Court File No. 141/07 (Barrie Action)

#### SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

NELSON BARBADOS GROUP INC.

- and -

RICHARD COX et al

\*\*\*\*\*\*

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE SHAUGHNESSY, AT THE COURTHOUSE IN OSHAWA, ONTARIO, ON TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

APPLICATION BY MR. BEST TO PURGE CONTEMPT ORDER

#### **APPEARANCES:**

D. Bestin Person.L. SilverCounsel for Kingsland Estates.G. RankingCounsel for PricewaterhouseCoopers.

#### i Table of Contents

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
Preliminary motion by Mr. Best	9
Ruling on Preliminary Motion	18
Application to Purge Contempt Order Submissions by Mr. Best	21
-	
Submissions by Mr. Silver	86
Submissions by Mr. Ranking	123
Reply Submissions by Mr. Best	140

#### INDEX OF EXHIBITS

#### EXHIBIT NO.

PUT IN ON PAGE

A	Draft Order Prepared By Donald Best	151
В	Proposed Draft Order Prepared By Respondents	151
С	Affidavit Of Donald Best Sworn April 29, 2013	152
D	Answers To Undertakings, Under Advisements And Refusals By Donald Best	152

## Legend:

(ph.) indicates spelling is unknown and therefore has been spelled phonetically

[sic] Latin term meaning "thus written" Indicates a word obviously misspoken in court

UPON	APRIL 30, 2013 RESUMING (9:46 AM)
O I O A	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Best, are you ready to
	proceed?
	MR. BEST: Your Honour, do I have to stand when
	talking to you?
	THE COURT: Yes.
	MR. BEST: Yes. Okay, Your Honour, I thought so.
	THE COURT: I expect counsel to and you will do as
	counsel. So my question was are you ready to
	proceed?
	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I'm not. I'm not ready to
	proceed. With great respect, Your Honour, I am
	overwhelmed. I'm
	THE COURT: You have made that submission before.
	This is the date that was set months ago. You
	have raised the issue about being overwhelmed,
	not being a lawyer, so I take it that's just a
	continuation of the same position you have
	advanced before, correct?
	<b>MR. BEST:</b> Well, Your Honour, it's - I am not a
	lawyer. I don't even know the rules of the game,
	Your Honour, and I'm doing the best I can.
	THE COURT: You seem to have some knowledge from
	the affidavit material that I looked at. That's
	fine. You are ready, Mr. Ranking?
	MR. RANKING: We both are.
	THE COURT: Mr. Silver?
	MR. SILVER: We are, Your Honour.
	THE COURT: All right. Now, I want to raise some
	preliminary matters that I expect to be answered
	here today and so I am speaking to everyone. You
	April 30, 2013

can have a sit while I'm speaking. MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. THE COURT: I have read the applications. I have read the affidavits. I would be foolish in the extreme if I suggested that I could digest all appendixes to the affidavits which the now comprise at least two banker boxes of material, but I have certainly read the affidavits and I have read in great detail the factums of Mr. Best and the joint factum of Messrs. Ranking and Silver on behalf of their respective clients, all right, and I have spent considerable time on this in getting ready. I am not going to make much more of a comment on that but here is where I want to make sure.

First, I am going to set up the time allotments because it was very clear from one of my endorsements today is the day, the only day. So we will discuss that very shortly and then we will start proceeding. We will start hearing the submissions of Mr. Best.

joint factum, In your and I am looking at Mr. Silver and Ranking, I want much more clarity about page - I guess it is paragraph 49, page 17 your factum. It was open-ended. There's a of "Documentary production: However, comment: it remains to be determined whether it is in compliance with orders"

Now, that is my rough hand notes. Let me finish April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

here and then I will hear from you. I have got to know about that. I don't want any - if I know all the facts, and I think I must have come on to this file in 2007, 2008 and I have written four decisions on it - I think I know all of the facts. So, I want that answer.

Mr. Best, in his factum, says he has answered all didn't the questions. Now I give you his reference but I am sure you can find it in his factum but that is what he says. He raises the issue of solicitor/client privilege and how it has been violated and how many other people really not associated with him at all but it seems to be associated with Mr. McKenzie and his law firm have been violated, but it is the answer. The matter I am focused on is when Mr. Best says in his factum that he has answered all the questions, notwithstanding what he calls solicitor and client breach. I want to be taken to that.

Again, at paragraph 55 of the respondent's factum, it says that Mr. Best "has likely not produced all documents". So bluntly, gentlemen, I am saying has he or has he not? That is what I want to know about.

Then the factum says he has not produced documents that relate to the November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> order. So, sorry, what year is that? That is two thousand and...

April 30, 2013

Z

MR. SILVER: Nine.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Nine. And the other THE COURT: issue that Mr. Best raises that I want answers to, and I think I know the answer but I don't know if it is in the - I can't see how it is responded to in the materials and I realize the factums had deadlines. The affidavits had deadlines. You had to move things in quickly. I get that. But that works from both sides.

But in his factum, Mr. Best argues that the costs were paid previously and now there is double dipping. That has to be answered. I am not saying those are the only issues but those are the ones that - what I call my side sheet issue summary that I just want you to be alerted to that I expect, in due course, to hear from you.

Now, we have roughly from now until one o'clock with at least a 15, 20 minute break for staff and then we will have this afternoon to resume at 2:15. I would like to be finished by 4:30 and certainly no later than quarter to five and you know that there is an afternoon break of another 15, 20 minutes. So, I have said there will be one day and there will only be one day. That is why we have factums. So, Mr. Best, I am going to ask you, leading off, how long you expect to be in your submissions.

30MR. BEST: Your Honour, most respectfully, sir, my31submissions, to be full and complete, would be32two to three days.

	Preliminary Submissions on Application
1	THE COURT: It is not going to be that, Mr. Best.
2	So, you know what, it is not going to be that.
3	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I am making my point.
4	THE COURT: You are making your point but you have
5	also been told well in advance that this is one
6	day. I have explained my commitments. I am here
7	at
8	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I
9	THE COURT: having squeezed this in at a time
10	that I am conducting also a murder trial and
11	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I understand, you're
12	THE COURT: So you know
13	MR. BEST: Oh, sorry.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Best, so you gave me your answer.
15	It looks like I am going to have to allot the
16	time and you are going to have to comply with it.
17	That is why we have factums. Factums are to focus
18	the case and focus the issues and Mr. Best, even
19	if you are representing yourself, the rules don't
20	change for you. I hope I am fair to both sides
21	but I will be just as difficult if Mr. Ranking
22	and Silver got up and said, "We need two to three
23	days to respond." It is not going to happen.
24	MR. BEST: Your Honour, may I speak to that,
25	Your Honour?
26	THE COURT: Yes.
27	MR. BEST: I understand what you've
28	THE COURT: Quickly, please, though. You are using
29	up your time here.
30	MR. BEST: I heard you, Your Honour. Someone else
31	has recently said it would take two or three days.
32	You, yourself, said it would take another judge
	April 30, 2013

1

	Preliminary Submissions on Application
1	two or three days to
2	THE COURT: I said another judge.
3	MR. BEST: understand
4	THE COURT: You know, Mr. Best, I really don't
5	appreciate you twisting my words.
6	MR. BEST: Oh, I didn't mean to
7	THE COURT: As I read in the factum, everything I
8	said
9	MR. BEST: upset you sir.
10	THE COURT: You have parsed the comment and then
11	you turn it around. So another judge would take
12	longer to get up to speed before he came into the
13	court but I am the judge. This is the day. We
14	don't have to worry about that, so let's move on.
15	MR. BEST: Very well, sir. Your Honour, very
16	quickly, I have - I am providing to the court a
17	suggested court order, with great respect, Your
18	Honour, any time today
19	<b>THE COURT:</b> Well, don't you already have that in
20	the materials? I saw the draft order.
21	MR. BEST: Well, this one's a little different
22	maybe.
23	THE COURT: Oh, this is different. Let me see this
24	one.
25	MR. BEST: Yes.
26	THE COURT: Have they seen this before, counsel?
27	<b>MR. BEST:</b> No, I'm just giving it - yes, they have
28	seen it before, Your Honour, with a different
29	date on it. I believe that was the only
30	difference.
31	
32	Your Honour, before we start this morning, there

line

line

16000

1

1

i.

Ŀ

is something that the court probably wants to hear about and deal with first and it's very respectful, Your Honour. I believe the court has to deal with it first. Number one, here is a copy of a very recent decision by the Ontario Court of Appeal, *R. v. Salmon*. The gentlemen already have this. **MR. RANKING:** We're getting it right now.

MR. BEST: And Your Honour, this says that the court has to stop the proceeding because the lawyers, Mr. Ranking, Mr. Silver and Mr. Roman, most respectfully, Your Honour, they lied to and deceived the court...

THE COURT: All right, now wait a minute. You are in to the exact argument that you are making in the entire application itself. I know that. I have read your affidavits. I have read your factum. I know where you are going so there is an Ontario Court of Appeal decision. I am trying to just delegate now, right now, and I am going to control this process. We are going to decide how much time is to be given. So just have a seat then for a second, Mr. Best.

MR. BEST: Well, there is one other important point, if I could, Your Honour. Number two, Your Honour, I was recently officially advised by the Durham Regional Police that in December of 2009, over a month prior to my January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 trial in absentia, а Durham Police court constable performed а secret, undocumented investigation into me, Donald Best, in all likelihood, in assistance to the court.

THE COURT: I have no idea what you are talking April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1	about.
2	MR. BEST: I know, Your Honour. I have an
3	affidavit here. I just found - this is brand new
4	evidence. I was just advised of it. This
5	affidavit was actually sworn yesterday.
6	THE COURT: Let me see it.
7	MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour.
8	THE COURT: Have you got copies for the others?
9	MR. BEST: Yes, I do, Your Honour. Your Honour, I
10	was advised by Sergeant Rushbrook of the Durham
11	Regional Police, Professional Standards Unit,
12	that in December 2009, over a month prior to my
13	January 15 <sup>th</sup> trial in absentia, a Durham Police
14	court constable performed a secret, undocumented
15	investigation into me, in all likelihood, in
16	assistance of the court. I am advised by
17	Sergeant Rushbrook that this investigation was
18	entirely undocumented and that no official notes,
19	reports or records of this court police
20	investigation exist with the Durham Regional
21	Police or at the court, including in the
22	administrative records of the court in Barrie or
23	Oshawa or in the Nelson Barbados Group Ltd. Court
24	file and court transcripts. An undocumented,
25	secret, private or on-the-side process, whatever
26	it may be called, and a court police
27	investigation of a person facing potential jail
28	term based on allegations of civil contempt that
29	may or may not have occurred at a future date
30	would mean that the entire hearing was polluted
31	to the point where there has been a miscarriage
32	of justice and with great respect, Your Honour,
I	April 30, 2013

April 30, 2013

great respect, it probably means that this court had to disgualify itself then and has to now. THE COURT: Why would you say that? MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour? THE COURT: Don't use those words "respect". It's insulting to me. What this is insinuating is that I... MR. BEST: No, sir. **THE COURT:** ... in presiding over this case - well you said "The Court". MR. BEST: No, sir, I mean the big small "c" court, Honour. In no way am Ι Your saying that Your Honour - no way, Your Honour, but I'm just repeating what I have been told officially by the police and I've been told that the undocumented court police investigation of me was secret. private, on-the-side. It was only revealed when Commissioner of the RCMP commenced the an internal audit concerning access to the Canadian Police Information Centre computer database known as CPIC. The facts that were explained to me recently by Sergeant Rushbrook and my own experience as a police sergeant and veteran of internal investigations call for an immediate and thorough examination of this court process and court police investigation. The fact that no electronic or paper records, official or otherwise, of this investigation exist with the Durham Police, such police notes, files, documents, occurrence as numbers - nothing exists in the court file and April 30, 2013

10

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

	Fremmary Submissions on Application
1	Your Honour, that speaks further of a cover-up or
2	a conspiracy in order to prevent a full hearing
3	and it adds to already serious concern that this
4	has been a miscarriage of justice and abuse from
5	the beginning.
6	
7	I am also informed - and this is incredible,
8	Your Honour. I am also informed by Sergeant
9	Rushbrook that this same type of undocumented,
10	secret, private or on-the-side court police
11	investigation in assistance to the court, has
12	also been done on occasion
13	THE COURT: What do you mean by assistance to the
14	court?
15	MR. BEST: Well, I'm - I'm saying what the police
16	have officially advised me, sir.
17	THE COURT: I don't care what the police
18	officially advised you.
19	MR. BEST: Well, if I could
20	THE COURT: You are insinuating - you are
21	insinuating that somehow I have been involved in
22	the process.
23	MR. BEST: I am not insinuating you at all, sir.
24	THE COURT: You use the word "court". Who is the
25	court if I am not the face of the court?
26	MR. BEST: I see, sir. I see your point.
27	THE COURT: You can talk about the
28	administration
29	MR. BEST: And I want to make it absolutely
30	clear
31	THE COURT: The police administration is a
32	different story but I am very sensitive to that
	April 30, 2013
	-

Sietal

1

type of an allegation.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

**MR. BEST:** I am not making that kind of an allegation at all, Your Honour.

THE COURT: All right, just continue.

