prosecutors to deny bail, pathologize her identity, or authorize aggressive force, constituted a fresh, actionable breach of her Charter rights. This doctrine effectively neutralizes the CHRC's attempt to sever the 2016 administrative error, legally linking it to the ongoing systemic harm experienced continuously through 2023.

8. The Damages Model and Demands for Systemic Reform

The litigation involves complex, escalating financial demands that accurately reflect the total, systemic destruction of the Plaintiff's life trajectory, personal liberty, and business enterprises over a decade.

8.1 The Structured \$50 Million Claim

The meticulously structured draft Statement of Claim formally seeks \$8,000,000.00 in specific damage heads, though the overview documents and intelligence reports routinely refer to a comprehensive \$50,000,000.00 valuation. This larger figure reflects the total systemic impact, encompassing the complete loss of the "Landry Industries Conglomerate" and the deprivation of Future Earning Capacity. The structured \$8,000,000.00 demand is broken down functionally to explicitly satisfy the *Ward* criteria for Charter damages:

Head of Damage	Amount Sought	Legal Basis and Functional Justification
General Damages	\$5,000,000.00	Compensation for non-pecuniary losses. Includes \$1.5M for the loss of liberty (1,095 days of false imprisonment); \$2M for severe psychological trauma (PTSD, anxiety) stemming from systemic betrayal and coercion; and \$1.5M for the destruction of professional reputation as an OSINT Spymaster/CEO.
Aggravated Damages	\$2,000,000.00	Compensation for the "high-handed," malicious, and offensive conduct of the state. Specifically penalizes the 9-year duration of the

Head of Damage	Amount Sought	Legal Basis and Functional Justification
		uncorrected error and the profoundly insulting administrative finding by the CRCC/CHRC that the false record had "no repercussions".
Punitive Damages	\$1,000,000.00	Directed purely at the deterrence function (<i>Ward</i>). Necessary to denounce the systemic failure of CPIC data integrity and to severely deter the state from utilizing known fabricated records to coerce guilty pleas from marginalized citizens.
Special Damages	~\$75,000.00+	Quantifiable, out-of-pocket financial losses. Primarily encompasses the legal fees expended fighting the coerced pleas and the extensive administrative costs incurred over years to force the correction of the CPIC record.

8.2 The \$1 Billion Escalation and Demands for Reform

Parallel to the drafted legal pleadings, correspondence directed to Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and Minister of Justice Arif Virani on December 18, 2024, served formal notice of intent to seek an escalated \$1 Billion in compensation. This escalated figure transcends standard tort compensation matrices and operates as a mechanism of intense political and public relations pressure.

It aims to compel a holistic settlement that moves beyond mere financial reparation to demand binding, systemic reforms. The Plaintiff's demands include a formal, public apology from the Government of Canada; the implementation of mandatory sensitivity training for all RCMP officers regarding gender identity and record management; the creation of transparent error-correction protocols for national databases with automatic notifications to affected citizens; the establishment of a truly independent oversight body; and a comprehensive, absolute ban on all forms of conversion therapy across all psychiatric and correctional institutions.

9. Synthesized Conclusions and Broader Implications

The exhaustive review of the materials related to Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry's conflict with the RCMP reveals a catastrophic, multi-year failure of the Canadian justice and administrative systems. An undisputed, localized data entry error in 2016 was permitted to metastasize into a systemic engine of criminalization, stripping the Plaintiff of her presumption of innocence, her liberty, her health, and her economic livelihood.

The defense strategies employed by the RCMP and federal oversight bodies—relying on strict

limitation periods, attempting to shift blame to municipal employees despite contradictory evidence, and minimizing the profound repercussions of the false record as "frivolous"—appear legally vulnerable when confronted with the "Continuing Tort" doctrine and the established duty of care outlined by the Supreme Court in *Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth*.

The Plaintiff's demand for significant Charter and tort damages is structurally supported by the functional justifications for constitutional remedies established in *Vancouver (City) v. Ward*.

Beyond financial compensation, the evidentiary record demands immediate systemic intervention. The case establishes that in the digital age, a citizen's liberty is inextricably tied to database integrity. CPIC is the central nervous system of Canadian law enforcement; a single unchecked data entry has the power to alter threat matrixes, deny bail, instigate physical violence, and coerce guilty pleas.

If litigated to a verdict, *Landry v. RCMP* possesses the requisite factual and constitutional gravity to fundamentally alter the landscape of police liability and digital data rights in Canada. It serves as a stark warning regarding the intersection of administrative negligence and systemic transphobia, demonstrating that digital defamation by the state is a direct, inescapable pathway to physical and constitutional deprivation.

