Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONDING MOTION RECORD

(Defendant's motion to strike, determined in writing under Rule 369 of the Federal Courts Rules)

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY
1-29 Connaught Avenue
Moncton, NB E1C 3N7
Tel: 506-588-2787
Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com
Plaintiff (Responding Party), self-represented

TO: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA Department of Justice Canada
Atlantic Regional Office
5251 Duke Street, Suite 1400
Halifax, NS B3J 3P1
Per: Amy Smeltzer
Tel: 902-829-7053 | Fax: 902-426-2329 Email: amy.smeltzer@justice.gc.ca
Counsel for the Defendant (Moving Party)

AND TO: THE REGISTRAR
Federal Court

DATED at Moncton, New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	Written Representations of the Plaintiff	3
2	Affidavit "A" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – RCMP Commanding Officer's Letter of Dec 1, 2023	13
	Exhibit "A" – Letter from Assistant Commissioner DeAnna L. Hill, Commanding Officer, New Brunswick RCMP (Dec 1, 2023)	15
3	Affidavit "B" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – RCMP Professional	17

	Responsibility Unit Letter of Sept 2023	
	Exhibit "B" – Letter from S/Sgt. Chantal Roger, J Division Professional Responsibility Unit, RCMP (Sept 2023; CRCC 2023-2623, RCMP 2023-1281916)	19
4	Affidavit "C" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – Correspondence with Cpl. Yanick Soucy, Sept 26, 2023	22
	Exhibit "C" – Email thread with Cpl. Yanick Soucy, RCMP Codiac Public Complaints (Sept 26, 2023)	24
5	Affidavit "D" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – City of Moncton Letter of Dec 5, 2024	28
	Exhibit "D" – Email and letter from Laura Armes, Director of Human Resources, City of Moncton (Dec 5, 2024)	30
6	Affidavit "E" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – Provincial Court Sheet, Oct 31, 2016	33
	Exhibit "E" – Provincial Court of New Brunswick court sheet, case 33094001 (Oct 31, 2016)	35
7	Affidavit "F" of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry – Provincial Court Records Request, Oct 16, 2026	37
	Exhibit "F" – Screenshot of email confirming court records request JTC-26-015640, Provincial Court at Moncton (Oct 16, 2026)	39
8	Amended Statement of Claim	41
9	Declaration Regarding Use of Artificial Intelligence	49

TAB 1

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PLAINTIFF *(Responding to the Defendant's Motion to Strike, determined in writing under Rule 369 of the Federal Courts Rules)*

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

OVERVIEW

1. The Defendant moves under Rules 221(1)(a), (c) and (f) of the *Federal Courts Rules*, SOR/98-106 [Rules] to strike the Statement of Claim without leave to amend or, in the alternative, for further and better particulars under Rule 181(2). The motion is being determined in writing under Rule 369. The Plaintiff does not object to that.

2. The core of this action is narrow. On October 31, 2016, the Crown withdrew the charges of indecent act and assault against the Plaintiff in the Provincial Court of New Brunswick at Moncton. The RCMP's records nevertheless showed both charges as convictions: the indecent act entry until May 2023 and the assault entry until July 2025. The RCMP has itself acknowledged in writing that the 2016 disposition was recorded in error.

3. The Plaintiff accepts that her original Statement of Claim, which she drafted without a lawyer, did not set out the material facts in the form the Rules require. She has prepared an Amended Statement of Claim (Tab 8). The Defendant has not filed a defence, so Rule 200 allows her to amend without leave. The amended pleading narrows the action.

It removes the request for judicial review and the claim for false imprisonment, identifies the Crown servants involved by position and office, and pleads facts supporting each element of each cause of action.

4. Read generously, the amended pleading discloses reasonable causes of action in negligence, misfeasance in public office and for damages under s. 24(1) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* [Charter]. It is not frivolous or vexatious, and it does not attack any court order or tribunal decision. The motion should be dismissed. If any part of the pleading is found deficient, the proportionate remedy is leave to amend or an order for particulars, not striking the action without leave.

PART I – STATEMENT OF FACTS

5. The facts below are those pleaded in the Amended Statement of Claim. Where a fact is also shown in the Plaintiff's affidavits, the affidavit is noted. That evidence is filed only for the grounds under Rules 221(1)(c) and (f) and for the question of leave to amend (see paragraph 18 below).

6. On January 22, 2016, the Codiac Regional RCMP opened occurrence file 2016-84414. The Plaintiff was charged with indecent act (*Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46, s. 173(1)(b)) and assault (s. 266) in Provincial Court case 33094001.

7. On October 31, 2016, in Courtroom 6 of the Provincial Court at Moncton, before Judge Jolène M. Richard, Crown prosecutor Éric Lalonde withdrew both charges. The court sheet records the disposition as "Withdrawn" (Affidavit "E", Exhibit "E"). No finding of guilt was ever made.

8. The disposition was then recorded in the RCMP's records for file 2016-84414 as a conviction rather than a withdrawal. As a result, the Plaintiff's records in the RCMP's Police Reporting and Occurrence System (PROS) and in the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) showed convictions for indecent act and assault. The indecent act entry was corrected in May 2023, about 2,373 days later. The assault entry was corrected in July 2025, about 3,195 days later.

9. Between late 2016 and 2019, the Plaintiff faced further charges, including mischief (s. 430 of the *Criminal Code*), taking a motor vehicle without consent (s. 335), assault (s. 266) and possession of cannabis. In those proceedings she was held in custody before trial, and at times under assessment orders, at the Shediac Correctional Centre, the Restigouche Hospital Centre and other facilities, for about 1,000 days in total. At her

bail hearings, the Crown relied on, and the presiding justices were given, her CPIC record, which falsely showed convictions for a sexual offence and an offence of violence.

10. In 2023 the Plaintiff complained to the RCMP and to the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP (CRCC). The RCMP's responses acknowledged the error:

    (a) In September 2023, S/Sgt. Chantal Roger of the J Division Professional Responsibility Unit wrote that the complaint concerned an employee of the court section of the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment who had not correctly documented the results of the court proceedings in the file in which the charges had been withdrawn in 2016, and who entered that information in police records (Affidavit "B", Exhibit "B").

    (b) On September 26, 2023, Cpl. Yanick Soucy of RCMP Codiac Public Complaints wrote: "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" (Affidavit "C", Exhibit "C").

    (c) On December 1, 2023, Assistant Commissioner DeAnna L. Hill, Commanding Officer of the New Brunswick RCMP, wrote that J Division Criminal Operations had reviewed file 2016-84414, including recordings and

documentation from the Moncton Provincial Court, and that the findings of an administrative error had been shared with the Officer in Charge of the Codiac Detachment with a direction to take corrective action (Affidavit "A", Exhibit "A").

11. The RCMP letters of September and December 2023 described the employee as a City of Moncton municipal employee. On December 5, 2024, after an internal review, the City of Moncton wrote that the person who made the mistake in 2016 "was not an employee of the City and was a Public Service Employee of the Federal Government" (Affidavit "D", Exhibit "D"). On April 8, 2026, the CRCC closed its review on the basis that federal public service employees fall outside its jurisdiction.

