December 17, 2008

VIA EMAIL to jclee@reeoic.com, fbeveridge@mbalawyers.ca, agiesen@killamcordell.com

Real Estate Errors & Omissions Insurance Corporation 1604 - 700 West Pender St. Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1G8

McLachlan Brown Anderson 10th Floor - 938 Howe Street Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 1N9

Killam Cordell Murray 2000 – 401 West Georgia St. Vancouver, B.C. V6B 5A1

Attention: Jennifer Clee, Fiona Beveridge, M. Antionette Giesen

Re: <u>Plaintiff;</u> <u>Satinder Paul Singh Dhillon</u> <u>V.</u> <u>Defendants:</u> <u>Corey Pannu aka Chamkaur Singh Pannu, 635160 B.C. Ltd.,</u> <u>Balbir Kaur Pannu, Ron Dulle, RE/MAX Little Oak Realty Ltd.,</u> <u>Bharat Panchal and Sutton Group - Medallion Realty</u>

British Columbia Supreme Court File No. S104801 British Columbia Court of Appeal File No. CA 035747

Dear Mesdames: Clee, Beveridge and Giesen,

I write to inform you that I will be filing an Application for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

I, along with many others, have been watching with keen interest and believe that the lower courts have erred in their decisions.

These decisions have put unrepresented ordinary citizens, or as they are commonly referred to in the legal process - **lay litigants** - at a severe disadvantage, when compared to those who are licensed to practice law.

In our opinion, the recent ruling handed down by the B.C. Court of Appeal sends a resounding message to the Canadian public. For the average citizen, this ruling essentially translates into lawyers in Canada having an unfair advantage when it comes to being afforded the opportunity to have a case heard on its merits. It is an unfortunate case of a double standard being applied.

This ruling has grave implications for self-represented Plaintiffs in Canada.

Due to the long term affects this ruling could have, we feel it absolutely necessary to apply to the Supreme Court of Canada.

If left unchallenged, this ruling could form the cornerstone of an unimaginable number of arguments being brought forward against lay litigants in the future.

In the case at bar, the courts unfairly held me to a higher test, than the one that is applied to lawyers. We all strongly disagree with this stark disparity and believe that the case deserves to be heard by the Supreme Court of Canada, as it was never allowed to be canvassed on its merit.

"Accessibility to justice" is listed by the Supreme Court of Canada as part of their mission in serving Canadians. This mission is listed along with the Court's commitment to: *"The rule of law and independence and impartiality"*.

The Supreme Court of Canada also states that its mission is to serve;

* 'Canadians by leading the development of common and civil law through its decisions on questions of public importance'.

The Supreme Court further goes on to state that their strategic objectives are:

To ensure the independence of the Court as an institution within the framework of sound public administration.

* To improve access to the Court and its services.

'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.'

We believe that - **Dhillon v. Remax et al.** - fits the above noted requirements, and that there is a high probability of our application succeeding.

While considering the importance of the issues that the lower court decisions raise, a few passages from a speech delivered - (at the Empire Club of Canada last year) - by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Right Honourable Madame Justice Beverly McLaughlin, best sum up the importance of justice being dispensed in an impartial and fair manner:

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;

"Recently the Chief Justice of Ontario stated that access to justice is the most important issue facing the legal system."

These views are also shared by the Honourable Chief Justice John D. Richard, of the Federal Court of Appeal. In a speech he gave to the International Association of Young Lawyers he quoted the following statement made by the Right Honourable Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Madame Justice Beverly McLaughlin; "access to justice is a basic right, just as education or health care are considered to be".

In light of the foregoing, I request that you please advise if your firms will continue to act for the Defendants and accept service at your offices in the normal course of business.

Sincerely,

Satinder Paul Singh Dhillon

CC:

- The Honourable Robert Nicholson Minister of Justice & Attorney-General of Canada
- The Honourable Wally Oppal Attorney-General of British Columbia & Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism
- Ujjal Dosanjh, Q.C.
 Member of Parliament Vancouver South, British Columbia
- Dr. Ruby Dhalla Member of Parliament – Brampton-Sprindale, Ontario
- Niki Ashton
 Ashton Member of Parliament Churchhill, Manitoba
- W5 (Attention: Ms. Kristen Yu)
- Canadian Business Magazine (Attention: Mr. John Gray)
- Remi Consultants (Attention: Ms. Charlene Lee)

- The National Post (Attention: Mr. Shinan Govani)
- South Asian Post
 (Attention: Mr. Harbinder Singh Sewak)
- Indo-Canadian Voice (Attention: Ms. Indira Prahst)
- The Globe and Mail (Attention: Ms. Roma Luciw)
- The Law Foundation of British Columbia
- The Canadian Bar Association (National Office)
- South Asian Bar Association of British Columbia (Attention: Uphar Dhaliwal)
- Community Legal Assistance Society
- Law Students' Legal Advice Program c/o University of British Columbia Faculty of Law
- ✤ B.C. Law Institute
- B C. Law Reform Group
- Canadian Forum on Civil Justice
- Uniform Law Conference of Canada
- Law Times
- Canadian Lawyer Magazine
- ✤ Various