MR. BEST: I am repeating what the police have told me and they've said that this court police investigation in assistance to the court has also been done on occasion to other accused persons who, like myself, have not yet been found guilty or even come to trial and this is undocumented, Your Honour. This is new evidence that has just come to my attention and I placed this in an affidavit which I have given you a copy of.

Your Honour, this secret investigation, we don't, at this point in time, know how deep it went or what came of it, who requested it, who received the product of the investigation but a secret investigation into an accused in assistance to the court a month prior to the accused's trial should disqualify any order that was made after that.

The involved court officer - and I don't know the involved court officer's name. That has not been told to me. The involved court officer apparently retired a few days after first being spoken with. THE COURT: Don't read the affidavit to me. I have read it.

**MR. BEST:** I'm not. I'm reading some comments I've made, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Well, you are. You are reading it April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

13

because that is just what I've read. MR. BEST: I see. **THE COURT:** I have read it, sir. MR. BEST: And... THE COURT: Just make your point. BEST: Well, Sergeant Rushbrook states that MR. this Durham Police court officer was informed in early 2009, a month before my trial, that the Court would be issuing a warrant for my arrest and incarceration on January 15<sup>th</sup>. That's just what the police told me. Currently, Sergeant Rushbrook does not know who of provided my name, date birth, or other information to the court officer or what the court officer did with the product of the investigation, whom he communicated that information to. Sergeant Rushbrook does not know the full extent of the December 2009 court police officer's investigation into me. Now, Your Honour, this is extremely serious and it has ramifications, I know you'll appreciate, that are much bigger than this case, especially when we've seen the type of corruption that happens in our justice system when, for instance, a doctor, Dr. Charles Smith of the Centre of Forensic Science, and also Mr. Ranking's expert witness, Jim Van Allen, that together, they both put innocent mothers into jail for the murder of their babies. And in other cases, we've seen police officers blatantly lying, fabricating

1	evidence that puts people in jail and Your Honour,
2	with everything that this means - Your Honour,
3	it's highly disturbing because an investigation
4	was secretly done a month before my trial.
5	THE COURT: All right, now you are being
6	repetitive.
7	MR. BEST: Well
8	THE COURT: It is in the affidavit. Please don't
9	repeat.
10	MR. BEST: Well, all right, Your Honour.
11	THE COURT: Time is precious here.
12	MR. BEST: A moment, please.
13	THE COURT: If you are just going to repeat your
14	submissions, it doesn't help me. I heard it the
15	first time and I have read it
16	MR. BEST: Your Honour, many questions remain
17	unanswered: who initiated it, who received the
18	product of the investigation. Was it by reports
19	verbally or both? Who knew it happened? Who knew
20	it happened afterward and remained silent to this
21	day?
22	
23	Now, I was told early by the trial coordinator
24	that she knew I had not received all the
25	documents in those days and I did not. Now I see
26	that other things were happening, more serious
27	than I thought. Your Honour, I respectfully
28	submit that this matter is so serious that the
29	court must stop the current proceeding
30	immediately and reverse or stay the original
31	January 15th, 2010 order.
32	THE COURT: All right, thank you. Who wishes to
	April 30, 2013

respond, Mr. Silver or Mr. Ranking? MR. RANKING: I can respond, albeit briefly, Your Honour.

THE COURT: I don't want to get off track here. Remember I started out I wanted to allocate time. MR. RANKING: I will make three very brief points. I have no idea what my friend is talking about and I can tell you that neither Mr. Silver nor I, nor our respective clients, had anything to do with any of the allegations set out in Mr. Best's affidavit concerning Mr. Rushton, Sergeant Rushton, that he has handed across today, number one.

Number two, my friend, Mr. Best, has not indicated in any of his submissions how the investigation would impact the submissions that were made that led to your contempt order or the order that you made finding Mr. Best in contempt and indeed, his affidavit, likewise, does not show any connection other than some investigation was conducted.

The third point, and I simply throw this out entirely speculatively, you will recall that Mr. McKenzie came to court with supposed agents and security and other things because of these alleged threats and who knows if in fact there is any truth to this, why this investigation was commenced, but it may have been commenced by reason of other matters and other allegations that were raised by Mr. McKenzie.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

THE COURT: Well, that is speculative too. 1 MR. RANKING: Entirely speculative. 2 THE COURT: I am not getting into speculation. 3 MR. RANKING: So all in all, Your Honour, we are 4 here ready to go. I see no basis upon which my 5 friend has raised to suggest that this in any way 6 7 impugns the integrity of this court or the order that you made and my respectful submission is 8 that we get to scheduling and move forward. 9 THE COURT: Any reply to what Mr. Ranking said? I 10 11 don't have to hear your arguments over again but just any retort to what Mr. Ranking said. 12 13 MR. BEST: Thank you. Your Honour, first of all, as I said and as mentioned in the affidavit, the 14 15 court officer isn't talking and there's a lot of serious questions that remain unanswered. So for 16 17 Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver to say it's not 18 important, I can tell you it's as if I was to be tried for a murder and a month in advance of my 19 trial, the court staff and the court police were 20 21 told to build a scaffold for the hanging. That's 22 important, Your Honour. That's not the way our 23 justice system works. And this is not me talking about what happened. This is, first of all, the 24 25 Commissioner of the RCMP and it's Durham Regional 26 Police and I've put what I know in evidence. 27 THE COURT: All right. 28 MR. BEST: Affidavit. Now... 29 THE COURT: No, no, not now. I asked you whether 30 you are replying to what Mr. Ranking says. This 31 is not a restatement. MR. BEST: Well, I responded to his first point 32

that he said and he's also assuring us that his
clients don't know and I would remind you that
Mr. Ranking's private investigator, by his own
admission in his affidavit, accessed secret
police records which he should not have, which
the people who hold those records, the police
association, say was a criminal offence that he
did it. That was

**THE COURT:** That goes to the main argument that you are making in this case.

MR. BEST: So, Mr. Ranking saying that his client doesn't know is - you know, it carries very little weight.

Your Honour, this is a fundamental undermining of my right to have a fair trial at the time. I think it needs to be fully investigated. There are larger issues here, as indicated, with other people. This is a - something that is so foreign to how I think our justice system is supposed to operate. It's like up in Barrie when they were doing the investigations on those witnesses perhaps. It's like when the officers lied and that's another reason why this should be stayed, which I haven't even gone into except to say that it should be, but this investigation that was secret a month before my trial, where it was undocumented, no occurrence number, with all the rest of that, Your Honour, it is so wrong, suspicious and for - could only be for a negative impact upon my trial that Ι believe that stay this should it's Your Honour and that April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

### Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al Ruling on Preliminary Motion – Shaughnessy J.

important and that big. And that's what I ask Your Honour to do and it's what I think should happen, most respectfully, Your Honour. THE COURT: All right, thank you.

#### RULING

#### SHAUGHNESSY J. (Orally)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

At the commencement of what is an application by Mr. Best to purge his contempt, he has, without notice, produced an affidavit, his own affidavit, sworn 29 April 2013, wherein he outlines that the Durham Regional Police have conducted what he describes as an "undocumented, secret, private or 'on the side' (whatever it may be called) court police investigation" of him.

He alleges in paragraph five of his affidavit that there has been a miscarriage of justice. He states that, "There has been a miscarriage of justice and probably means that this court had to disqualify itself then and has to now."

He also, in paragraph one, alludes to the fact that his undocumented police investigation was made "most likely in assistance to the court".

In paragraph 12 to this affidavit, he states that this "cover-up or conspiracy" was to prevent a full hearing into his situation. Therefore, he states that this proceeding should be terminated and he has provided to the court a case called April 30, 2013

### Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al Ruling on Preliminary Motion – Shaughnessy J.

*R.v. Salmon* on the CanLII copy, a recent decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal, March 28, 2013.

The first paragraph indicates that this was the trial judge staying 17 charges against the respondent for a variety of offences on the basis of "police fabrication of evidence such as he found occurred in this case, so clearly contravened fundamental notions of justice and undermined the integrity of the criminal judicial process..."

Neither the *Salmon* case nor Mr. Best's affidavit produced this morning is relevant to the matter in which I am presiding.

Mr. Ranking, not having prior notice, nor Mr. Silver having prior notice, have stood up and said they have no idea what Mr. Best is talking about, that neither they nor their clients have been involved in any conspiracy or cover-up as alleged in this most recent affidavit.

I reject the information and material as being irrelevant to the proceeding I am dealing with. If Mr. Best has any complaint, it must be against the Durham Regional Police but it is unrelated to the very issue before me and that is whether Mr. Best is able to purge his contempt.

So we are proceeding. That is my ruling on that matter.

1

2

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

#### 20 Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al

Now, we have spent roughly half an hour on this issue. I want to divide up the time. I want to over to - and be fair about this - Messrs. Ranking and Silver as to how we divide up the time.

MR. RANKING: Your Honour, we have spoken about that and I think we can fairly say that our collective submissions will be no more than two hours and we can likely be shorter than that.

THE COURT: I would like it shorter.

MR. RANKING: All right.

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. RANKING: And so we're happy - we're in your hands - if you split it up however you wish. We are in your hands but realistically, we think each of our respective submissions will be 45 minutes, but that is our best guess. We haven't heard what Mr. Best is going to say but certainly that's our best guess and we are in the court's hands and happy to abide by whatever ruling you might make with respect to the length of time we have for our submissions.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Best, we are going to begin now and I am going to give you two and a half hours with a break. Then I will begin with counsel in the afternoon. I may have to ask the court staff, if need be, if we have to creep into the time beyond the time we normally sit, whether that is available. I understand there are family commitments and issues but it would be of assistance to me. I just thought I would send that message out now so you can make inquiries

and come back to me.

1 2

3

4

5

6

All right, Mr. Best, begin. Please, sir, remember what I told you. I read your affidavits, read your factum.

### 7 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEST ON CONTEMPT APPLICATION

1	SUBMISSIONS BI MR. BEST ON CONTEMPT APPLICATION
8	Your Honour, first of all, I would like to ask
9	your forgiveness to the fact that I am not a
10	lawyer. I don't know the rules.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Best, I am well aware of that.
12	MR. BEST: And I don't know what I'm doing, Your
13	Honour.
14	THE COURT: Unrepresented people appear in front
15	of me all the time, sir, so I understand that.
16	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
17	THE COURT: I don't need apologies. I just need
18	your submissions
19	MR. BEST: I just don't want to upset the court or
20	make you angry.
21	THE COURT: You are not making me angry. I just
22	would like you to stay focused, sir.
23	MR. BEST: Your Honour, if I could mention about
24	the issue with the police investigation, that it
25	was the police who told me that it was likely
26	done, 99.9%, in assistance to the court. Now,
27	Your Honour, I
28	THE COURT: What do you imply by that, sir?
29	MR. BEST: I did not mean you. It could have been
30	your court staff. It could have been - who knows
31	what?
32	<b>THE COURT:</b> My court staff, sir, are - I have the
·	April 30, 2013

finest individuals with me from the man, Mr. Mills, who has been my - I am afforded as an older judge the same court service officer and I don't know what I would do if I didn't have him day to day. The reporters are the very best. The registrars are very discreet. I don't know who it was back then. I don't know but I assume they are the same quality of the individuals I have in front of me today.

MR. BEST: I'm not saying it's any of these people or anything, Your Honour. I don't know and the police don't know.

THE COURT: Al right, but you have made that point. I have told you it is not relevant to what I am dealing with today. Please move on to the essential arguments you have and remember that I have read your factum. I know the issues that you have raised. So what you should be doing is highlighting to me those issues which you think are the most persuasive in terms of what your original application was. Please don't lose sight of the application drafted by Mr. Greenspan and what this is all about.

MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour. The application was to set aside the contempt order issued against the applicant on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010. I am reading from the application record, Notice of Application. It is made on behalf of Donald Best, the applicant herein, and it's to set aside - an order setting aside the contempt order issued against the applicant on January 15<sup>th</sup> and, in the alternative, an order varying the contempt order April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

issued against the applicant on January 15<sup>th</sup>, and an order staying the operation of the words "pending" and "determination" and such further order. That's what I'm trying to convince you to do today, sir, is to set aside that order.