12. Even after the RCMP's written acknowledgements of September and December 2023, the assault entry remained in CPIC until July 2025, about 20 months later.

13. The Plaintiff commenced this action on May 26, 2026. The Defendant served a Demand for Particulars dated June 15, 2026, which the Plaintiff answered on June 16, 2026. The Defendant brought this motion by notice dated July 6, 2026.

PART II – POINTS IN ISSUE

14. The issues are:

(a) whether the Statement of Claim, as amended, discloses a reasonable cause of action (Rule 221(1)(a));

(b) whether it is scandalous, frivolous or vexatious, or an abuse of process (Rules 221(1)(c) and (f)); and

(c) if any deficiency remains, whether the Court should grant leave to amend or order particulars rather than strike the claim without leave.

PART III – SUBMISSIONS

A. The test on a motion to strike

15. The Defendant must show that it is plain and obvious, assuming the facts pleaded to be true, that the claim discloses no reasonable cause of action: *R v Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd*, 2011 SCC 42 at para 17; *Hunt v Carey Canada Inc*, [1990] 2 SCR 959 at 980; *Fitzpatrick v Codiac Regional RCMP Force, District 12*, 2019 FC 1040 at para 15 [*Fitzpatrick*].

16. The pleading must be read generously. Drafting deficiencies or the wrong label for a cause

of action are not grounds to strike, particularly where the claim was drafted by a self-represented party. That a cause of action is novel or difficult to establish is not, by itself, a basis to strike: *Fitzpatrick* at paras 16–17.

17. The Plaintiff accepts that flexibility for self-represented parties does not excuse compliance with the Rules. A claim must set out the material facts – the "who, when, where, how and what" – supporting every element of each cause of action: Rule 174; *Fitzpatrick* at paras 19 and 24; *Al Omani v Canada*, 2017 FC 786 at paras 14–18 [*Al Omani*]. The Amended Statement of Claim was drafted to meet that standard.

18. Under Rule 221(2), no evidence may be heard on the ground in Rule 221(1)(a). The Plaintiff's affidavits are therefore filed only on the grounds under Rules 221(1)(c) and (f), and to show that any deficiency can be cured by amendment.

B. The Amended Statement of Claim

19. Rule 200 allows a party to amend its pleading without leave at any time before another party has pleaded to it. The Defendant has not filed a defence, and a notice of motion is not a pleading. The Plaintiff will serve and file the Amended Statement of Claim in accordance with Rule 79 and asks the Court to assess this motion against it. In the alternative, she asks for leave to amend under Rule 75(1). Because the pleading has been rewritten in full, she asks that it be accepted without underlining, or in whatever form the Court directs.

20. The amendments respond directly to the Defendant's grounds. They:

(a) delete the request for judicial review of the CRCC and Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) decisions;

(b) delete the claim for false imprisonment;

(c) delete the allegations of fraud, cover-up and coercion that were not particularized;

(d) identify the Crown servants by position, office and period;

(e) plead the dates, places and records on which the claim is based; and

(f) state expressly that the Plaintiff does not seek to set aside or vary any conviction, plea, bail order, assessment order or tribunal decision.

C. Vicarious liability: the Crown servants are sufficiently identified

21. The Crown is liable for torts committed by its servants: *Crown Liability and Proceedings Act*, RSC 1985, c C-50 [CLPA], ss. 3(b)(i) and 10. Members of the RCMP are deemed to be servants of the Crown for the purpose of determining liability: CLPA, s. 36. Federal public service employees are servants of the Crown.

22. A plaintiff must identify the individuals said to be responsible, but need not name them. Identifying "job positions, an organizational branch, an office, or a building" will usually be sufficient: *Merchant Law Group v Canada Revenue Agency*, 2010 FCA 184 at paras 37–38 [*Merchant Law Group*].

23. The amended pleading identifies three groups: (a) the employee or employees of the court section of the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment in Moncton who recorded the October 31, 2016 disposition in the RCMP's records for file 2016-84414; (b) the

RCMP members and employees responsible for the accuracy and correction of the Plaintiff's records in PROS and CPIC from October 31, 2016 to July 2025; and (c) the RCMP members of the J Division Professional Responsibility Unit and Criminal Operations who reviewed file 2016-84414 in 2023, and the Officer in Charge of the Codiac Detachment to whom their findings were referred. The Defendant knows who these people are: its own officers reviewed the file and wrote to the Plaintiff about it.

24. The Plaintiff pleads that the court section employee was a federal public service employee. On a motion under Rule 221(1)(a), that fact must be taken as true. It is also supported by the record: the RCMP's own investigator called the person "one of our PSE", and the City of Moncton says the person was not a City employee (Exhibits "C" and "D"). The earlier RCMP letters describe a municipal employee (Exhibits "A" and "B"). That conflict, between statements made by the Defendant's own officers, is a question of fact for trial. It is not a basis to strike a pleading.

25. In any event, the claim does not depend only on that employee. It pleads that RCMP members, who are Crown servants under s. 36 of the CLPA, were responsible for the records, knew of the error by 2023, and still kept the assault entry until July 2025.

D. Negligence is a reasonable cause of action

26. The Supreme Court of Canada has recognized that police owe a duty of care in their operational conduct toward a particularized suspect, in the tort of negligent investigation: *Hill v Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board*, 2007 SCC 41; see *Fitzpatrick* at para 26.

27. The amended pleading sets out the facts supporting a duty of care here. The records were about the Plaintiff alone. They existed to be relied on by police, prosecutors and courts when making decisions about her liberty, including bail. It was plainly foreseeable that recording withdrawn charges of a sexual offence and assault as convictions would be used against her. Recording a court disposition is an operational task, not a policy decision.

28. The pleading particularizes the breach (recording the withdrawn charges as convictions, failing to check the records against the court disposition for about six and a half and eight and a half years, and failing to correct the assault entry for about 20 months after the error was acknowledged), causation (the false record was given to the justices at her bail hearings) and damage (about 1,000 days in custody, loss of

reputation and distress). Whether a duty of care exists in this precise setting is at least arguable. A novel duty is not a reason to strike: *Fitzpatrick* at para 17.

E. Misfeasance in public office is a reasonable cause of action

29. The tort has two distinguishing elements: (i) deliberate unlawful conduct in the exercise of public functions; and (ii) awareness that the conduct is unlawful and likely to injure the plaintiff. The plaintiff must also prove causation and compensable injury: *Odhavji Estate v Woodhouse*, 2003 SCC 69 at paras 23 and 32 [*Odhavji*]. *Odhavji* itself concerned police officers' alleged failure to comply with a legal duty, and the Supreme Court allowed the misfeasance claim against them to proceed.

30. State of mind must be particularized, and bare conclusions are not enough: Rule 181(1)(b); *Merchant Law Group* at paras 34–35. The amended pleading therefore limits the misfeasance claim to the period after the RCMP knew of the error, and pleads the facts from which that knowledge arises:

    (a) by September 2023, RCMP officers had reviewed file 2016-84414, including the court's recordings, and acknowledged in writing that the 2016 disposition had been recorded in error;

    (b) the RCMP members responsible for the Plaintiff's records had a legal duty to keep them accurate, including under s. 6(2) of the *Privacy Act*, RSC 1985, c P-21;

    (c) they nonetheless kept the assault conviction entry in CPIC, available to police, prosecutors and courts, until July 2025; and

    (d) they knew that a recorded conviction for assault was likely to harm the Plaintiff, because that is what such records are used for and because she had told the RCMP in writing of the harm the record was causing her.

