

Satinder Dhillon Takes the Fight for Equality and Justice to the Supreme Court of Canada



[Back to story](#)

Thu Apr 30, 9:00 am ET

Satinder Dhillon, 31, a self-represented Plaintiff from British Columbia has filed an application to have his case heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. Dhillon cites the pursuit of justice and truth as being his motive to fight on, despite the lower court decision in British Columbia. Dhillon claims the issue at bar is of national importance and that the lower court decision will negatively impact the rights of many Canadians in the future, if it is left to stand.

Ottawa, Ontario (PRWEB) April 30, 2009 - On February 9, 2009, an application was submitted by Satinder Dhillon, 31, seeking that the Supreme Court of Canada (Court File No. 33003) overturn a ruling handed down by the lower court in British Columbia.

On December 19, 2007, the Honourable Justice McEwan of the Supreme Court of British Columbia pronounced the disputed decision, which effectively threw out Dhillon's lawsuit despite not having been heard on its 'merits' (order of Justice McEwan - December 19, 2007).

Dhillon had filed his original Writ of Summons in March of 2007 (Court File No. S104801). There were numerous hearings, and while representing himself, Dhillon had received several favourable rulings from the court until Justice McEwan's decision on December 19, 2007.

One of the favorable decisions to Dhillon was pronounced on June 4, 2007, by the Honourable Justice Burnyeat, a noted foreclosure expert during his career as a lawyer in Vancouver, British Columbia.

After a full day of submissions by opposing counsel and Mr. Dhillon, Justice Burnyeat pronounced an order that essentially prevented the misappropriation of any equitable interest Dhillon potentially had in a property that is at the center of this litigation, which is located in Surrey, British Columbia, and was estimated to be worth \$3 million at the time of the ruling in June of 2007.

"In a highly irregular breach of fiduciary duty, by an officer of the court, the Burnyeat order was never filed and registered with the Land Title Office".

"I currently am awaiting a ruling on a special motion that has been filed with the Supreme Court of Canada, to deal specifically with this breach" said Dhillon.

One week later, on June 11, 2007, the Honourable Justice Groves granted Dhillon the ability to pursue his claim and adjourned an application brought on by some of the Defendants to have the claim dismissed prematurely.

In a 10-page decision, Justice Groves noted "that the matter appears to be complexbut Dhillon represents himself, and he appears articulate and is in Court with a large number of banker's boxes".

Dhillon stated that, "the case was moving along just fine and according to schedule in the summer of 2007".

"I was looking forward to finally getting my day in court, but then inexplicably in November and December of 2007, things just fell off the rails. Dates for examination had been set, and documents had been exchanged".

"I have spoken to many legal professionals across Canada, and they are stunned at what has occurred here in British Columbia".

"In October of 2007, I assisted a friend of mine who was representing himself in a separate case (Court File No. 193466VA99) that was presided over by the Chief Justice of British Columbia - the Honourable Donald Brenner. After those days in court in October of 2007, my fortunes before the British Columbia Judiciary seemed to have turned overnight" (for more information about this case please visit www.justiceandtruthforall.com).

"I am very fortunate to have had the assistance of my family and friends along the way, and to have found great legal help from practitioners across Canada".

"My present counsel from Ottawa, firmly believe that a grave injustice was suffered".

"Self-represented litigants, or as they are commonly referred to in the judicial system - lay litigants - could potentially be adversely affected by these decisions in the years to come, if this ruling is not overturned".

"Essentially the ruling means that the average person can be held to a higher test than a lawyer".

"I believe that throwing the truth by the wayside sends the wrong message to Canadians, especially in this era of self-represented litigants already being so marginalized".

"A nation is only as strong as its laws, and enforcement of same. Justice must be accessible to its citizens, and no legal professional should be able to rely upon such narrow technicalities to circumvent the due process afforded to Plaintiffs in Canada, as was done in my case".

The Supreme Court Act states that 'an application for leave may be granted when the Supreme Court finds that the case raises an issue of public importance, and is therefore a case that ought to be decided by the Supreme Court. This means that the case must raise an issue that goes beyond the immediate interest of the parties to the case'.

"I believe that my case fits the mandate, as prescribed by the Supreme Court Act, and it would give the Court a chance

to fulfill their mission in serving Canadians, as 'accessibility to justice' is listed as a very important part of that mission".

"Last year the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada - The Right Honourable Beverly McLaughlin-- stated in a speech that 'the most advanced justice system in the world is a failure if it does not provide justice to the people it is meant to serve. Access to justice is therefore critical' ".

"She further went on to say, in that same speech that 'recently the Chief Justice of Ontario stated that access to justice is the most important issue facing the legal system' ".

"Over the course of the past 9 plus years we have with the greatest of care, and meticulously accumulated irrefutable evidence as to what really transpired. To have it never see the light of day due to procedural chicanery, and a misguided and heavy handed ruling pronounced by a member of the B.C. Judiciary, would be a much greater travesty, when viewed in a national context".

"This decision, if left to stand, will negatively impact self-represented Plaintiffs, and put them at a severe disadvantage in Canada for the years to come" added Dhillon.

"Recently I attended the Access to Justice town hall meeting that took place in Vancouver, B.C.(www.accesstojustice.ca)"

"I was shocked to learn how just how badly the system in B.C. had been gutted by the cuts to legal aid funding in the past 9 years. There seems to be a disturbing trend in British Columbia, as far as the average citizen being able to access justice is concerned".

"Even the United Nations has weighed in on the issue and expressed its dismay".

"Currently I am working with some individuals who also notice this trend, and a full length documentary is in the works" added Dhillon.

A letter written by Mr. Dhillon to opposing counsel is attached.

For the complete article please visit:

www.andjusticeforall.ca

For more information about Dhillon versus RE/MAX et al (Action No. S104801 New Westminster Registry) please visit:

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/satinder/dhillon/prweb538346.htm>

(July/ 2007)

For more information about Case No. 193466VA99 please visit:

www.justiceandtruthforall.com

Media Contact:

Charlene Lee

310-254-0972

###

Charlene Lee

310-254-0972

[E-mail Information](#)

Trackback URL: <http://prweb.com/pingpr.php/RW1wdC1aZXRhLVNxdWEtU3F1YS1TcXVhLUNvdXAkWmVybW==>

Copyright © 2009 Yahoo! Inc. All rights reserved. [Questions or Comments](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Terms of Service](#) [Copyright/IP Policy](#)