Now, just a moment, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

Your Honour, we do have a brand new case from the Court of Appeal and you are correct that it was about police officers who lied and fabricated evidence and upon that evidence, the court was asked to convict that man and notwithstanding that - I mean you read the newspaper and all the of that. It rest was а procure of young all prostitutes and sorts of things but notwithstanding that, because evidence had been faked, the court had been lied to:

He stayed the proceedings on the basis that the police fabrication of evidence such as found occurred in this case, SO clearly contravened fundamental notions of justice and undermined the integrity of the criminal judicial process that it was necessarv to dissociate the court from the continued prosecution of the case.

And later on, paragraph 9, page 4 of the printout I provided to you, it said that:

A balancing of interests is apparent in his finding that the police conduct in this case was so egregious that only a stay could serve April 30, 2013

society's interest in preserving the integrity of the judicial system.

Your Honour, it is my submission to you today that this is the same situation we are facing here only it's worse because the gentlemen who I allege lied and misled the court are officers of the court. They are people in positions of trust and upon their evidence, their false evidence, this court convicted me. Your Honour, it's my intent right now to go into those lies and to prove to you that those lies happened and that they matter.

Now, Your Honour, I'm alleging and I know - I'm trying to be as - I'm speaking very respectfully here but I have to allege that Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver and Mr. Roman lied and deceived the court in many ways and it was not just in relation to that November 17th phone call and the surrounding events of that phone call.

The first series of lies was actually evidence submitted by the defendants and Mr. Ranking and indeed Mr. Silver - his client submitted evidence also, which was about the purported name of the purported entity that was Mr. Ranking's purported client and Kingsland's purported auditor "PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm", all of that in capitals.

That series of lies actually begins before the April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

lised

Nelson Barbados Group Ltd. case, as I will show vou. That series of lies in itself, in and of itself, regarding Mr. Ranking's client does not exist, as both the client and Mr. Ranking have given evidence to the court, and I will show you. That alone, I believe, would match the test in R. v. Salmon and I have made extensive references to that in my affidavit but there is new evidence provided by Mr. Ranking himself on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 during my cross-examination, and we'll get to that. He, in effect, confirmed that everything I have been saying and everything others have been saying, including Mr. Alair Shepherd, Q.C., the fraudulent, non-existence of his about purported client is true. Mr. Ranking actually confirmed that himself and Your Honour, his continued - continued behaviour in this regard, I respectfully submit to the court, verv Your Honour, is fraud upon the court in the face of the court.

I'm not much of a lawyer, Your Honour, but I was called the best fraud investigator in Canada by the head of the Toronto Police Commission and given a few awards and Your Honour, I will lay that all out for you today.

Of course, Mr. Ranking could stop that right now by standing up and presenting a registration certificate in Barbados for his purported client, "PricewaterhouseCoopers", new word "East", new word "Caribbean", new word "Firm", April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Pricewaterhouse Coopers, new word "East", new 1 word "Caribbean", new word "Firm". He could do 2 that. He's had the chance and I will lay it out. 3 He can't do that because it doesn't exist. Yet he 4 still maintains that some entity formed four 5 years after the perjury, which is not the same 6 7 name, has something to do with what he has done and his client has done for four years. And as I 8 9 mentioned in materials, it wasn't just - it didn't just start with that. It also started with 10 11 the name of the company they used before and I'm 12 going to show that. 13 14 It's also about where the money went, Your Honour. 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

Mr. Ranking received over a million dollars in costs and wherever it went, it didn't go to a bank account PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm. It did not.

So, Your Honour, I have - and I must apologize. I've got some things for you in three-ring binders only because, Your Honour, I - it was all I was able to manage in the middle of the night, 2:00 p.m. last night. So I have one for each of the gentlemen and one for the court.

If I could just have a moment here, Your Honour.

Your Honour, at Tab 1 of the compendium, which is in the three-ring binder, called "Situation Two", we have an affidavit of Philip St.Eval Atkinson and this was signed - one moment here - in 2006. April 30, 2013

	Submissions on Application to Furge Contempt (Dest)
1	Now, Your Honour, Mr. Atkinson says that "I am a
2	partner of PricewaterhouseCoopers (Barbados)"
3	and
4	THE COURT: This is the Barbados action you are
5	referring to.
6	MR. BEST: Yes, sir, and Mr. Atkinson
7	THE COURT: It's a separate action. You understand
8	that?
9	MR. BEST: Sorry, sir?
10	THE COURT: It is a separate action.
11	MR. BEST: Yes, it is a separate action.
12	THE COURT: It isn't even Mrs. Knox's action
13	against Deane Cox, Kingsland, and
14	PricewaterhouseCoopers. Is this the one that went
15	up the Privy Council?
16	MR. BEST: You will - I'm not sure about that, sir.
17	THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead.
18	MR. BEST: You will see that this affidavit and
19	the information from - it is actually spoken to
20	by Mr. Ranking and his client in affidavits
21	that
22	THE COURT: All right, just take me to the point.
23	MR. BEST: I will, sir, but what I'm saying is at
24	this point in time, in an affidavit before a
25	court, over - with the same defendants, they're
26	saying that the name of their legal entity is
27	"PricewaterhouseCoopers (Barbados)" and Your
28	Honour, you'll see that that company doesn't
29	exist.
30	THE COURT: All right, just show me. Go ahead.
31	MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour. You'll see that that
32	does not exist.
	Amil 20, 2012

THE COURT: You understand that I got that issue out of your factum, what you are raising now, and I just want you to understand, though, in taking me through it, I have read your affidavits and I read your factum. So I am aware of what you are saying on this issue. Just go ahead, though. What I am saying to you is you don't have to provide me with background. Just point me to what you say are the inconsistencies or why you say there isn't such an entity.

MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, first of all, I make a point that there's a reason why people use false names and that these people, because it's the same partner, as you will see - Mr. Atkinson is a partner with Mr. Hatch and they're all in it together and they habitually use false names. Now there was also a little bit of legal kerfuffle in Texas over the use of, you know, what is the real name and this matters...

**THE COURT:** Do we have to get into that? Can you not just take me forward on this particular matter and leave Texas alone?

MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, I apologize. I've never done this before. I don't know what I'm doing but I'm doing my best, Your Honour. I've had no advice. I'm doing my best.

So the court can see that this group of people the court will see this group of people uses false names and it matters because there's over 700 PWC entities in the world and you know, one is not responsible for the work of other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

And there's also - and we'll get to it. There's five or six entities having something to do with Pricewaterhouse, something maybe, in Barbados and they're all different from who Mr. Ranking says his client is and who his people he works with or his visible people. I hesitate to use the word clients. His clients who are people, the people who give him instructions.

So they're all different and that means that it's important who sues whom. It's important who's doing work. It's important where money goes and so this sets the ground that PricewaterhouseCoopers (Barbados) never existed, never has, but they used it in a lawsuit and they used it for other ways.

Now then we had Marcus Hatch in this case, Nelson Barbados, and Mr. Ranking represented Mr. Hatch and he was with him when he was cross-examined and he was with him when he put in an affidavit in this action. If we go to Tab 2, what we see, just like the affidavit in the motion record that Mr. Ranking put in in this case, that said that the name of the defendant was wrong because when had started this case, sued we we PricewaterhouseCoopers (Barbados) because that's who they said they were because that's what they delivered in an affidavit. That's who they said they were.

So, we believed them and we sued them but when we April 30, 2013

29

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

	Submissions on Application to Furge Contempt (Best)
1	did that, Mr. Ranking and his client,
2	Marcus Hatch, came and said, "No, you've got it
3	all wrong. It's "PricewaterhouseCoopers East
4	Caribbean Firm" and they put in an affidavit to
5	say that.
6	THE COURT: This is the cross-examination that I
7	take it took place in Barbados that I ordered, I
8	directed. This is all old material of
9	Mr. McKenzie representing Nelson Barbados
10	MR. BEST: That's right
11	THE COURT: asking the questions and the
12	outline is there on the page.
13	MR. BEST: Right, and I have made
14	THE COURT: So let's go on.
15	MR. BEST: I have taken the transcript and taken
16	some pages from it and you'll see here that I
17	have some quotes, where both Mr. Ranking and
18	Mr. Hatch assure me, my lawyer
19	THE COURT: Mr. McKenzie
20	MR. BEST: Mr. McKenzie, that
21	"PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm" is
22	the proper legal entity, the proper legal name,
23	and that it's a member of PricewaterhouseCoopers
24	International Ltd.
25	
26	The entire transcript focuses in many places on
27	the legitimacy of PricewaterhouseCoopers East
28	Caribbean Firm as a real entity. That's assured
29	by Mr. Ranking.
30	THE COURT: You have said that several times. You
31	have been on this issue now approximately half an
32	hour. I am saying to you, you are repeating.
ı	April 30, 2013

April 30, 2013

1MR. EEST: Well, Your Honour2THE COURT: It is matters that are in your factum.3I think you should try to move forward and use4your time wisely. I can't control you and tell5you. I am just trying to assist you and say we6have been on this issue for approximately a half7an hour and if you are going to get to all your8points, you had better consider your time9allotment.10MR. EEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. EEST: Thes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. EEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. EEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit25THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. EEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31 <th></th> <th>Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)</th>		Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
3I think you should try to move forward and use4your time wisely. I can't control you and tell5you. I am just trying to assist you and say we6have been on this issue for approximately a half7an hour and if you are going to get to all your8points, you had better consider your time9allotment.10MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit27affidavit because I have them with stickers as to30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	1	MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour
4your time wisely. I can't control you and tell5you. I am just trying to assist you and say we6have been on this issue for approximately a half7an hour and if you are going to get to all your8points, you had better consider your time9allotment.10MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit25THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	2	THE COURT: It is matters that are in your factum.
5you. I am just trying to assist you and say we6have been on this issue for approximately a half7an hour and if you are going to get to all your8points, you had better consider your time9allotment.10MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which26MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in the way I28affidavit because I have them with stickers as to39othe date it was sworn is the way I	3	I think you should try to move forward and use
<ul> <li>have been on this issue for approximately a half</li> <li>an hour and if you are going to get to all your</li> <li>points, you had better consider your time</li> <li>allotment.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have</li> <li>never done this before and I</li> <li>THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes.</li> <li>THE COURT:what time you have and the</li> <li>importance of managing your time and your</li> <li>submissions and also that I have read the</li> <li>affidavits. I have read the factum.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that</li> <li>says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is</li> <li>structured and that each of the firms are</li> <li>independent legal entities.</li> <li>THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,</li> <li>MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>attached as</li> <li>THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	4	your time wisely. I can't control you and tell
7an hour and if you are going to get to all your8points, you had better consider your time9allotment.10MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	5	you. I am just trying to assist you and say we
<ul> <li>points, you had better consider your time</li> <li>allotment.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have</li> <li>never done this before and I</li> <li>THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes.</li> <li>THE COURT:what time you have and the</li> <li>importance of managing your time and your</li> <li>submissions and also that I have read the</li> <li>affidavits. I have read the factum.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that</li> <li>says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is</li> <li>structured and that each of the firms are</li> <li>independent legal entities.</li> <li>THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same</li> <li>point as made at Tab 2.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?</li> <li>THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,</li> <li>MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>attached as</li> <li>THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	6	have been on this issue for approximately a half
<ul> <li>allotment.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have never done this before and I</li> <li>THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes.</li> <li>THE COURT:what time you have and the importance of managing your time and your submissions and also that I have read the affidavits. I have read the factum.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is structured and that each of the firms are independent legal entities.</li> <li>THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same point as made at Tab 2.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?</li> <li>THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2, Mr. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit attached as</li> <li>THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which affidavit because I have them with stickers as to dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	7	an hour and if you are going to get to all your
10MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	8	points, you had better consider your time
11never done this before and I12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	9	allotment.
12THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	10	MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. Again, I have
13MR. BEST: Yes.14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	11	never done this before and I
14THE COURT:what time you have and the15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	12	THE COURT: Well, I started out by telling you
15importance of managing your time and your16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	13	MR. BEST: Yes.
16submissions and also that I have read the17affidavits. I have read the factum.18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	14	THE COURT:what time you have and the
<ul> <li>17 affidavits. I have read the factum.</li> <li>18 MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that</li> <li>19 says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is</li> <li>20 structured and that each of the firms are</li> <li>21 independent legal entities.</li> <li>22 THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same</li> <li>23 point as made at Tab 2.</li> <li>24 MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?</li> <li>25 THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,</li> <li>26 Mr. Hatch's own words.</li> <li>27 MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>28 attached as</li> <li>29 THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>30 affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>31 dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	15	importance of managing your time and your
18MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	16	submissions and also that I have read the
19says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	17	affidavits. I have read the factum.
20structured and that each of the firms are21independent legal entities.22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	18	MR. BEST: Then Tab 3, it's just an exhibit that
<ul> <li>21 independent legal entities.</li> <li>22 THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same</li> <li>23 point as made at Tab 2.</li> <li>24 MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?</li> <li>25 THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,</li> <li>26 Mr. Hatch's own words.</li> <li>27 MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>28 attached as</li> <li>29 THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>30 affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>31 dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	19	says how PricewaterhouseCoopers International is
22THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same23point as made at Tab 2.24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	20	structured and that each of the firms are
<ul> <li>point as made at Tab 2.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?</li> <li>THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,</li> <li>Mr. Hatch's own words.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>attached as</li> <li>THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	21	independent legal entities.
24MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	22	THE COURT: You made that point. It is the same
25THE COURT: It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,26Mr. Hatch's own words.27MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	23	point as made at Tab 2.
<ul> <li>26 Mr. Hatch's own words.</li> <li>27 MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>28 attached as</li> <li>29 THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>30 affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>31 dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	24	MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour?
<ul> <li>MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit</li> <li>attached as</li> <li>THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which</li> <li>affidavit because I have them with stickers as to</li> <li>dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I</li> </ul>	25	<b>THE COURT:</b> It is the same point, got it, at Tab 2,
28attached as29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	26	Mr. Hatch's own words.
29THE COURT: It is better if you tell me which30affidavit because I have them with stickers as to31dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	27	MR. BEST: Okay. Now, Your Honour, in my affidavit
30 affidavit because I have them with stickers as to 31 dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	28	attached as
31 dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I	29	
		affidavit because I have them with stickers as to
32 refer to it.	1	dates. So the date it was sworn is the way I
	32	refer to it.