31. These are material facts, not conclusions. They are enough at the pleading stage. **F.**

The Charter claim is a reasonable cause of action

32. Section 11(e) of the Charter guarantees a person charged with an offence the right not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause. It entrenches the effect of the presumption of innocence at the pre-trial stage: *R v Antic*, 2017 SCC 27 at para 1. The amended

pleading relies on ss. 7, 9 and 11(e), and no longer on s. 11(d), which concerns the trial itself.

33. The RCMP is bound by the Charter. The pleading alleges that the Crown's servants put false conviction records before the justices deciding the Plaintiff's bail, and that this deprived her of liberty contrary to the principles of fundamental justice, contributed to her arbitrary detention, and denied her reasonable bail without just cause. Damages are available under s. 24(1) where they serve the functions of compensation, vindication or deterrence and countervailing considerations do not make them inappropriate: *Vancouver (City) v Ward*, 2010 SCC 27 at paras 24–25 and 33.

G. The claim is not frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of process

34. The Defendant says the claim lacks particulars and makes allegations of bad faith without foundation. The amended pleading removes the unparticularized allegations. What remains has a documentary foundation in the Defendant's own letters (Affidavits "A" to "C").

35. The claim is not a collateral attack. Relitigating a criminal conviction in another forum can be an abuse of process: *Toronto (City) v CUPE, Local 79*, 2003 SCC 63. This action does not do that. The Plaintiff does not ask this Court to set aside, vary or second-guess any conviction, plea, bail order, assessment order under the *Mental Health Act*, RSNB 1973, c M-10, or any decision of the CRCC or the CHRC, and the request for judicial review has been deleted. The wrong sued on – Crown servants recording and keeping false convictions in the RCMP's records – has never been decided by any court or tribunal, and the CRCC declined to consider it.

36. Saying that the Crown's servants supplied false information to a court is not an attack on the court's order. The justices are not said to have erred on the record before them; the claim is that the record given to them was false.

H. The Federal Court has jurisdiction

37. The Federal Court has concurrent original jurisdiction in all cases in which relief is claimed against the Crown: *Federal Courts Act*, RSC 1985, c F-7, s. 17(1). The claim is brought only against the federal Crown, for the conduct of RCMP members (Crown servants under s. 36 of the CLPA) and federal public service employees concerning RCMP records, including the national CPIC system. No claim is made against provincial Crown prosecutors, judges or provincial institutions.

I. In the alternative, leave to amend or particulars

38. Where a pleading discloses even a scintilla of a cause of action, it should be struck with leave to amend: *Fitzpatrick* at para 26, citing *Al Omani* at paras 32–35. In *Fitzpatrick* the claim was struck without leave because it had no factual basis and the plaintiff had not asked to amend (paras 23–27). Here the facts are documented and an amended pleading is before the Court.

39. The Defendant's own alternative request is for further and better particulars under Rule 181(2). The Plaintiff has already obtained from the Provincial Court at Moncton the list of her court files and has requested copies of the records in them (Affidavit "F"), so the hearing dates can be supplied promptly. If the Court finds any part of the amended pleading insufficient, that, or leave to amend, is the proportionate remedy.

PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT

40. The Plaintiff asks the Court for an order:

(a) dismissing the Defendant's motion;

(b) declaring that the Plaintiff may serve and file the Amended Statement of Claim at Tab 8 without leave under Rule 200 or, in the alternative, granting leave under Rule 75(1) to serve and file it within 10 days of the order, in the form at Tab 8 or as the Court directs;

(c) requiring the Defendant to serve and file its Statement of Defence within 30 days after service of the Amended Statement of Claim;

(d) in the further alternative, if any part of the pleading is struck, granting the Plaintiff leave to amend within 30 days; and

(e) awarding the Plaintiff her costs of the motion or, alternatively, ordering that each party bear its own costs.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.

DATED at Moncton, New Brunswick, this 28 day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY
Plaintiff (Self-Represented)
1-29 Connaught Avenue
Moncton, NB E1C 3N7
Tel: 506-588-2787
Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com

PART V – LIST OF AUTHORITIES

Legislation

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (UK), 1982, c 11, ss. 7, 9, 11(e), 24(1)

Criminal Code, RSC 1985, c C-46, ss. 173(1)(b), 266, 335, 430, 515(10)

Crown Liability and Proceedings Act, RSC 1985, c C-50, ss. 3(b)(i), 10, 36

Federal Courts Act, RSC 1985, c F-7, s. 17(1)

Federal Courts Rules, SOR/98-106, rr. 75, 79, 174, 181, 200, 221, 369

Mental Health Act, RSNB 1973, c M-10

Privacy Act, RSC 1985, c P-21, s. 6(2)

Case law

Al Omani v Canada, 2017 FC 786

Fitzpatrick v Codiac Regional RCMP Force, District 12, 2019 FC 1040

Hill v Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board, 2007 SCC 41

Hunt v Carey Canada Inc, [1990] 2 SCR 959

Merchant Law Group v Canada Revenue Agency, 2010 FCA 184

Odhavji Estate v Woodhouse, 2003 SCC 69

R v Antic, 2017 SCC 27

R v Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd, 2011 SCC 42
Toronto (City) v CUPE, Local 79, 2003 SCC 63
Vancouver (City) v Ward, 2010 SCC 27

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "A" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On October 31, 2016, the criminal charges against me under RCMP investigative file 2016-84414 (one count of indecent act and one count of assault) were withdrawn in the Provincial Court of New Brunswick at Moncton.

3. After the charges were withdrawn, they were recorded and kept in the RCMP's records and in the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) database as convictions.

4. On or about September 26, 2023, I sent further correspondence and evidence to the Commanding Officer of the RCMP's "J" Division about the error in file 2016-84414.

5. In response, the RCMP re-tasked the "J" Division Criminal Operations Office to review file

2016-84414 and compare it with the new evidence, obtained further documentation, including recordings, from the Moncton Provincial Court, and engaged its Professional Responsibility Unit to review the actions that led to the administrative

error.

6. On or about December 1, 2023, I received a letter from Assistant Commissioner DeAnna L. Hill, Commanding Officer of the New Brunswick RCMP.

7. In that letter, Assistant Commissioner Hill stated that:

   (a) an administrative error had been made in RCMP investigative file 2016-84414, which the letter attributed to a municipal employee of the Codiac RCMP detachment;

   (b) the findings had been shared with Superintendent Benoit Jolette, Officer in Charge of the Codiac detachment, and Charles Savoie, described as the City Manager for municipal employees with the Codiac RCMP; and

   (c) both had been directed to take the necessary measures and corrective actions to ensure the occurrence does not re-occur.

8. Attached as **Exhibit "A"** to this affidavit is a true copy of the letter from Assistant Commissioner Hill dated December 1, 2023.

9. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN~~ (or AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick


William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "A"

referred to in the Affidavit "A" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 28th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029



Assistant Commissioner, Andrea L. Hill, OOM
Commanding Officer, New Brunswick RCMP

TAB 3

Federal Court File No.: T-2559-26 Plaintiff's Responding Motion Record

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)
Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING
Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "B" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY *(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)*

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On or about July 19, 2023, I raised my concerns with the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP (CRCC) about how the outcome of the criminal charges withdrawn against me in 2016 had been recorded.

3. In September 2023, I received a letter in French from Staff Sergeant Chantal Roger, Non-Commissioned Officer in charge of the J Division Professional Responsibility Unit of the RCMP in Fredericton, under CRCC file 2023-2623 and RCMP file 2023-1281916. The day of the date is not legible on my copy. The RCMP's letter of December 1, 2023 (Affidavit "A", Exhibit "A") refers to it as dated September 19, 2023.

4. In that letter, Staff Sergeant Roger stated, in substance (my translation), that: 17

(a) my complaint concerned an employee working with the court at the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment who had entered the information in police records, and who had not correctly documented the results of the court proceedings in a file in which the charges against me were withdrawn before the court in 2016;

(b) the public complaint process under Part VII of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act* applies only to members and to persons appointed or employed under Part I of that Act, and because the employee was described as a municipal employee of the City of Moncton, my complaint would not be investigated under Part VII; and

(c) my complaint had been brought to the attention of Superintendent Benoit Jolette, Officer in Charge of the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment, and Charles Savoie, the manager responsible for municipal employees of the Codiac RCMP, for any measures they considered necessary.

5. Attached as **Exhibit "B"** to this affidavit is a true copy of the letter from Staff Sergeant Roger (two pages, in French).

6. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN~~ (or AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "B"

referred to in the Affidavit "B" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 28th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmerie Royale du Canada

Sergent d'état-major Chantal Roger
Groupe de la responsabilité professionnelle de la Division J
GRC – Division J
1445 Rue Regent
Frédéricton N.B
E3B 4Z8

CRCC File # - CCETP no de référence

2023-2623

Our File - Notre référence

2023-1281916

Marie Landry

D

Le 7 September, 2023

Objet : Plainte contre un employé municipal

Bonjour,

La présente lettre fait suite aux préoccupations que vous avez exprimées auprès de la Commission civile d'examen et de traitement des plaintes relatives à la Gendarmerie royale du Canada (CCETP) le 19 juillet 2023. Elle traite d'une allégation contre un employé municipal travaillant au bureau de la section de la cour du Détachement régional de Codiac de la Gendarmerie royale du Canada (GRC). L'employé n'a pas correctement documenté les résultats de la procédure judiciaire dans un dossier dans lequel les accusations portées contre vous ont été retirées devant le tribunal en 2016.

J'aimerais vous informer que la GRC et la Commission civile d'examen et de traitement des plaintes relatives à la GRC ont pour mandat, en vertu de la partie VII de la Loi sur le GRC, de traiter les plaintes concernant la conduite dans l'exercice de tout devoir ou fonction de tout membre ou autre personne qui, au moment où la conduite aurait eu lieu, était membre ou employé sous le régime de la Loi sur le GRC.

Les critères suivants sont requis lorsqu'il s'agit de la partie VII de la Loi sur la GRC :

1- S'applique uniquement aux membres et aux personnes nommées ou employés en vertu de la partie I de la Loi sur la GRC
2- Doit concerner la conduite, en service, pendant l'exercice de ces fonctions ; ou

2

3- Comportement hors service ou le membre se présente comme un policier et agit avec autorité (ex. : montre son insigne, indique qu'il est policier, etc.)

Concernant cette plainte, un examen des informations a permis de déterminer que vous déposiez une plainte concernant le comportement d'un des employés municipaux de la GRC de Codiac qui travaille avec la cour et a inscrit l'information dans les dossiers de police.

Cet employé n'est pas « un membre ou une personne nommée ou employée en vertu de la partie I de la *Loi sur la GRC* », puisqu'il est un employé municipal de la Ville de Moncton. Le processus de plainte du public ne peut pas être appliqué aux plaintes concernant une personne qui n'est pas employée sous l'autorité de la *Loi sur la GRC*. Par conséquent, vos préoccupations ne feront pas l'objet d'une enquête en vertu de la partie VII de la *Loi sur la GRC*.

Néanmoins, votre plainte a été portée à l'attention de l'officier responsable du Détachement régional de Codiac de la GRC, le surintendant Benoit Jolette et du gestionnaire responsable des employés municipaux de la GRC de Codiac, Charles Savoie, pour toute mesure qu'ils jugeraient nécessaire. J'apprécie le temps que vous avez pris pour soulever les préoccupations décrites dans votre correspondance au CCETP.

Quant à votre plainte pour harcèlement de la part des policiers de Codiac, elle sera traitée selon la partie VII de *la Loi sur la GRC*. Un enquêteur vous contactera prochainement pour en discuter davantage.

Salutations distinguées,

Chantal Roger, Sergent d'état-major
Sous-Officier responsable
Groupe de la responsabilité professionnelle de la Division J

CC: Direction nationale des plaintes du public
Commission civile d'examen et de traitement des plaintes

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "C" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On or about September 26, 2023, following an in-person meeting about my public complaints (CRCC 2023-2623 / CHRC 2023-0331 / RCMP 2023-1281916), I exchanged emails with Corporal Yanick Soucy of RCMP Codiac Public Complaints.

3. In that correspondence I sent Cpl. Soucy a written summary of our meeting. It described the administrative error we had discussed, my concerns about transphobic bias in how I had been treated, the dismissal of my earlier statements to police, and my requests for exoneration, public apologies and access to the audio recording and records of the investigation.

4. On September 26, 2023, Cpl. Soucy replied in writing. He acknowledged our conversation, explained how to request the audio recording through access to information, referred to the roles of the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC)

and the CRCC, and wrote: *"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, but be reassured that the charge under Section 173 was withdrawn accordingly in October 2016 before the Court."*

5. Attached as **Exhibit "C"** to this affidavit is a true copy of the complete email thread between me and Cpl. Soucy dated September 26, 2023, with my forwarding emails of September 26, 2023 and May 12, 2025.

6. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN~~ (or AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "C"

referred to in the Affidavit "C" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 28th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

Gmail

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry (Marie Landry Spy Shop) <marielandryceo@gmail.com>

Subject: Key Points Meeting Summary - CRCC 2023-2623 / CHRC 2023-0331 / RCMP 2023-1281916

7 messages

Marie Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 03:49 To: <yanick.soucy@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>

Subject: Key Points Meeting Summary - CRCC 2023-2623 / CHRC 2023-0331 / RCMP 2023-1281916 Dear

Investigator Cpl. Yanick Soucy,

I wish to provide a concise and factual summary of our recent conversation concerning my case, comprising CRCC 2023-2623, CHRC 2023-0331, and RCMP 2023-1281916:

Key Points:

1. Error Confirmation: We jointly acknowledged a significant error made by a city worker, which had far-reaching consequences on my reputation and legal standing.