Works cited

1. Landry vs. RCMP Case Overview, 2. Urgent: Landry vs. RCMP Case Overview, 3. Re: URGENT: Subject: Formal Submission - Alleged Criminal Record Discrepancies and Systemic Justice Failures - Marie Seshat Landry - July 1, 2025, 4. Evidence in Marie Seshat Landry vs RCMP false corrupted records.pdf, <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Z58iu9TunlomZziwU9-tvVs-oPGwNPEA> 5. Statement of Claim (Draft): Misfeasance & Charterpdf, <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1-A3ezYVqIUrfHV0GRskFjlp6ZjGIbrw> 6. Subject:  Urgent Request for Justice: \$1 Billion Claim Against Government of Canada for Systemic Failures, 7. Landry vs. RCMP Case Overview.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1aEtUcNxbGGqCOqFiwp5KZQo_2XrgilV 8. A Law Commission Consultation Paper on The Statutes of Limitation : Claims in Contract and Tort in Respect of Latent Damage (Other than Personal Injury), https://www.lawreform.ie/_fileupload/consultation%20papers/cpLatentDamage.htm 9. Restatement of the Law Third Torts: Miscellaneous Provisions - americancollegecoverage.org, https://www.americancollegecoverage.org/assets/CommitteeNewsArticles/ACCC_Articles_LiabEconHarmChp3IntWEconInt_ALI_20250515.pdf 10. Conte v. County of Nassau | Cases - Westlaw, [https://content.next.westlaw.com/Document/lf57f008af90511e2a98ec867961a22de/View/FullText.html?transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://content.next.westlaw.com/Document/lf57f008af90511e2a98ec867961a22de/View/FullText.html?transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)) 11. OSINT RELEASE: A Proposal For Rebranding The Greater Moncton Area (GMA) To The Greater Codiac Area (GCA) | PDF | New Brunswick - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/919745471/OSINT-RELEASE-A-Proposal-for-Rebranding-the-Greater-Moncton-Area-GMA-to-the-Greater-Codiac-Area-GCA> 12. Subject: List of Witnesses, Roles, and False Video Claims in Case 2016-84414, 13. Fwd: Urgent: RCMP Falsification of CPIC Records, Transphobic Harassment, and Wrongful Prosecutions, 14. Landry vs. RCMP Case Overview | PDF | Damages | Negligence - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/967241560/Landry-vs-RCMP-Case-Overview> 15. [Confidential] « Mission Complete » : [Full report]: --- **Title:** Comprehensive Intelligence Report on Systemic LGBTQ Discrimination in Law Enforcement - Lessons and Calls to Action

****Date:**** September 9, 2023, 16. Criminal Code (RSC , 1985, c. C-46) - Justice Canada, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/page-26.html> 17. Hate crimes and incidents in Canada: Facts trends and information for frontline police officers, <https://rcmp.ca/en/corporate-information/publications-and-manuals/hate-crimes-and-incidents-canada> 18. Bans on conversion therapies | ILGA World Database, <https://database.ilga.org/conversion-therapies-lgbti> 19. Standards Regarding Conversion Therapy - NBASW, <https://www.nbasw-atsnb.ca/assets/Uploads/Conversion-Therapy-Full-Standards-EN.pdf> 20. Standards Banning Conversion Therapy - NBASW, <https://www.nbasw-atsnb.ca/assets/Uploads/Standards-Banning-Conversion-Therapy-EN.pdf> 21. CMHA statement on conversion 'therapy', <https://cmha.ca/brochure/cmha-statement-on-conversion-therapy/> 22. Justice for All: Ending Conversion Therapy Practices in Canada - OurCommons.ca, <https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/432/JUST/Brief/BR11006100/br-external/WellsKristopher-e.pdf> 23. Unclassified Report - Myself, Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry - Made With Google Espionage, <https://www.scribd.com/document/967242210/Unclassified-Report-Myself-Marie-soleil-Seshat-Landry-Made-With-Google-Espionage> 24. Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry: OSINT Spymaster Profile | PDF | Artificial Intelligence - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/980655169/Marie-Soleil-Seshat-Landry-OSINT-Spymaster-Profile> 25. UNCLASSIFIED REPORT - MYSELF, MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY - MADE WITH GOOGLE ESPIONAGE.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1c_-2Oz_ktztj1Vr6M9E5rDp4jAVJAdt_ 26. Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board - SCC Cases, <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2382/index.do> 27. Investigative Negligence Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board (2007), <http://archive.reid.com/pdfs/hillhamilton.pdf> 28. Hill v Hamilton-Wentworth | Case Brief Wiki - Fandom, https://casebrief.fandom.com/wiki/Hill_v_Hamilton-Wentworth 29. The Tort of Negligent Investigation: Canada's Recognition of the Tort as a Model for Improving Compensation for the Wrongfully Convicted - Wisconsin International Law Journal, https://wilj.law.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1270/2021/08/38.3_618-649_Olsen.pdf 30. Re: URGENT: Potential \$13M Charter/Misfeasance Claim (s. 7/11(d)) against RCMP—9-Year CPIC Falsification Causing 3 Years Unlawful Incarceration, 31. Charter damages as a Means of Addressing Government Wrongs in Individual and Class Action Litigation - Rice Harbut Elliott, <https://rhelaw.com/charter-damages-as-a-means-of-addressing-government-wrongs-in-individual-and-class-action-litigation/> 32. Tort Lite?: Vancouver (City) v. War and the Availability of Damages for Charter Infringements - Osgoode Digital Commons, <https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1220&context=sclr> 33. Vancouver (City) v. Ward - SCC Cases, <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/7868/index.do> 34. UNDERSTANDING CHARTER DAMAGES, <https://utppublishing.com/doi/preview-pdf/10.3138/9781552213902.35644> 35. 35644 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA (ON APPEAL FROM THE ALBERTA COURT OF APPEAL) BETWEEN: SAMIR MOHAMED Appellant, https://www.scc-csc.ca/pdf/case-documents/35644/FM020_Respondent_Her-Majesty-the-Queen.pdf 36. The Doctrine of Discoverability - Grenier Law, <https://grenierlaw.ca/markup-html-tags-and-formatting/> 37. The Law Society of Saskatchewan Library's online newsletter highlighting recent case digests from all levels of Saskatchewan Courts, <https://www.lawsociety.sk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/CM25-5.pdf>