. Cetta

in the second

MR. BEST: December 10<sup>th</sup>, Exhibit T. 1 2 THE COURT: Got it. 3 MR. BEST: This is - and I'd like you to go into one, two, three, four - six pages in. You will 4 5 get a statement giving... THE COURT: Six pages in? 6 7 MR. BEST: Six pages in of Tab 4. THE COURT: Tab 4 or Tab T? 8 9 MR. BEST: Tab 4. THE COURT: Just a minute. You said to me the 10 December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012... 11 MR. BEST: Okay, I'm sorry, Your Honour, I didn't 12 13 clarify that. I'm still looking at my compendium 14 and at Tab 4 of the compendium, you will find Exhibit T from my December 10<sup>th</sup> affidavit. I put 15 it in the compendium. I apologize I didn't make 16 17 that... THE COURT: That's fine and then go in how many 18 19 pages? 20 MR. BEST: ... that clear. Well, if you go in two 21 pages... 22 THE COURT: Two pages. 23 MR. BEST: ... you will see "Statement of Notice to 24 the Partners". 25 THE COURT: Yes. 26 MR. BEST: And the names on there that I ask you 27 to look at down below, halfway, Marcus Andrew 28 Philip St.Eval Atkinson. Hatch, So they're 29 partners. 30 31 And then three pages from the back or however 32 many pages that is from the front that says

"Business Name Rules". Page number eight on Tab 4 compendium, "Business Name Rules". of the statement giving notice of changes. You'll notice the date in the top there, Your Honour, June 23rd, 2011 and it says that the partnership known as PricewaterhouseCoopers, on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011, and it was Marcus Hatch - that's his signature there. You can check that out - changed the name of the firm to PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean. Now, once again "PricewaterhouseCoopers", new word "East", new word "Caribbean".

This is the first time, in 2011, four years after those affidavits were sworn in 2007 saying that East Caribbean Firm PricewaterhouseCoopers existed. This is the first indication we see of anything like it, except that it's not the same. It doesn't have "Firm" on the end, so it's something similar but it's not the same. This was in my December 10<sup>th</sup> affidavit, of course, and it basically makes the point that, "Hey, this is as close as it comes," four years after people were testifying under oath that PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm exists. Now, even if this said "PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm", it would still be four years after the offence of perjury, obstruct justice, swearing а false affidavit occurred.

Now, once again, I am pointing out this is in my affidavit. Tab 5, my December 10th affidavit – and that's important, that date, December 10<sup>th</sup>. That's when I brought that up. On the 5th or April 30, 2013

33

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Tab 5, rather, you'll see a number of Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property Office of Barbados just indicating that there are so many different firms down there having something to do with PricewaterhouseCoopers. Perhaps some of them are holding companies. Perhaps they have different partnerships, who knows, but none of them are "PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm".

Tab 7, Notice of Appearance filed by Mr. Ranking very recently on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012. That's after years - years- of allegations and controversy as to the fact that his client was not real, was not registered and still they continue to say it was and it was real and here it is here again. And Your Honour will remember it took some doing to get him to file that.

Tab 8, Alair Shepherd. Alair Shepherd indicates that PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm does not now exist as a genuinely registered entity in Barbados, nor has it existed at any time in the past. And that is also true on the next page, paragraph seven, of PricewaterhouseCoopers (Barbados). So, you know, once again, we have a history of false affidavits, lies in affidavits, in motions, in verbal statements, in cross-exams and backed up by Mr. Ranking.

Number 9 and number 10. On January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013... April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

	Submissions on Application to Furge Contempt (Dest)
1	THE COURT: Well, nine refers to the Certificate
2	of Registration of PricewaterhouseCoopers on the
3	15 <sup>th</sup> of October, 2003, right?
4	MR. BEST: Yes, that's the first one, yes, the 15 <sup>th</sup>
5	of October, 2003, PricewaterhouseCoopers.
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	MR. BEST: And that is that
8	THE COURT: Now we are over to Tab 10.
9	MR. BEST: Right. That is a
10	THE COURT: A Certificate of Registration.
11	MR. BEST: Right. You saw these before in my
12	Exhibit T file on the 10 <sup>th</sup> . And here we have the
13	Certificate of Registration. Once again, the name
14	was created June 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2011. You will see that on
15	the next page and there's the stamp.
16	THE COURT: I see it.
17	MR. BEST: All right, and it's not
18	PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm. Your
19	Honour, these things matter. It matters and it is
20	extremely telling reading the transcript of
21	January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 when Exhibit 32 and Exhibit 31
22	were introduced during my cross-examination by
23	Mr. Ranking. When he went to read this
23 24	Mr. Ranking. When he went to read this certificate, Exhibit 32, which says
24	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says
24 25	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean, he
24 25 26	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean, he verbally inserted the word "Firm" when he spoke
24 25 26 27	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean, he verbally inserted the word "Firm" when he spoke about it in the transcript and I called him on it.
24 25 26 27 28	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean, he verbally inserted the word "Firm" when he spoke about it in the transcript and I called him on it. I actually started laughing because, Your Honour,
24 25 26 27 28 29	certificate, Exhibit 32, which says PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean, he verbally inserted the word "Firm" when he spoke about it in the transcript and I called him on it. I actually started laughing because, Your Honour, back in December - and I'm going by memory here

April 30, 2013

and in context. 1 BEST: All right. All right, then give 2 MR. you're right, Your Honour, and I'm doing my best. 3 Please give me a moment. I'm going to find it. 4 5 Your Honour, I'm going to ask for your indulgence, 6 7 Your Honour. MR. SILVER: What is my friend looking for? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes, maybe they can find it for you 10 fast, Mr. Best. 11 MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour.... THE COURT: But tell me what you are saying I said 12 13 in December and you know, what matters is rulings but you go ahead. What did I say? 14 15 MR. BEST: Well, you said that you were... MR. SILVER: This is December 2012? 16 17 MR. BEST: I believe so. I think that's when it was and Your Honour basically said, in regards to 18 19 argument that PricewaterhouseCoopers my East 20 Caribbean Firm didn't exist, that you were 21 unconvinced. You didn't say ... 22 THE COURT: Well, you had better quote me. 23 MR. BEST: Something like that. 24 THE COURT: Yes, something like that. 25 MR. BEST: I want to get it right, Your Honour. 26 You know, let's... 27 THE COURT: You know, I sort of would like it too 28 to be right, Mr. Best... 29 MR. BEST: I understand, Your Honour, and I'm... 30 THE COURT: ... after reading your factum but go 31 ahead. 32 MR. BEST: Yes.

	Submissions on Approación to Faige Contempt (Dest)
1	MR. SILVER: All I can do to try to assist is -
2	I'm not sure there was an attendance before you
3	in December. There's a transcript in our motion
4	record at Tab 53. There is a transcript of the
5	proceedings before you on November 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2012. So
6	if Mr. Best has the date wrong and it's the
7	November, he can find that transcript at Tab 53
8	of our motion record.
9	MR. BEST: Okay, it was actually
10	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Silver.
11	MR. BEST: Well, okay, let me look at it but I
12	thought it was after I submitted my December $10^{th}$
13	affidavit, Your Honour.
14	MR. RANKING: Your Honour, I believe - and I've
15	got to go back because I was looking at my notes.
16	I believe there was a December 11 <sup>th</sup> attendance. I
17	think there was a December 11 <sup>th</sup> attendance. My
18	friend may not be aware of it because he had hip
19	surgery and I think I attended that day.
20	THE COURT: I remember that issue, yes.
21	MR. SILVER: That's right.
22	MR. RANKING: I think it was December 11 <sup>th</sup> , Your
23	Honour.
24	THE COURT: All right.
25	MR. SILVER: Okay, we don't have a transcript for
26	that in our motion record.
27	MR. BEST: Well, hang on. Let me
28	I have the December 11 <sup>th</sup> transcript here. I'm
29	going to work from the back because I think it
30	might have been near the end.
31	THE COURT: Well, if you can't find it, Mr. Best -
32	and you have been at this for about 10 minutes.
	April 30, 2013
	<b>-</b> <i>'</i>

37

1.1

(Com)

times

- 22

You have got about 25 minutes to the morning 1 break. Perhaps you should just move on to your 2 3 next point. MR. BEST: You know, I will then, Your Honour. I 4 will say I recall you saying something like you 5 remained unconvinced. 6 7 Your Honour, prior to Mr. Ranking submitting this 8 perhaps Your Honour had some doubt but, 9 Ranking submitted Your Honour, once Mr. 10 Exhibit 32 and Exhibit 31 agreeing, in effect, 11 with my December 10th affidavit in Exhibit T, 12 13 Your Honour, he admitted it. THE COURT: All right, you have made that point, 14 Mr. Best. I have heard it. 15 MR. BEST: Right, so... 16 17 THE COURT: So let's move on. are settled that So now if 18 MR. BEST: we 19 "PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm" is not a legally registered entity and does not 20 21 exist and that the court has been, for years, 22 been provided with sworn evidence that it does 23 exist, Your Honour, surely there was due 24 diligence done at the start by Mr. Ranking and 25 his firm but even if that wasn't the case - let's 26 say they made a mistake at beginning. By that 27 cross-examination in 2008 when Mr. Ranking gave 28 all assurances that "PricewaterhouseCoopers East 29 Caribbean Firm" was a legal entity, by that time, 30 even if he didn't know, even if his clients were 31 lying to him, as they did with their previous 32 name used in the previous lawsuit, by the time we April 30, 2013

S.

껢

á

Ø

5

ï

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	get to January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 and Mr. Ranking lays
2	down on the table Exhibit 32 and Exhibit 31,
3	admitting that everything he is - every motion,
4	every piece of evidence, every affidavit, even
5	what he's done now, is false, Your Honour, and
6	this has real importance because
7	THE COURT: You have told me that.
8	MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour.
9	THE COURT: You have told me that, Mr. Best.
10	MR. BEST: All right.
11	THE COURT: Please don't be repeating. I have got
12	the point.
13	MR. BEST: All right, and with the new case,
14	R.v. Salmon, I think, Your Honour, that just on that
15	lie alone, that Your Honour should stay this case
16	right now.
17	THE COURT: All right. What is your next point?
18	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I don't know the procedure
19	here. Would I be
20	THE COURT: You are not having much difficulty
21	manoeuvring the procedures, from my observation.
22	MR. BEST: Would it be out of order if,
23	hypothetically - am I allowed to ask the court to
24	rule, make a ruling on whether
25	PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean
26	THE COURT: No, that would not be correct.
27	MR. BEST: Okay, then Your Honour, I apologize.
28	THE COURT: I said move on to your next point. You
29	are making all of your submissions now.
30	MR. BEST: All right.
31	THE COURT: They are going to respond to your
32	submissions.
	April 30, 2013

- 540 to 1

ł

MR. BEST: I see.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

My next point will take, frankly, several hours, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Mr. Best, you are not listening to me.
MR. BEST: I heard you, Your Honour.