2. RCMP Involvement: I expressed my profound concerns regarding the participation of Constable Gabriel Gallant, Informant Tania Mallet, and the presence of transphobic biases and disinformation throughout my identity and court cases. In all my arrests and court proceedings from 2016 to 2023, I faced transphobia, being misrepresented as a man with mental health issues, coupled with false allegations of indecent acts and assaults. Witnesses were erroneously informed that I had pleaded guilty to these charges, and this misinformation has persisted, impacting my life to this day.

3. Complex Legal History: My history involved multiple court cases between 2016 and 2019, including charges of indecent acts (later withdrawn), violence (later withdrawn), mischiefs, and a joyride. These legal actions detrimentally affected my medical records. I believe that these false convictions cast a shadow over the proceedings, as the RCMP refused to acknowledge or consider any of my depositions from 2016 to 2023.

4. Hate Mail and Threats: I received disturbing hate mail from a far-right white supremacist neo-Nazi group in Moncton, which included explicit threats against my life and liberal political leaders. These threats were directed at me due to my transgender identity and my alignment with liberal political beliefs. Regrettably, the RCMP has thus far overlooked this alarming threat.

5. Depositions and Reports: I contend that my depositions and reports were consistently dismissed or trivialized by law enforcement between 2016 and 2023. This has led to a sense of mistrial in all cases where I was denied the fundamental right to provide a deposition and have my version of events considered in court. In each instance, I acted in self-defense.

6. Seeking Exoneration: My primary objective is to secure exoneration for my entire criminal record in New Brunswick. This appeal is grounded in self-defense claims, violations of Human Rights, and concerns regarding mistrials in all cases.

7. Apologies and Mediation: I formally request public apologies from the RCMP and any involved parties. Additionally, I seek a mediation process facilitated by CRCC and CHRC to prevent the recurrence of such incidents and to address the damages endured.

8. Documentation Access: It is imperative that I gain access to the audio recording of our recent meeting, as well as all pertinent documents related to the investigations conducted by the RCMP and CRCC. These will be forwarded to CHRC for ongoing mediation efforts.

9. Clarity on Correspondence: I kindly request clarification on whether there will be additional documentation sent 25 via mail in the future? Or is the letter from Chantal Roger all I will have from this investigation? I also would like a copy of the document I signed which ended the investigation into the late city worker, Pierre.

These key points capture the various aspects of our discussion and my earnest calls for transparency, accountability, and the pursuit of justice in this complex matter.

I extend my gratitude for your steadfast commitment to uncovering the truth and for your relentless pursuit of a just resolution.

Sincerely,

Marie Landry

Marie Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 03:58 To: <complaint.plainte@chrc-ccdp.gc.ca>, <complaints@crcc-ccetp.gc.ca>

Forwarded for future reference.

[Quoted text hidden]

Soucy, Yanick (RCMP/GRC) <Yanick.Soucy@rcmp-grc.gc.ca> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 10:10 To: Marie Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com>

Good morning Marie.

First, It was nice to meet you last week and I appreciated the conversation.

You will be able to obtain a copy of the audio through ATIP. The 2023-1281916 will have to be reviewed by Fredericton Professional Responsibility Unit and will also be reviewed by the CRCC (Ottawa) before conclusion. Once the review are done, ATIP will be able to provide you with a copy.

In reference to the incidents, that you were involved in between 2016-2019, which led you to get a criminal Record, I would encourage you to seek Legal Counsel for that matter (Not sure how that legal aspect works).

As we discussed, with a Complaint to the CHRA, they oversees the RCMP's actions. They will render a decision in your case with supporting or not supporting your allegations.

If you have any issues with threats (hate mail etc), I would encourage you to make a complaint to one of our local Officers so the matter can be investigated. The RCMP Codiac's phone number is 857-2400.

I don't know if you've received the letter from S.Sgt.Roger yet, but this should be the last letter you get from the RCMP (in reference to Codiac, I don't know about the RCMP in Fredericton ??). You might get something from the CRCC as well, I'm not sure 100%.

I feel bad that there was a mistake made by one of our PSE back in 2016 in your case, in reference to the 26 disposition, but be reassured that the charge under Section 173 was withdrawn accordingly in October 2016 before the Court.

I hope you find justice in whatever you are pursuing and wish you the best. Take care !

Cpl.Yanick SOUCY

RCMP-GRC Codiac

Public-Complaints

(506) 857-2400

[Quoted text hidden]

Marie Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 11:11 To: Soucy, Yanick (RCMP/GRC) <Yanick.Soucy@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>

Everything is noted. Thank you for helping me make light of the situation. It is very appreciated. [Quoted text hidden]

Soucy, Yanick (RCMP/GRC) <Yanick.Soucy@rcmp-grc.gc.ca> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 11:59 To: Marie Landry

<marielandryceo@gmail.com>

Just FYI, I've been in touch with Blainville Police Que. (Court Officer) in reference to your warrant from 2012, I will probably know more tomorrow of Thursday... I will let you know.

[Quoted text hidden]

Marie Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com> Tue, Sep 26, 2023 at 12:16 To: Soucy, Yanick (RCMP/GRC) <Yanick.Soucy@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>

That is great news. Thank you.
[Quoted text hidden]

Marie Seshat Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com> Mon, May 12, 2025 at 03:26 To: Karaceper Alberti, Sibel (CHRC/CCDP) <sibel.karaceperalberti@chrc-ccdp.gc.ca>

Forwarded.
[Quoted text hidden]

TAB 5

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "D" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On October 30, 2024, I wrote to the Mayor and City Council of the City of Moncton about the administrative error in the records of the Codiac RCMP detachment concerning the 2016 charges against me.

3. On December 5, 2024, I received an email and a letter in response from Laura Armes, Director of Human Resources for the City of Moncton.

4. In the letter, the City stated that, following an internal review, it had determined that the person who made the alleged mistake in 2016 was not an employee of the City and was a Public Service Employee of the Federal Government.

5. Attached as **Exhibit "D"** to this affidavit is a true copy of the email and letter from Laura Armes dated December 5, 2024.

6. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN~~ (or AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "D"

referred to in the Affidavit "D" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 28th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

Gmail

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com>

Formal Public Complaint and Demand for Restitution of $50 Million Due to City of Moncton Employee Misconduct

Laura Armes <laura.armes@moncton.ca> 5 December 2024 at 13:59 To: "marielandryceo@gmail.com" <marielandryceo@gmail.com>

Good Afternoon Marie,

Please see attached response.

It has been determined that the person that alledgedly made an error was not a City of Moncton

employee. I wish you all the best,

Laura Armes

Laura Armes (she/her/elle)

Director/Directrice

Human Resources/ Ressources humaines

Direct | 506-853-3505
laura.armes@moncton.ca

MONCTON

From: Marie Seshat Landry <marielandryceo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 9:02:50 PM
To: Web Info Mayor <info.mayor@moncton.ca>; General Information Inquiries / Demande d'information <info@moncton.ca>; Web Info Council <info.council@moncton.ca>
Subject: Formal Public Complaint and Demand for Restitution of $50 Million Due to City of Moncton Employee Misconduct

EXTERNAL EMAIL | COURRIEL EXTERNE
Review before responding or opening attachments/links. | Réfléchissez avant d'y répondre ou d'ouvrir une pièce jointe/un lien.