**THE COURT:** And you know what, I find it very deliberate. I have told you what time. I have given you more time than the others. Ι have allocated this day. You have known for months that it was this day and I told you to properly allocate your time. You have prepared factums. It is the purpose of the factum to alert the court to the issues, to summarize the arguments. You are not going to be given days, as you requested, or even further hours. I am telling you right now you present and summarize your most important Because I have read them, I have an issues. awareness of them and what you are attempting to do is to persuade me by highlighting what you say are the most important points.

But if I could just make one comment, sir. Go your original back to application drawn bv Mr. Brian Greenspan. This is an application to purge your contempt. You have already been found in contempt so the issue now is can you or will you be able to purge your contempt or, alternatively, as you would like to put it, to have my order of January 15th, 2010 set aside, which found you to be in contempt of the court. You used the words "not guilty of contempt of court" in your draft order. But I am telling you

	Submissions on Application to Furge Contempt (Best)
1	right now that is the issue and I am throwing it
2	out there again and I have said repeatedly that
3	is the issue that you have got to deal with today.
4	So with that in mind, I am not going to remind
5	you again. I am going to sit, I am going to
6	listen but I ask you to organize your arguments
7	as it relates to the issue that is central to the
8	attendance today.
9	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I've heard what you said.
10	THE COURT: You heard me but I don't think you are
11	buying it. Go ahead.
12	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I don't understand. I will
13	try and
14	THE COURT: Oh, you understand, Mr. Best. It is
15	just that you have decided that you are going to
16	go in certain directions and deal with issues
17	notwithstanding. I am just telling you that at
18	some point, you would really want to address the
19	most important central issues that deal with your
20	contempt and the order that I made of January the
21	15 <sup>th</sup> , 2010.
22	MR. BEST: I see.
23	THE COURT: That is what you really want to get at
24	today.
25	MR. BEST: I see.
26	THE COURT: I say no more, sir. Go ahead.
27	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
28	MR. BEST: I had intended to play for you the tape
29	of the November 17th phone call.
30	THE COURT: Sir, I have read the transcript of it.
31	I actually opened up and I read that transcript
32	from front to back. I read - you have produced it.
·	April 30, 2013

You even had it verified. I read it. 1 2 MR. BEST: With respect, Your Honour... THE COURT: I read what you had to say and I don't 3 think anvthing jumped out at me from the 4 transcript that I had not already heard way back. 5 6 MR. BEST: And Your Honour, that is why - because 7 everything that was done was done in context and for instance, well, I have here a compendium, 8 9 which I have actually given to Mr. Ranking and 10 Mr. Silver at another place. It's the same 11 compendium. MR. RANKING: And I think my friend is referring 12 to the mediation compendium, which I have left in 13 14 my office. I don't know why we are handing up the 15 compendium that was prepared for the mediation. 16 THE COURT: You can't get into that. I know that you attended before Justice Edwards because I 17 18 asked that the mediation be set up. I don't know 19 what goes on at the mediation. 20 MR. BEST: Well, this is... 21 THE COURT: Justice Edwards... 22 MR. BEST: Oh, sorry, sorry. 23 THE COURT: Justice Edwards cannot disclose to me 24 - that is the whole purpose of it - what was 25 discussed, what issues were raised, nor should I 26 be looking at any materials that you put in front 27 of him. You have got all the materials here and 28 vou talk about the transcript. Ι have the 29 transcript. It has been produced. Mr. Best, we 30 have three banker boxes - that is what I am 31 running - packed with materials as it relates to 32 this particular - this particular application. So

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	I am not going to get into mediation briefs,
2	sorry. Go ahead.
3	MR. BEST: Okay. Actually, this was redone as a
4	hearing brief, Your Honour, but in any event,
5	it's all exhibits that are already in before the
6	court.
7	THE COURT: Right, so why do we duplicate it? Go
8	ahead. Just tell me.
9	MR. BEST: Well, because I
10	THE COURT: It may be of assistance to you. You go
11	ahead. I am not looking at it.
12	MR. BEST: I see.
13	THE COURT: I have all those materials.
14	MR. BEST: I see. Well, Your Honour, my point is
15	about - about the lies surrounding the
16	November 17 <sup>th</sup> phone call. All of that started back
17	in October, October 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009, when Mr. Ranking
18	hired his private investigator and I wanted to
19	take Your Honour - because only by seeing things
20	as they occurred in context and by seeing them in
21	a chronological order do you, for instance, know
22	when Mr. Ranking spoke to you on December 2 <sup>nd</sup>
23	during the hearing and said what he did.
24	THE COURT: He made submissions to me. Please
25	don't say he spoke to me. He made submissions in
26	open court.
27	MR. BEST: He made submissions and everything.
28	THE COURT: You are aware of what he said.
29	MR. BEST: When you see all that in context - and
30	I'm sorry Your Honour hasn't actually listened to
31	the conversation because there's a lot to be said
32	with tenor and pauses and tone and such and it's
	April 30, 2013

No.

	Submissions on Application to Turge Contempt (Dest)
1	important. That's why - but Your Honour, I hear
2	you. I will obey your order for me to move on but
3	most respectfully, sir, I don't think I'm getting
4	a fair shot here.
5	THE COURT: Again, that is a very unfair comment
6	because I am bending over backwards to keep you
7	focused. I have given you direction.
8	MR. BEST: All right, sir.
9	THE COURT: I have not given you orders. Sir, if
10	you want to utilize your time on other issues,
11	you go right ahead. All I am saying to you - I
12	tried to get you back focused onto the issue so
13	that you can maximize the time allowance given to
14	you.
15	MR. BEST: All right, sir.
16	THE COURT: If you don't wish to do so, sir,
17	that's entirely up to you. I can do no more.
18	MR. BEST: What I would like to do then,
19	Your Honour, is to show that I've answered all
20	the - I've answered all the questions. I've done
21	everything that you wanted. I've done it and more
22	in your orders. I've done it
23	THE COURT: Well, now you are on the points that
24	MR. BEST:all.
25	THE COURT: Go ahead.
26	MR. BEST: Your Honour - okay, and if I can have
27	just a moment, here. It's all done, Your Honour.
28	I answered everything.
29	<b>THE COURT:</b> Can we just get out the order itself?
30	I don't have a memory of it but I know it is in
31	the materials.
32	MR. BEST: Yes, your November 2 <sup>nd</sup> order,
	April 30, 2013

Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best) 1 Your Honour? 2 THE COURT: Yes, I want to get both of them. 3 MR. BEST: Yes, sir. THE COURT: They are together. 4 MR. RANKING: The November 2<sup>nd</sup> order, Your Honour, 5 is under Tab 25. 6 THE COURT: Of your materials? 7 MR. RANKING: Yes, and the December 2<sup>nd</sup> order is 8 9 under Tab 30. MR. BEST: I'm sorry, 25 and 30, sir? 10 MR. RANKING: 25 and 30. 11 12 THE COURT: Yes. MR. RANKING: The November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup>. 13 THE COURT: Oh, I need another binder. I have got 14 15 30 but 25 is in the other one. 16 MR. SILVER: In Volume 1. MR. RANKING: And for your benefit, Your Honour, 17 18 at Tab 37 is the January 15<sup>th</sup> order. So the three orders are Tabs 25 - going from earliest to 19 20 latest, 25, 30 and 37. 21 THE COURT: Madam Registrar, it says "Responding 22 Party's Motion Record". It is volume number one. 23 It has got a blue backing. 24 ... DISCUSSION ABOUT LOCATING DOCUMENTS 25 MR. RANKING: Your Honour, I have not marked mine. 26 I will just hand it to the registrar. 27 THE COURT: I had it. I have clearly seen it, but 28 it's all right if we can use ... 29 RANKING: Do you have the MR. first volume, 30 Your Honour? THE COURT: I have got Volume 2. One is not -31 32 madam registrar is having a problem. It may be

45

that we have got yet another box upstairs. 1 MR. RANKING: These have not been marked. I can 2 represent that to the court. 3 THE COURT: No, I have got two. All I need is 4 Tab 25. 5 MR. RANKING: Yes. 6 MR. SILVER: There is also a Volume 3. 7 MR. RANKING: Well, I am handing that up. 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 ... DISCUSSION WITH THE STAFF ABOUT MORE DOCUMENTS 10 BEING IN CHAMBERS 11 THE COURT: That order shows up in other places, 12 just so you know. It is well presented. 13 All right, so let's go to - you wanted to start 14 with the order of November  $2^{nd}$ , 2009 and it is at 15 Tab 25. 16 MR. BEST: Your Honour... 17 THE COURT: ... of the respondent's materials. Yes, 18 19 go ahead. MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour. Now, I'd like to say 20 that all the requirements of your orders were 21 22 fulfilled through the combination of: 23 Ι provided memory sticks with tens of A) 24 thousands of documents of the books and records 25 of Nelson Barbados Group Ltd. to Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver in court on January 25<sup>th</sup>. 26 27 THE COURT: Where did you get those documents? 28 MR. BEST: Your Honour, some I had myself. Some I 29 got off the internet. A large amount of them I 30 got off the internet because I'll tell you right 31 now, Your Honour, Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver took 32 copies of my file or took all the file, even April 30, 2013

	Submissions on Application to Turge Contempt (Dest)
1	things I don't have that I wish I had, and
2	Mr. Silver said he gave it all to his clients. He
3	said that on January - well, in one of the cross-
4	examinations. And Your Honour, so I gave what I
5	had and I have them here.
6	THE COURT: No, no, no, no. Let's just stay
7	focused, okay?
8	MR. BEST: All right, but
9	THE COURT: We are dealing with
10	MR. BEST: In any event
11	THE COURT: Just a minute. When I am talking
12	MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour.
13	THE COURT: you stop and then I will stop
14	talking and you can talk.
15	MR. BEST: I'm sorry, Your Honour.
16	THE COURT: November 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009 order, Tab 25. It
17	begins with directions that you will appear in an
18	examination November 17 <sup>th</sup> but let's go over to
19	subparagraphs (a) through (e) of paragraph three.
20	That is what we are dealing with, and paragraph
21	four of that order.
22	MR. BEST: Yes. Well, Your Honour, I
23	THE COURT: And paragraph seven. So that is what -
24	wait a minute, that is Mr. McKenzie, sorry. So
25	paragraph seven relates to McKenzie and of course,
26	at that time, you were using UPS stores as your
27	addresses in Kingston and elsewhere, so I made
28	orders in that regard. You had a box at 250 The
29	East Mall, Box 1715 in The East Mall, and then
30	there was Box 200 at 427 Princess Street. So the
31	record will speak for itself on those issues.
32	So tell me, you are on the issue I want to hear
	April 30, 2013

COTON N

600

about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MR. BEST: Yes.

**THE COURT:** What do you say in terms of compliance with that order?

MR. BEST: Yes. Your Honour, there is - if we can break it down into two sides and that is I have and you know, I've heard you, Your Honour. I'm just saying what I have - many hours, even a whole day on why I did not fulfill - why I was unable to fulfill your order at the time you made your orders, and that's a combination of I was prevented and it's a combination of I didn't know. It's a combination of I wasn't served. But leaving all of that aside for the moment, I would like to show Your Honour that notwithstanding that I did not do what you wanted me to do on the dates you wanted me to do them, notwithstanding that - and there were good reasons and I could for an entire day I could tell you about those reasons.

THE COURT: Well, you have ...

MR. BEST: But notwithstanding that, I want Your Honour to know that now, right here as we are right now, I have fulfilled all of the things in your orders that are possible for me to fulfill. I can't appear on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 because that is gone, but everything that I - I have done everything I possibly can and I'm going to show you that.

30THE COURT: All right. Well, you have got to31succinctly direct me to that because your factum32is pretty silent. You make a blanket statement.April 30, 2013

There is no detail. That is the kind of material 1 I was looking for. 2 MR. BEST: All right, well... 3 THE COURT: And then we have, of course, the order 4 of, don't forget, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December, 2009 and in 5 particular, paragraphs two, three and three has 6 7 (i) through (iv). So let's deal with it. MR. BEST: All right. Well, to deal with what I 8 9 think I had to do to fulfill the orders now, as can, I have done - first of all, Ι 10 best I 11 provided these two gentlemen with the memory sticks and as I recall, I tried to give it to 12 13 court too but the court did not want it. But I have that still here now if the court wants it. 14 15 So the court could look at it and see the hundred thousand documents itself. 16 17 THE COURT: No, no. You have referred to the 100,000 documents in your factum. The issue is 18 19 finitely I want to know, in relation to those two 20 orders... 21 MR. BEST: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: ... did you make the productions and 23 provide the materials and answers that those 24 orders stipulate? 25 MR. BEST: I did. 26 THE COURT: That's the... 27 MR. BEST: I did, sir, and also... 28 THE COURT: Well then, you had better be able to 29 tell me and show me because now we are... 30 MR. BEST: Yes, sir. 31 THE COURT: ... at the heart of the issue here. 32 MR. All right. I have BEST: here, sir, my

1"Answers To Undertakings, Under Advisements And2Refusals".3THE COURT: Let's see that, and why wasn't this4filed earlier?5MR. BEST: Well, I didn't know - I didn't know6what - I thought that - I guess I thought that7these gentlemen would do it and then when I read8in their9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give24these25MR. BEST: Yes, sir.26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,<		Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
3THE COURT: Let's see that, and why wasn't this4filed earlier?5MR. BEST: Well, I didn't know - I didn't know6what - I thought that - I guess I thought that7these gentlemen would do it and then when I read8in their9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. BIST: Your Honour, you told me to give24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Yes, sir.26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	1	"Answers To Undertakings, Under Advisements And
4filed earlier?5MR. BEST: Well, I didn't know - I didn't know6what - I thought that - I guess I thought that7these gentlemen would do it and then when I read8in their9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give24these25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	2	Refusals".
5MR. BEST: Well, I didn't know - I didn't know6what - I thought that - I guess I thought that7these gentlemen would do it and then when I read8in their9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give24these are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	3	THE COURT: Let's see that, and why wasn't this
<ul> <li>what - I thought that - I guess I thought that these gentlemen would do it and then when I read in their</li> <li>THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with all due respect, and now you are handing to me</li> <li>MR. BEST: Well, I</li> <li>THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings, Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best, Applicant, Stemming From His January 11<sup>th</sup> And January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page count on this? There is no page count. I have got to believe it is several hundred pages. I would think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	4	filed earlier?
7these gentlemen would do it and then when I read8in their9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	5	MR. BEST: Well, I didn't know - I didn't know
<ul> <li>in their</li> <li>THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with</li> <li>all due respect, and now you are handing to me</li> <li>MR. BEST: Well, I</li> <li>THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to</li> <li>reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,</li> <li>Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,</li> <li>Applicant, Stemming From His January 11<sup>th</sup> And</li> <li>January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it</li> <li>begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the</li> <li>purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will</li> <li>be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page</li> <li>count on this? There is no page count. I have got</li> <li>to believe it is several hundred pages. I would</li> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	6	what - I thought that - I guess I thought that
9THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	7	these gentlemen would do it and then when I read
10all due respect, and now you are handing to me11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	8	in their
11MR. BEST: Well, I12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	9	THE COURT: It is not their application, sir, with
12THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	10	all due respect, and now you are handing to me
13reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	11	MR. BEST: Well, I
14Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	12	THE COURT: Just a minute. I want the record to
15Applicant, Stemming From His January 11th And16January 23rd, 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	13	reflect. You are saying "Answers To Undertakings,
16January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it17begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the18purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will19be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page20count on this? There is no page count. I have got21to believe it is several hundred pages. I would22think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.23MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and24then there are attachments.25MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give26these27THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now28what I am getting.29MR. BEST: Yes, sir.30THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am31not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	14	Under Advisements, Refusals By Donald Best,
<ul> <li>begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the</li> <li>purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will</li> <li>be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page</li> <li>count on this? There is no page count. I have got</li> <li>to believe it is several hundred pages. I would</li> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	15	Applicant, Stemming From His January 11 <sup>th</sup> And
<ul> <li>purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will</li> <li>be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page</li> <li>count on this? There is no page count. I have got</li> <li>to believe it is several hundred pages. I would</li> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	16	January 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2013 Cross-Examinations" and it
<ul> <li>be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page</li> <li>count on this? There is no page count. I have got</li> <li>to believe it is several hundred pages. I would</li> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	17	begins - the pages are unnumbered but for the
<ul> <li>count on this? There is no page count. I have got to believe it is several hundred pages. I would think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	18	purposes of the record, it will be filed. It will
<ul> <li>to believe it is several hundred pages. I would</li> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	19	be seen to encompass - has somebody got a page
<ul> <li>think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.</li> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and</li> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	20	count on this? There is no page count. I have got
<ul> <li>MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	21	to believe it is several hundred pages. I would
<ul> <li>then there are attachments.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	22	think, conservatively, 250, 300 pages.
<ul> <li>MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	23	MR. SILVER: The letter itself is 119 pages and
<ul> <li>these</li> <li>these</li> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	24	then there are attachments.
<ul> <li>THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now</li> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am</li> <li>not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	25	MR. BEST: Your Honour, you told me to give
<ul> <li>what I am getting.</li> <li>MR. BEST: Yes, sir.</li> <li>THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,</li> </ul>	26	these
29 MR. BEST: Yes, sir. 30 THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am 31 not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	27	THE COURT: That's fine. I am just describing now
30 <b>THE COURT:</b> Let's just go through it. Well, I am 31 not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	28	what I am getting.
not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,	29	MR. BEST: Yes, sir.
go allead,		THE COURT: Let's just go through it. Well, I am
32 sir, go ahead.		not going to describe it any further. Go ahead,
	32	sir, go ahead.

ineres a

1	MR. BEST: But with great respect, Your Honour,
2	you didn't tell me to file it. I didn't know
3	enough to file it. I obeyed your order to give it
4	to them on the day that I should and I did.
5	THE COURT: All right, go ahead.
6	MR. BEST: All right, sir. So this
7	THE COURT: So tell me how that answers all the
8	questions and orders that I made of November 2 <sup>nd</sup>
9	and December 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009.
10	MR. BEST: Okay. You - in your orders, you asked
11	some very specific things. For instance, let me
12	go to the first order here, which is at Tab 25,
13	the 2 <sup>nd</sup> of November. Okay, number three, I
14	appeared for two days in examination.
15	THE COURT: I know that.
16	MR. BEST: On - yes, and I answered all the
17	questions that were asked of me and they could
18	have had me back for as many days as they wanted
19	and Your Honour was quite clear about that. And
20	so I did appear and for two days and I answered
21	all the questions refused or undertaken. This is
22	on the next page:
23	(A): "All questions refused or taken under
24	advisement at the cross-examination of John Knox
25	held on November 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2008 and all questions
26	reasonably arising therefrom."
27	Your Honour, in here I have addressed each of
28	those questions one by one.
29	
30	(B) "All questions refused or taken under
31	advisement at the Rule 39.03 examination of
32	Donald Best held on March 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009 and all
	April 30, 2013

(intra)

ann

April 30, 2013

questions reasonably arising therefrom."

Your Honour, they too, I went through them one by one and I answered them and I - I answered them to the best of my ability. I mean you can see what's here, Your Honour. I spent a long time, weeks.

"And all questions which Justice Shaughnessy directed be answered on April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2009", they are also covered here, Your Honour. They are covered.

"All questions relating to his employment, subsequent duties, responsibilities" - this is Paragraph (D). I answered all questions that were asked of me and Ι answered all questions concerning the shares. I answered them and I answered them and all these questions as if I was sitting there on November 17<sup>th</sup> and I had arrived or January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and I've - I've done - I've done that, sir, and that's one of the ways that I fulfilled your orders.

The other way...

1 2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

**THE COURT:** Just a minute. I'm going through Tab 2. What I am noticing is...

MR. BEST: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let me get this focused. What it begins with is - these pages are numbered and it comprises - just Tab 2 alone of the material you have given me comprises 119 pages. The first almost five pages, 4¾ pages is all argument and the position that you have advanced and the April 30, 2013

attacks that are made against Mr. Silver, Mr. Ranking, Mr. Roman, their law firms, clients and your argument. That is the first five pages.

Then we get to undertaking number one and other undertakings for which I am presuming I will hear more, including undertaking number four, which includes a printout of an article on Barbados Underground dated October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009, "The Shady Secretive World of Peter Andrew Allard and the Graeme Hall Nature Sanctuary: Does Barbados Need Any Of It?" That same article shows up in other materials that you have filed with this court. I have seen it.

MR. BEST: They asked me for it, sir. They asked me to give...

THE COURT: All right, so that's...

MR. BEST: I'm just fulfilling their undertaking, sir.

THE COURT: The bottom of page five and page six relates to undertakings. Then from page seven is an ongoing, continuing argument of your position. Then we get to undertaking number five, which is at page 11, where you say: "A copy of Exhibit 6 is attached to these answers. See also number four," referring to the article, "The Secret World of Peter Andrew Allard".

Then we have undertaking number six, page 11.

Undertaking number seven and number eight are on page 12.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Then from page 13, there is quotations of transcripts and again, the presentation of your argument, which goes from page 13, quoting attendances by Mr. Greenspan before me.

Then we get to undertaking number nine and number ten at page 17. Up until that, it's just the argument and transcripts.

Undertaking number eleven is at page 18 and then we begin refusals.

Refusals begin three-quarters of the way down on page 18 and then goes on a long, long argument or an argument, I should say, pages 19 through 20, and then refusals two, three, and four, page 20. Refusals five, six, seven and eight at page 21. Refusal nine, ten and eleven, page 22.

And then we begin "Under Advisements" at page 23, which the advisements continue on with argument interspersed among the matters taken under advisement. That's at least up to number 51 Under Advisement at page 35 and then begins further argument, which runs from page 36. We then get to advisement number 52, which then also refuses it goes into transcripts of January 11<sup>th</sup>, cross. Under advisement number 53, 54, 55, 56 and the answer to that seems to span several pages. Under advisement number 57, 58, 59 - well... MR. BEST: Sorry, Your Honour, these are page numbers you're guoting?

April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

THE COURT: Your page numbers. They are your page numbers in the bottom corner. MR. BEST: Yes, sir. THE COURT: These advisements go on to page 47. MR. BEST: Sorry, page 47? THE COURT: 45, advisement number 65. And then we begin the January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 cross-examination and undertakings, page 48 and argument is interspersed on those under - that refusal, refusal number 13 and it begins at page 50. Refusal number 14, page 51 and all sorts of references and arguments to attendances, comments the manner in made, attacks on which the examination or cross-examination, I should say, took place. And then we go back to refusals 15, 16. 17 and 18, more under advisements again interspersed with references to the notice of application. I really don't want to spend any more time with this. There are refusals where there are answers. I will have to hear what the submissions are on that regard.

And then begins a long argument or I would call it argument and it begins at page 103. "Is John Knox aware that there are materials from the Ontario action that have been passed on blogs?" The answer, refusal number 104, "The answer is yes," and it goes on then for several pages referring to affidavits of Mr. Knox and Knox's being aware of a conspiracy published on the April 30, 2013

int	ern	et	
		~ ~	

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

MR. BEST: May I...

I see more refusals. The refusal THE COURT: numbers are all over the place. I take it the bracketed number must be the transcript pages which are up to 1447, at least that page as page 114. And John Knox under indicated at advisements begin at page 115.

MR. BEST: So I went through the transcript and... THE COURT: I don't know how much time it would take. In any event, that is a fair description at Tab 2. I guess we will take the morning break now and then we will come back.

I just want to advise you, Mr. Best, that it is now twenty minutes to 12:00. I have given you up to one o'clock. We are going to take a very brief break - I hope the staff is happy with that -10 minutes, no more, and we will resume. But please, sir, I just caution you, manage your time. RECESS

23 UPON

RESUMING

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Best.

#### (11:54 AM)

(11:36 AM)

MR. BEST: So, Your Honour, to keep on the subject

of have I now fulfilled everything, I truly believe I have.