HUMAN RESOURCES
City Hall
655 Main St.
Moncton, NB
Canada E1C 1E8

RESSOURCES HUMAINES
Hôtel de ville
655, rue Main
Moncton, NB
Canada E1C 1E8

MONCTON

December 5, 2024

Via Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com

Marie Seshat Landry (She/Her)
29 Connaught #1
Moncton, NB, E1C 3N7

Private and Confidential

Dear Ms. Seshat Landry:

Re: Response to October 30, 2024 Correspondence

I am writing to you on behalf of the Administration of the City of Moncton (the "City").

The City is in receipt of your letter dated October 30, 2024 addressed to the Mayor's Office. The subject of your letter was: "Formal Public Complaint and Demand for Restitution of $50 Million Due to City of Moncton Employee Misconduct".

The concerns you brought forward in your letter have been taken seriously by the City. Following receipt your letter, the City promptly conducted an internal review of the matter. It has been determined that the person who made the alleged mistake in 2016 was not an employee of the City and was a Public Service Employee of the Federal Government.

Accordingly, the City has no involvement with your claim and the matter is now considered to be closed.

Yours truly,

Laura Armes (she/her/elle)
Director/ Directrice
Human Resources/ Ressources humaines
Direct | 506-853-3505
laura.armes@moncton.ca

TAB 6

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "E" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On October 31, 2016, the criminal charges against me in Provincial Court of New Brunswick case 33094001 came before the Court at Moncton, in Courtroom 6, before Judge Jolène M. Richard.

3. As recorded on the court sheet, Crown prosecutor Éric Lalonde appeared for the Crown, and my defence counsel, Johanne Landry, appeared for me.

4. The court sheet records the charge under s. 173(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code* (indecent act) as "Withdrawn" on October 31, 2016. The assault charge under s. 266 in the same case was withdrawn at the same appearance. No finding of guilt was made on either charge.

5. Attached as **Exhibit "E"** to this affidavit is a true copy of the court sheet for case 33094001 dated October 31, 2016.

6. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN (or~~ AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "E"

referred to in the Affidavit "E" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 29th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029





Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

AFFIDAVIT "F" OF MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

(in response to the Defendant's motion to strike)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

I, **Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry** (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), of the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, **SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT:**

1. I am the Plaintiff in this proceeding and as such have personal knowledge of the matters in this affidavit, except where I state that a matter is based on information and belief, in which case I identify the source and believe it to be true.

2. On October 16, 2026, I asked the Provincial Court of New Brunswick at Moncton for copies of the records in my criminal court files from 2016 to 2019, which are under my former name, Jean-Yves Landry. I made the request by telephone and, at the Court's request, also completed and sent its Access to Court Records request form.

3. On October 16, 2026, I was informed by Lydia LeBlanc of Client Services at the Provincial Court in Moncton, by email, and I believe, that all but one of the files are in archives, that it can take up to five business days to search for and order them, and that copies cost $0.50 per page, payable before the copies are released.

4. The same day, I received an email confirming my request, with request reference number JTC-26-015640 and court location Moncton. The email lists the following court files under the name Jean-Yves Landry: 37441501, 34640601, 33730701,

33593801, 33574901, 33540101, 33571101, 33501301, 33383501, 33261401, 33094001, 32969301, 32943101, 32928601, 32929501, 32768001 and 32567701.

5. Attached as **Exhibit "F"** to this affidavit is a true copy of a screenshot, taken on my phone, of the part of that email that shows my information and the details of my request.

6. I make this affidavit in response to the Defendant's motion to strike in Federal Court File No. T-2559-26 and for no improper purpose.

~~SWORN~~ (or AFFIRMED) before me at the City of Moncton, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick


William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029

THIS IS EXHIBIT "F"

referred to in the Affidavit "F" of
MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY,
sworn (or affirmed) before me at the City of Moncton,
in the Province of New Brunswick,
this 29th day of October, 2026.

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or Notary Public) in and for the Province of New Brunswick

William A Dixon
Commissioner of Oaths
My Commission Expires on
December 31, 2029



TAB 8

Federal Court File No.: T-2559-26 Plaintiff's Responding Motion Record

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant

AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

(Amended under Rule 200 of the Federal Courts Rules on the _____ day of _____, 2026)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

TO THE DEFENDANT:

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the Plaintiff. The claim made against you is set out in the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, you or a solicitor acting for you are required to prepare a statement of defence in Form 171B prescribed by the *Federal Courts Rules*, serve it on the Plaintiff, who is self-represented, and file it, with proof of service, at a local office of this Court, within the time provided by the *Federal Courts Rules*.

IF YOU FAIL TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, judgment may be given against you in your absence and without further notice to you.

CLAIM

I. RELIEF SOUGHT

1. The Plaintiff claims:

(a) a declaration under s. 24(1) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* [Charter] that the Defendant, through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and its servants, infringed the Plaintiff's rights under ss. 7, 9 and 11(e) of the Charter;

(b) general damages for negligence and misfeasance in public office, and damages under s. 24(1) of the Charter, in the amount of $2,500,000;

(c) aggravated damages in the amount of $750,000;

(d) punitive damages in the amount of $250,000;

(e) special damages in an amount to be proven at trial;

(f) pre-judgment and post-judgment interest under the *Federal Courts Act*; and (g) costs.

II. THE PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

2. The Plaintiff, Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry (also known as Jean-Yves Landry), resides in Moncton, New Brunswick.

3. The Defendant, His Majesty the King, is liable under ss. 3(b)(i) and 10 of the *Crown Liability and Proceedings Act*, RSC 1985, c C-50 [CLPA] for torts committed by servants of the Crown, including members of the RCMP, who are deemed to be servants of the Crown by s. 36 of the CLPA, and federal public service employees. The Defendant is also answerable under s. 24(1) of the Charter for the conduct of the RCMP and its members and employees.

4. This Court has jurisdiction under s. 17(1) of the *Federal Courts Act*, RSC 1985, c F-7. **III.**

THE CROWN SERVANTS

5. The Crown servants whose conduct is in issue are identified below by position, office and period. Their names are known to the Defendant, whose officers reviewed the relevant file in 2023.

   (a) **The Court Section Employee:** the employee or employees of the court section of the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment in Moncton, New Brunswick, whose duties included recording the results of court proceedings in the RCMP's records, and who recorded the October 31, 2016 disposition in RCMP file 2016-84414. The Plaintiff pleads that this person was a federal public service employee.

   (b) **The Records Custodians:** the RCMP members and federal public service employees at the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment, and in the RCMP's records and Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) services, who were

responsible from October 31, 2016 to July 2025 for the accuracy, review and correction of the Plaintiff's records in the RCMP's Police Reporting and Occurrence System (PROS) and in CPIC.

   (c) **The Reviewing Officers:** the RCMP members of the J Division Professional Responsibility Unit and J Division Criminal Operations who reviewed file

2016-84414 between July and December 2023, and the Officer in Charge of the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment, to whom their findings were referred in 2023 with a direction to take corrective action.

IV. MATERIAL FACTS

The 2016 charges and their withdrawal

6. On January 22, 2016, the Codiac Regional RCMP opened occurrence file 2016-84414 concerning the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff was charged with indecent act under s. 173(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46, and assault under s. 266, in Provincial Court of New Brunswick case 33094001.