28 The memory stick that I provided, thousands of 29 documents, which fulfills their request. Ι 30 answered questions during two days of cross-31 examination and that's all they wanted and I gave 32 them what they wanted. Now, I don't know if April 30, 2013

1	Your Honour has read the transcripts of those
2	cross-examinations.
3	THE COURT: No.
4	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour. On
5	January 23 <sup>rd</sup>
6	THE COURT: Well, look, I don't have to be taken
7	through it because the factums describe where the
8	examinations took place. I know they took place,
9	certainly the second one, in Barrie. I don't know
10	where the first one was. Was it Barrie as well?
11	MR. SILVER: Both.
12	THE COURT: And where you have made references, I
13	have seen those references to it.
14	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
15	<b>THE COURT:</b> Please don't - please don't read me
16	the transcript.
17	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
18	THE COURT: The transcript is meant to focus me to
19	specific areas. You understand if you give a
20	memory stick with 100,000 documents and I have
21	three banker boxes principally with all of your
22	materials – let's say 96 percent, 95 percent are
23	your materials. You can't possibly expect, with
24	all my other commitments, for me to get into
25	100,000 documents on a memory stick plus three
26	banker boxes. That is why we have factums and we
27	have affidavits. It is why I am trying to stay
28	focused and trying to keep you focused on the
29	issues. I did a lot of preparation. I did a lot
30	of reading. I am not talking about one day here.
31	I am talking about several days I spent, and
32	evenings and weekends, trying to get up to speed
ī	April 30, 2013

	Submissions on ripproducin to r alge contempt (2000)
1	to deal with this. In fairness, I am trying to
2	give you a fair hearing, so I am sensitive when
3	you make the suggestion you are not getting a
4	fair hearing. I have done everything I can,
5	Mr. Best. I say no more and I will let the record
6	speak for itself. Go ahead.
7	MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, on the memory stick,
8	the documents are in fulfillment of their
9	questions and your orders and also when I
10	answered the questions and the transcripts show
11	that I answered the questions. And it was very
12	difficult, the two days, and I don't know - I
13	know you - it was very difficult during the two
14	days, Your Honour, and I remained calm while,
15	frankly, there were objects thrown at me,
16	outbursts, foul language.
17	THE COURT: All of which you made reference to in
18	your answers and undertakings.
19	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
20	THE COURT: I saw it. I mean I sped read the
21	material as it was presented in this "Answers to
22	Undertakings, Under Advisements and Refusals".
23	MR. BEST: Very good, Your Honour.
24	
25	Now, I don't have - they wouldn't give me the
26	audiotapes of that. They said it would take your
27	order. I'm not about to ask you for your order
28	because I know - well, I wish I could but in any
29	event, if you listen to the tapes, you would see
30	exactly how I complied and how it was an un -
31	I've never seen anything like it in my life and
32	I'll leave it like that, Your Honour, because the
	1

tapes would speak for themselves, they really would, as a transcript just cannot.

Now, Your Honour, you said to Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver that I could - they could take as many days as they wanted. They took two and I did it. **THE COURT:** I think I ordered that there be cross and then I think the request was made that as a result of the materials that were then being delivered, that a further day was going to be required and I granted that. That is quite correct. That is one of my endorsements.

MR. BEST: Yes. Your endorsement actually indicates - I forget the words but as many days as many days, not just one, but in any event, Your Honour, I attended and I answered those questions and I did so very well and with great respect and I did so very well under very trying conditions. I believe the conditions that were established there were intended to make me do something and I didn't respond. I'll leave it at that.

I also, in my 119 pages plus exhibits of the answers, which you have seen, I answered all of the previous stuff going way back, stuff that isn't even relevant and in 2010, there was the de-privileging and release of my and my company's entire files from Mr. McKenzie, a hundred thousand pages. And let's remember, Your Honour, the idea was they wanted somebody to pay for their costs and they wanted to bring Mr. Allard April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

and you know, that took like three into it 1 2 documents. And so they got everything they want 3 with all those things and I have ... THE COURT: Well, Mr. Allard was involved. As you 4 5 read decisions, Mr. Allard was involved way way 6 back. 7 MR. BEST: My point, Your Honour, is that is that even with the release, the de-privileging 8 9 and release of a hundred thousand documents - and 10 I'm not even talking about the side issues of 11 identity information and other people, dozens of 12 them. I'm not talking about that. 13 THE COURT: You've made that point. 14 MR. BEST: Yes. 15 THE COURT: I read that. 16 BEST: But I'm talking about the documents MR. 17 themselves were exponentially far more than they 18 would have received had I been there, had I been 19 able to be there and I haven't addressed that yet 20 and I'll address that briefly. 21 22 But Your Honour, what I'm saying is here, as I 23 stand here now, I have - Your Honour, I have 24 great respect for the court. I have great respect 25 for you. 26 THE COURT: Good. 27 MR. BEST: Ι am in fear and respect and 28 Your Honour, I've done it. I've done it to the 29 best of my ability. Now, I will say, Your Honour, 30 that these gentlemen wanted to be never finished

and they have acted in a manner that shows me

that - what their intent is and they have said

· · · · · ·

31

32

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	that in their materials. You've got it.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Best, they have clients. They have
3	clients who instruct them. Mr. Silver and
4	Mr. Ranking are not parties to the proceeding.
5	They are counsel. They are legal counsel. They
6	represent the parties named and you know who they
7	are.
8	MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, I
9	THE COURT: It's not fair to comment in that
10	regard. They have received instructions and they
11	are following their clients' instructions.
12	MR. BEST: Did their clients instruct them to
13	throw objects at me and swear at me?
14	THE COURT: All right, you've made your point.
15	Let's move on.
16	MR. BEST: I will, Your Honour. I hear you but I
17	think that the issue of their intent when you
18	listen to them - Your Honour, I mean I've just
19	done everything. With great respect, sir, I've
20	done everything and the materials that I
21	submitted, the answers that I gave during cross-
22	examination, all the materials, and I've - and
23	I've answered everything, Your Honour, that I
24	possibly could to the best of my ability.
25	
26	Now, I didn't - I was unable to be in court on
27	those days that you wanted me to back in 2009,
28	2010 and Your Honour, that was a combination of a
29	number of factors: fear for myself, my family.
30	You are shaking your head, Your Honour.
31	THE COURT: I am not shaking my head at all.
32	MR. BEST: Oh, I'm sorry.
	April 30, 2013

1

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	<b>THE COURT:</b> Please don't interpret me as shaking
2	my head.
3	MR. BEST: I apologize, Your Honour. I thought you
4	would tell me to stop talking.
5	THE COURT: If you meant that as an off-handed
6	comment, that's fine but I am not shaking my head.
7	Please, sir.
8	MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour.
9	In any event, I wanted to put in an affidavit
10	which would have brought all that together and
11	included a lot of new information and just this
12	one point - and I won't dwell on it, Your Honour.
13	You looked at my "Answers to Undertakings and
14	Advisement" and sort of with a little comment - I
15	forgot what it was and it was about how I went on
16	and on in one of the questions.
17	THE COURT: Oh, no. No, several questions.
18	MR. BEST: Sure.
19	THE COURT: You made argument.
20	MR. BEST: Sure.
21	THE COURT: And advanced the argument and referred
22	to other transcripts. I certainly made that
23	comment, not once. I made it several times by
24	perusing as best I could the
25	<b>MR. BEST:</b> Okay, I guess - I guess I'm talking
26	about how, in the case of - for instance, I was
27	accused of certain things and we now know from
28	forensic records and reports and frankly, what
29	Mr. Iain Deane, Mr. Andrew Roman's client said
30	on-line and wrote on-line under his own name - we
31	now know that that whole mess they accused me of
32	was actually part of their campaign and that is
ı	April 30, 2013

seen in the John Knox affidavit where they give the - where Mr. Knox gives the forensic evidence to show that, for instance, some of the threats that were coming to my witnesses originated actually at Miller Thomson over a number of years in Toronto.

Anyway, what I'm saying, sir, is that there has been a long-term campaign of harassment, criminal acts to do with this case against my witnesses, myself, me and there's actually - one of the justices in Barbados has commented on this very cultural phenomenon in Barbados and I have a little bit of that here. I'll just - it's Justice Randall Worrell was interviewed in an article in the "NationNews", which is a big newspaper down there, and he was talking about how witnesses in Barbados don't talk because they're threatened. They're killed. They're burned out.

Then we had in Canada, Professor Hans Machel, University of Alberta. He was tasked to go down to Barbados and investigate a cave-in where many people died and such and he said, and I quote him:

"I found out many more things that the public has a right to know but that have been hidden so far. I encountered an atmosphere of frustration and intimidation nourished especially under the previous BLP government. I met several individuals who were afraid to speak out for fear of losing their jobs, April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

bodily harm, or having their houses burnt down if they ever went public with what they know. I will speak for them."

And indeed he testify at the Arch Cot inquest

Then there's another article here, Thursday, July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2012, in the "NationNews" and it talks about poaching of sea turtles and such but it gets to the point where it says that nobody will help the police because the witnesses are afraid. They are afraid that they will be attacked for going to court.

Now, Your Honour, not all societies are the same. Canada has its problems. The U.S. has their problems. Apparently, Barbados has this particular problem with witnesses in their courts. May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012, a firebomb attack of a lady at her home, Ms. Shirnell Gill, pointing to the blacked and broken window through which the Molotov cocktail was thrown. There's many many articles. It's a national problem that even the judiciary acknowledges.

**THE COURT:** So you are linking this to the reason why you didn't attend...

26 MR. BEST: What I'm saying...

THE COURT: ...not just in relation to November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> but the other date, January the 10<sup>th</sup> when I gave you the opportunity to attend in court, this is how you are connecting this argument. Is that it?

MR. BEST: What I'm saying, sir, is Your Honour April 30, 2013

64

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

29

30

31

has previously indicated that the attacks on my family and my witnesses are - and once again, Your Honour, I'm scared, frightened to put words into your mouth.

**THE COURT:** You are and you have made this in the factum.

MR. BEST: Then I don't want to do it.

THE COURT: You take discussions that I had and I indicated the whole issue of safety of these witnesses, of John Knox, Mr. McKenzie. I had spent several days. I wrote a ruling on it. I am saying to you I was not oblivious to that issue. I made findings and I made rulings. You are trying to bring it back up and revisit it. I tell you my rulings will speak for themselves. My decisions, they were written decisions. You have them so you can...

MR. BEST: I hear you, Your Honour, and...

THE COURT: No, I don't appreciate that when you take words, and I saw it, and you don't put it into context, it misrepresents exactly what has taken place but you know what, we have transcripts and another appellate court can look at what I said and they will measure what I said. MR. BEST: Your Honour, I don't mean to offend you.

I don't know what I'm doing here.

THE COURT: You are not offending - I am just saying to you, please, sir, it is repetitive. If you want to link why or tell me why, in terms of purging your contempt, you didn't come in January...

> MR. BEST: All right, Your Honour, I'll speak to April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

	Submissions on Application to 1 arge Contempt (Dest)
1	that.
2	THE COURT: when I opened up the opportunity,
3	January 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2010.
4	MR. RANKING: The 15 <sup>th</sup> , Your Honour.
5	THE COURT: Yes, 2010, why you did not come, which
6	is now more than three years ago but then I
7	understand it, but I am just trying to look at
8	your time. We now have - you have got 45 minutes
9	left. I just want you to make best use and stay
10	focused. Go ahead.
11	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I said there was two parts
12	to this business of my satisfying the court. One
13	was - one was that I have satisfied. I have done
14	everything I can now and that's my position and I
15	think I have given you evidence to see that, sir.
16	THE COURT: Yes, I see that.
17	MR. BEST: Now
18	THE COURT: Well, I hear the argument.
19	MR. BEST: Right.
20	THE COURT: There's two parts. The second part?
21	MR. BEST: The second part, Your Honour, is why
22	was I unable to attend. Why did I not attend?
23	THE COURT: Right.
24	MR. BEST: Was I able to attend and why did it
25	take me so long to get back here? Well,
26	Your Honour, first of all, to set the stage - and
27	once again, I wish I had been able to put in that
28	affidavit. I'll say no more.
29	THE COURT: What affidavit, sir?
30	MR. BEST: The affidavit that I wanted to put in
31	which brought all the long campaign of threats
32	and intimidation and criminal acts against my
	April 30, 2013

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	witnesses, myself and I and Your Honour did not
2	allow me to submit that.
3	THE COURT: I didn't even make that.
4	MR. BEST: I'm sorry.
5	THE COURT: I didn't make that ruling, sir. I
6	don't know where you are.
7	MR. BEST: Okay, then maybe
8	<b>THE COURT:</b> I am just basically saying to you I
9	know what the history is. I didn't make - please
10	don't
11	MR. BEST: All right.
12	<b>THE COURT:</b> I did not make a ruling on any
13	affidavit. I don't even know what the affidavit
14	is and I am not sure that even the respondents
15	have been provided with this affidavit.
16	MR. RANKING: Perhaps, and obviously through
17	Your Honour, if Mr. Best could identify the
18	affidavit that he's referring to, when it was
19	sworn?
20	THE COURT: Yes. What date was it sworn? Whose
21	affidavit is it?
22	MR. BEST: Okay. I had asked you for permission to
23	put in - you know what, rather than me going off
24	my memory, Your Honour, I would like to - it must
25	be in one of the transcripts here. Rather than me
26	go off my memory, I would like to
27	MR. RANKING: What is the affidavit date?
28	MR. BEST: I would like - the affidavit was to do
29	with bringing together - you know, the affidavit
30	was to bring together a comprehensive index and
31	history of all the incidents, safety and security,
32	criminal acts against the witnesses over the
ı	April 30, 2013

.....