7. On October 31, 2016, in Courtroom 6 of the Provincial Court at Moncton, before Judge Jolène M. Richard, Crown prosecutor Éric Lalonde withdrew both charges. No finding of guilt was made on either charge, and the Plaintiff did not plead guilty to either.

The false records

8. After October 31, 2016, the Court Section Employee recorded the outcome of case 33094001 in the RCMP's records for file 2016-84414 as a guilty plea and conviction on both charges, instead of a withdrawal.

9. As a result, the Plaintiff's records in PROS and in CPIC showed convictions for indecent act and assault.

10. CPIC is the national police information system operated by the RCMP. Police services, Crown prosecutors and courts rely on it for a person's criminal record, including at bail hearings. PROS is the RCMP's records management system.

11. The Records Custodians did not check the entries against the court's disposition or correct them. The indecent act entry remained until May 2023, about 2,373 days after the withdrawal. The assault entry remained until July 2025, about 3,195 days after the withdrawal.

Use of the false records at the Plaintiff's bail hearings

12. After October 31, 2016 and until 2019, the Plaintiff was charged in the Provincial Court at Moncton with further offences, including mischief under s. 430 of the *Criminal Code*, taking a motor vehicle without consent under s. 335, assault under s. 266 and possession of cannabis.

13. In those proceedings the Crown sought the Plaintiff's detention under s. 515 of the *Criminal Code*. At the show-cause hearings, the Crown relied on, and the presiding justices were given, the Plaintiff's criminal record as shown in CPIC, which falsely

showed convictions for a sexual offence and an offence of violence.

14. The false record made the Plaintiff appear to have a history of sexual and violent offending. That bore directly on whether her detention was necessary for the protection or safety of the public under s. 515(10)(b) and to maintain confidence in the administration of justice under s. 515(10)(c), and on the conditions of any release.

15. The Plaintiff was detained before trial and, at times, under assessment orders, at the Shediac Correctional Centre (Shediac, NB), the Restigouche Hospital Centre (Campbellton, NB), The Moncton Hospital and the Dr. Georges-L.-Dumont University Hospital Centre (Moncton, NB), for about 1,000 days in total between 2016 and 2019.

16. But for the false record, the Plaintiff would have been released, or released sooner or on less restrictive conditions, and would not have spent much of that time in custody.

17. The registry of the Provincial Court at Moncton lists the following court files under the name Jean-Yves Landry: 32567701, 32768001, 32928601, 32929501, 32943101, 32969301, 33094001, 33261401, 33383501, 33501301, 33540101, 33571101, 33574901, 33593801, 33730701, 34640601 and 37441501. The proceedings referred to in paragraphs 12 to 16 are among these files. The hearing dates in those proceedings will be inserted in this paragraph or provided in an appendix to this pleading. They are recorded in the court files and are also available to the Defendant. The dates on which the Plaintiff's CPIC record was queried and supplied to the Crown and the courts are recorded in the Defendant's CPIC transaction logs.

18. The Plaintiff does not seek in this action to set aside, vary or relitigate any conviction, plea, bail order, assessment order or detention order, or any decision of the Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP (CRCC) or the Canadian Human Rights Commission. She claims damages for the conduct of the Defendant's servants in

creating and keeping the false records.

The RCMP's acknowledgements of the error

19. On or about July 19, 2023, the Plaintiff complained to the CRCC about how the 2016 disposition had been recorded.

20. By a letter dated in September 2023 (CRCC file 2023-2623; RCMP file 2023-1281916), S/Sgt. Chantal Roger, Non-Commissioned Officer in charge of the J Division Professional Responsibility Unit, stated that the complaint concerned an employee working with the court at the Codiac Regional RCMP Detachment who had entered the information in police records and had not correctly documented the results of the court proceedings in the file in which the charges against the Plaintiff were withdrawn in 2016. The letter stated that the complaint would not be investigated under Part VII of

the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, RSC 1985, c R-10, because the employee was not a member or a person appointed or employed under Part I of that Act, and referred the matter to the Officer in Charge of the Codiac Detachment, Supt. Benoit Jolette, and to Charles Savoie.

21. On September 26, 2023, Cpl. Yanick Soucy of RCMP Codiac Public Complaints wrote to the Plaintiff that there had been a mistake made "by one of our PSE back in 2016" in reference to the disposition, and confirmed that the s. 173 charge was withdrawn before the court in October 2016.

22. On December 1, 2023, Assistant Commissioner DeAnna L. Hill, Commanding Officer of the New Brunswick RCMP, wrote that J Division Criminal Operations had been re-tasked to review file 2016-84414, that documentation including recordings had been obtained from the Moncton Provincial Court, that the Professional Responsibility Unit had reviewed the actions that led to the administrative error, and that the findings had been shared with Supt. Jolette and Mr. Savoie, who were directed to take corrective action.

23. On December 5, 2024, after an internal review, the City of Moncton wrote to the Plaintiff that the person who made the mistake in 2016 was not a City employee and was a Public Service Employee of the Federal Government.

24. On April 8, 2026, the CRCC closed its review on the basis that it has no jurisdiction over federal public service employees under s. 45.53(1) of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*.

25. Despite the acknowledgements in paragraphs 20 to 22, the assault conviction entry remained in CPIC, available to police, prosecutors and courts, until July 2025.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

A. Negligence

26. The Court Section Employee and the Records Custodians owed the Plaintiff a duty of care to record accurately the disposition of the charges against her, to keep her records accurate and to correct them. The relationship was close and direct: the records concerned the Plaintiff alone; they existed to be relied on by police, prosecutors and courts in decisions about her liberty; and it was reasonably foreseeable that recording withdrawn charges as convictions would cause her serious harm. Recording a court disposition is an operational task, not a matter of policy.

27. They breached that duty by:

(a) recording the withdrawn charges as a guilty plea and convictions;

(b) failing to record the withdrawal;

(c) failing, for about 2,373 days and 3,195 days respectively, to check the entries against the court's disposition and correct them; and

(d) failing to correct the assault entry promptly after the error was identified in 2023.

28. These breaches caused the losses described in Part VI.

B. Misfeasance in public office

29. From no later than September 2023, the Records Custodians and the Reviewing Officers knew, from their review of file 2016-84414 and the court's recordings, that both charges had been withdrawn on October 31, 2016 and that the RCMP's records showed convictions in error.

30. In the exercise of their public functions, they were obliged to keep the Plaintiff's records accurate and to correct them, including under s. 6(2) of the *Privacy Act*, RSC 1985, c P-21, and under the obligations of their offices.

31. Knowing that the assault conviction entry was false, they deliberately kept it in CPIC, available to police, prosecutors and courts, until July 2025. That conduct was unlawful and inconsistent with the obligations of their offices, and they knew it.

32. They knew that a recorded conviction for assault was likely to injure the Plaintiff, because such records are used to assess a person's risk, character and liberty, and because the Plaintiff had told the RCMP in writing, including in her email of September 26, 2023, of the harm the false record had caused to her reputation and legal standing.

33. Their conduct caused the Plaintiff loss of reputation, emotional distress and interference with her ability to find work.

C. Damages under s. 24(1) of the Charter

34. The RCMP and its members and employees are bound by the Charter.

35. By recording and keeping false conviction entries, and by supplying them for use at the Plaintiff's bail hearings, the Defendant's servants:

(a) deprived her of liberty other than in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice, contrary to s. 7;

(b) contributed to her arbitrary detention, contrary to s. 9; and

(c) denied her reasonable bail without just cause, contrary to s. 11(e).

36. Damages under s. 24(1) are appropriate and just to compensate the Plaintiff, to vindicate her rights and to deter similar breaches.

VI. DAMAGES

37. As a result of the conduct pleaded above, the Plaintiff suffered:

(a) loss of liberty during about 1,000 days in custody;

(b) psychological harm and emotional distress;

(c) loss of reputation, including being treated by police, prosecutors and others as a person convicted of a sexual offence and of assault;

(d) interference with her ability to find work; and

(e) legal and other out-of-pocket expenses, which will be particularized before trial.

38. Aggravated damages are claimed because the Defendant's servants kept the assault entry for about 20 months after acknowledging the error, and because the Defendant's officers gave the Plaintiff contradictory accounts of who employed the person responsible (paragraphs 20 to 24), compounding her distress.

39. Punitive damages are claimed because the knowing maintenance of a false conviction record by a national police force, after it admitted the error, calls for denunciation and deterrence.

VII. PLACE OF TRIAL

40. The Plaintiff proposes that this action be tried at Moncton, New Brunswick.

DATED at Moncton, New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY
Plaintiff (Self-Represented)
Address for service:
1-29 Connaught Avenue
Moncton, NB E1C 3N7
Tel: 506-588-2787
Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

DECLARATION REGARDING USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

(Federal Court Notice of May 7, 2024, The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Court Proceedings)

Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document. I, Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry, the self-represented Plaintiff in Court File No. T-2559-26, declare as follows:

1. Generative artificial intelligence was used to draft content in the documents in this Motion Record that I prepared: the Written Representations (Tab 1), Affidavits "A" to "F" (Tabs 2 to 7), the Amended Statement of Claim (Tab 8) and this declaration. As the Court's Notice requires, each of those documents states in its first paragraph that AI was used to generate content in it.

2. The exhibits (Exhibits "A" to "F") are copies of documents I received from the RCMP, the City of Moncton and the Provincial Court of New Brunswick, of my own email correspondence, and of a screenshot of an email confirming my court records request. They were not generated by AI.

3. Before filing, I reviewed each document. The legislation and cases cited were checked against the official sources: the Justice Laws Website and the published decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Federal Court of Appeal and the Federal Court. The facts stated in the affidavits are within my own knowledge or are taken from the attached exhibits.

DATED at Moncton, New Brunswick, this 28 day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY
Plaintiff (Self-Represented)
1-29 Connaught Avenue
Moncton, NB E1C 3N7
Tel: 506-588-2787
Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com

Court File No.: T-2559-26

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

JEAN-YVES LANDRY
(ALSO KNOWN AS MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY)

Plaintiff
(Responding Party)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Defendant
(Moving Party)

NOTE REGARDING EXHIBITS "E" AND "F"

(exhibit images that did not print in the commissioned paper copy)

DECLARATION: Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to generate content in this document.

1. When this Motion Record was printed for swearing on October 28, 2026, two exhibit images did not print. In the commissioned paper copy, each appears as a blank box with a warning symbol:

   (a) Exhibit "E" (Tab 6): the Provincial Court of New Brunswick court sheet for case 33094001, dated October 31, 2016 (page 36); and

   (b) Exhibit "F" (Tab 7): the screenshot of the email confirming court records request JTC-26-015640, dated October 16, 2026 (page 40).

2. The Commissioner for Taking Affidavits, William A. Dixon, holds the complete digital copy of this Motion Record, which contains both images. He did not sign the certificates for Exhibits "E" and "F" without the exhibits before him.


3. So that the Court has the complete exhibits, both images are reproduced on the following two pages exactly as they appear at pages 36 and 40 of the digital copy.

DATED at Moncton, New Brunswick, this 28th day of October, 2026.

MARIE-SOLEIL SESHAT LANDRY
Plaintiff (Self-Represented)
1-29 Connaught Avenue
Moncton, NB E1C 3N7
Tel: 506-588-2787
Email: marielandryceo@gmail.com

EXHIBIT "E" – IMAGE (Tab 6)

Provincial Court of New Brunswick court sheet, case 33094001 (October 31, 2016). Reproduced from page 36 of the digital copy; this image did not print in the commissioned paper copy.



Judge Jolène M. Richard
Stenographer: Nicole P. Murray
Courtroom: 6
Date: October 31, 2016

RETURN FILE TO STENO ☐
Conflict: Yes☐ No☐
Seized: Yes☐ No☐

CASE # 33094001 TIME/TYPE 9:30 TP

ACCUSED: Jean Yves Landry
Present☑ in custody☐ absent☐

Crown Prosecutor: Éric Calonde
Defence Counsel: Johanne Caron
Duty Counsel☐ Retained☐

ELECTION: P.C. ____ J.J. ____ J.A. ____

PLEA: GT ____ NG ____ GT to lesser offence ____ Admit ____ Deny ____

Français ☑ English ☐ Domestic violence ☐ BAN OF PUBLICATION ☐

CHARGES:
1) CC 173(1)(b) 22 jan. '16. To Mackenzie
2) ____
3) ____
4) ____
5) ____
6) ____
7) ____
8) ____
9) ____
10) ____
11) ____
12) ____
13) ____
14) ____
15) ____
16) ____
17) ____
18) ____
19) ____
20) ____

POSTPONED FOR ____ ON ____ at ____ before Judge ____
½ day ☐ Full day ☐ multi-day ☐ Come Out Order ☐
REASON for adjournment: PBL☐ PD☐ PL☐ ☐ Letter for Cross Exam

MANAGEMENT APPEARANCE: ____

☐ UNDERTAKING
☐ Pre-Sentence Report
☐ Victim Impact Statement

☐ Bail Hearing Held
☐ Remanded
☐ Released

☐ Trial Held
☐ Found Guilty
☐ Found Not Guilty
☐ Stay of Proceedings

☐ Preliminary Inquiry
☐ Committed to Trial
☐ Waived Preliminary

☐ Not Criminally Responsible
☐ Unfit to Stand Trial
☐ Withdrawn ____
☐ Dismissed ____
☐ Deemed Guilty ____

☐ Warrant of Arrest Issued
☐ for jurisdiction
☐ endorsed
☐ for review of sentence

☐ Warrant of Committal Issued

☐ WITNESS Warrant of Arrest Issued : ____

☐ Warrant of Arrest Vacated
☐ Warrant of Committal Vacated

☐ Warrant of Remand (jail)
☐ S.515 (no contact)

☐ Warrant of Remand Assessment
☐ Criminal Responsibility
☐ Fitness to Stand Trial
☐ Detention Centre
☐ Restigouche
☐ Out of Custody

EXHIBIT "F" – IMAGE (Tab 7)

Screenshot of email confirming court records request JTC-26-015640, Provincial Court at Moncton (October 16, 2026). Reproduced from page 40 of the digital copy; this image did not print in the commissioned paper copy.