1	years. Now, Your Honour, let's - let me find that
2	over lunch.
3	THE COURT: No, no, no.
4	MR. BEST: No?
5	THE COURT: No, no, we are dealing with it now.
6	Over lunch - the respondents are beginning this
7	afternoon. Have you got that affidavit that you
8	are referring to? Is it there in front of you?
9	MR. BEST: No, Your Honour.
10	THE COURT: You never put it together.
11	MR. BEST: No. You know what, Your Honour, rather
12	than go from memory, please, let me - let me find
13	it in the transcripts over lunch and
14	THE COURT: If your reference is to the fact that
15	I am aware of the allegations, the sordid history,
16	the various experts who testified when
17	Mr. McKenzie was representing your company, I
18	have been through that. If that is the comment
19	you are looking for, I acknowledge that I said
20	that.
21	MR. BEST: Your Honour
22	THE COURT: I also have indicated that I have
23	written - I gave written reasons on that entire
24	issue and they are in the materials. So if that
25	is what you are referring to, let's say yes, I
26	certainly said that. If you want to draw a
27	distinction that somehow it's Mr. McKenzie, his
28	witnesses, as opposed to your family and their
29	security, well then that is a distinction you can
30	draw but let's accept certain premises and move
31	on because this is not that kind of an absolute
32	technical argument, Mr. Best. I am trying to deal
	April 30, 2013

with your ability to comply with the orders, 1 purge your contempt of my order of January the... 2 MR. RANKING: 15<sup>th</sup>. 3 THE COURT: January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010. 4 5 MR. BEST: Let me just say this, Your Honour. In 6 leading up to - leading up to October of 2009, 7 there had been a long history that I was aware of, of criminal acts all associated with, shall we 8 9 call it, my side of the case, against mγ witnesses, and I was aware of all that. 10 11 THE COURT: Your witnesses being who? John Knox? MR. BEST: The Knox, all those - all the Knox 12 13 family and their extended family. There were also incidents against persons who were thought to be 14 15 associated with ... 16 THE COURT: All this relates to blogs, correct? 17 That's where the threats through, came on 18 underground blogs? 19 MR. BEST: Your Honour, some threats came through 20 on blogs and please, if I could finish - and 21 after those threats were made, there were, for 22 instance, follow-up arsons. So some actually came 23 via email as early as 2003 and 2004. The ones 24 from Miller Thomson started coming in 2004, very 25 disturbing, and there were home invasions. There 26 were vehicles that were... 27 THE COURT: All right. 28 MR. BEST: ... sabotaged. So what I'm saying, it's 29 not just somebody saying something on the 30 internet, sir. There were real acts of violence 31 and criminal acts, including identity theft and 32 mail theft all interspersed with that.

Now, that leads me - how I got to October 30th. On 1 October 30<sup>th</sup>... 2 **THE COURT:** 2009? 3 MR. BEST: 2009. 4 5 THE COURT: Yes. MR. BEST: All the information or a great deal of 6 7 the Mr. Ranking's private information that investigator had gathered was published on the 8 internet, including my identity information and 9 I'm sure you're aware, Your Honour, that that's a 10 criminal offence. And I knew from reading the 11 article -12 although I didn't it know was 13 hired Mr. Ranking who had the private 14 investigator at that time, I knew that the police 15 community had been somehow penetrated and was 16 giving information. So that sets the stage. 17 And then, on October 30<sup>th</sup>, that was published and 18 19 things began to happen because there were calls 20 not only on that website but some others and 21 excuse my language, sir, one of them was called 22 "Cat Piss and Vinegar" and there were other and 23 biker websites that exhorted persons... 24 THE COURT: You have raised this in your factum. 25 MR. BEST: Pardon? 26 THE COURT: You have raised all these issues in 27 your factum. 28 MR. BEST: All right, sir, I'll... 29 THE COURT: So I am trying to understand how you 30 focus the argument. 31 MR. BEST: All right. Then, Your Honour, one of my children was approached and a person threw down 32

	Bubinissions on Approximit to Funge Contempt (Best)
1	an article, one of the articles and the threats,
2	and asked my child whether they were related to
3	me and my child lied. My child had to lie.
4	THE COURT: Again, isn't this in your factum about
5	your child being approached?
6	MR. BEST: It's in the affidavits, I'm sure, sir.
7	THE COURT: Yes, I am sure it is, so I am aware of
8	it.
9	MR. BEST: Oh, okay. Yes, sir. Okay, so - and then
10	I was assaulted. I was assaulted on the street
11	while walking early in the morning, November 5 <sup>th</sup> .
12	THE COURT: Where?
13	MR. BEST: Near my home, sir.
14	THE COURT: Where?
15	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I was in my neighbourhood.
16	THE COURT: No, I am asking you specifically, city,
17	town, country.
18	MR. BEST: Your Honour, if I
19	THE COURT: Just answer my question or do you not
20	want to answer it? Just say, "I don't wish to
21	tell you, sir."
22	MR. BEST: Well, let me
23	MR. RANKING: I can tell you, just as an officer
24	of the court, I have gone through this entire
25	line of questioning and every single question of
26	the sort that Your Honour has just asked was
27	refused.
28	MR. BEST: If I could
29	THE COURT: No. You know what, I asked a very
30	specific question. Your response can be,
31	"Your Honour, I would prefer not to tell you,"
32	and that answers the question.

in the

MR. BEST: Your Honour...

THE COURT: I don't want to waste this time.

MR. BEST: I would prefer not to give - in the history of what has happened and continues to happen, I prefer not to say in a public forum where my family either lived or lives because it's their safety and I ask Your Honour to understand that.

So, right away, that was the end of it. I booked a flight for the family and we left Canada and we headed...

**THE COURT:** So that answers the question. You were in Canada at the time.

MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. BEST: But I knew nothing about anything.

**THE COURT:** Well, Mr. McKenzie didn't keep you advised? Is that what you're saying?

MR. BEST: Sir, he did not. He had resigned as my lawyer and I left Canada on November 11<sup>th</sup> because of everything that had happened and I travelled and - to New Zealand where I expected I would be able to settle down and be safe but that didn't happen. And Your Honour, you have to also remember my history, my personal history. I think you've probably acknowledged that it's in all the materials.

So I left, took my family. I had never had to appear in this case in court. I had never had to appear. I didn't know and as a matter of fact, April 30, 2013

many of the things that were said to have been sent to me never arrived, never arrived at all. Some material caught up June and July of 2010. But what I'm saying, Your Honour, is I was unaware of January 15<sup>th</sup>. I had not been served with the materials. I had not been served with previous materials for December and Your Honour, I have not been able to cross-examine on any of this but, Your Honour, the stuff that they said they sent me and that they told the court that I had - that I said I had received, and they falsely told you that.

I was in legitimate fear for myself and my family and it was Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver's clients and their supporters and indeed, some of the things that Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver said to me on November 17<sup>th</sup> - they didn't care. They wouldn't help me even if they could to find out who was doing criminal acts against my family. Your Honour, if you'd listen to the tape, you'd hear some of the humour in their voice.

THE COURT: I have read the transcript.

MR. BEST: I understand, Your Honour, but as I say, it's another thing to hear the voice and to hear all of them say they had no idea who hired the private investigator when in fact, everybody was there to cross-examine the private investigator and Mr. Kwidzinski.

So, Your Honour, there were people who either were hired in New Zealand or who - you know, April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

whatever, they began searching for us. I had intended to stay in New Zealand where I had relatives but we were unable to, so I left and I didn't get my mail for a long time.

But Your Honour, I began to search for a lawyer and it was a very difficult process, let me tell you. And even Mr. Greenspan took over a year, and there was another lawyer before him, and there were actually some other lawyers too. I have done my best to get back as soon as I could. I have fulfilled your orders, Your Honour. I deeply regret that I was unable, that I was prevented, and that I didn't know about this at first and that when I knew a process was in place, I wasn't served with a lot of stuff and I didn't know a lot of the exact things and I was run off and the attacks still continue.

So, Your Honour, I've never not attended court in my life before. There was a good reason why I could not, many reasons, some of which were I wasn't told about it and I wasn't served. Others were. I was being threatened by the very people who demanded I be convicted for this, and that story is yet to be told.

So, Your Honour, that's - that's what I have to say. I have fulfilled my orders and I've done my best and I wish I could have done it before but I didn't know about it and if I had been tied up let me put it this way. If I'd have been kidnapped and held in a closet with a gun to my April 30, 2013

74

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

head and I was unable to discover or to have freedom to move, as silly as that situation sounds, in many ways it was very much what happened to my family and me.

And Your Honour, you've seen some of the proof here as to who was doing that and believe me, Your Honour, since you sat on this case, there's a lot more proof that has come forward and Your Honour, it's real. I had to protect my family and as I say, in many cases I couldn't - I didn't know about it so I couldn't come. And Your Honour has been told falsely that I received certain documents and that I said I received certain documents. That's not true.

I also notice other things that are strange in the paperwork like when an affidavit of service is served and it's said that something was sent by Purolator. A Purolator courier receipt would be the normal thing that would be filed. So many things like that and I'm not going to go into the minutia of that, Your Honour, but that is what I'm saying about the issues of your order and me fulfilling them. I have now fulfilled them a hundred percent and I regret that I couldn't fulfill them at the time but I was unable to as much as if someone had that gun to my head, Your Honour. Plus, I didn't know about a lot of it and that is what I have to say about those subjects, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. Who is leading off, April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

	Submissions on Application to Furge Contempt (Best)
1	Mr. Silver?
2	MR. SILVER: I'm going to go first, Your Honour.
3	THE COURT: Or are you finished, Mr. Best?
4	MR. BEST: Well, I had other things that I
5	wanted
6	THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, back down. That sounded
7	like a conclusion. I didn't mean to rush you. You
8	have got another 25 minutes, so go right ahead,
9	sir. You organize what you want to say. I wrongly
10	interpreted that as your final comment but you go
11	right ahead.
12	MR. BEST: Well, that was
13	<b>THE COURT:</b> If you've got other things to say, you
14	say them.
15	MR. BEST: I was addressing a situation that I
16	thought you wanted me to address, sir.
17	THE COURT: Yes, that's fine.
18	MR. BEST: One moment, please.
19	Your Honour, I wanted to speak to the issue of
20	the November 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2009 conversation and what
21	preceded it and to try and place into context for
22	you everything that happened and what was said
23	and some paperwork that's very relevant so that
24	instead of considering phrases out of context -
25	and Your Honour mentioned context and I - I hear
26	you, Your Honour, and you are well aware that
27	context is so very important and I'll illustrate
28	it this way.
29	
30	A man and a woman are walking down the street and
31	they meet and the man says to the woman, "Hey,
32	great to see you again." If they were high school
1	

sweethearts or co-workers and they had a lovely time at a party the week before, "Hi, great to see you again," is nothing more than "Hi, great to see you again." But if he was put away for five years for raping her or used to beat her, then, "Hi, great to see you again," takes on a different meaning and of course, Your Honour, I know you know this. I just make the point.

So what I'm saying is how important it is when people say this and people say that or say that this phrase means that and not this. It's important to start right at the beginning, what people said, what they knew, and I would like to do that.

Your Honour, the Van Allen affidavit, which has been filed as an exhibit several times in various affidavits, including mine, but was not filed until long after the information from it appeared on the Internet - Mr. Van Allen's affidavit was sworn October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009. Now, on page three, Mr. Van Allen says that on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009, he was hired by Gerry Ranking, October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009. So Mr. Ranking knew that he hired him and if we go to Mr. Ranking's - I'm sorry, the invoices from Mr. Van Allen to Mr. Ranking that have been redacted, there's enough in there to also indicate that Mr. Ranking and Mr. Kwidzinski worked with Mr. Van Allen to put together his affidavit. So, Mr. Ranking knew all about Mr. Van Allen.

April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Now, on October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2009, Mr. Kwidzinski swore an affidavit and attached to that affidavit as one of the exhibits was a printout of my driver's licence number, Don R. Best, and also my medical height and such and address status and information from Ministry of the Transport records. So that information was all known and Mr. Silver knew about Mr. Kwidzinski. So did all the lawyers. Why? How do we know that? Well, there were letters sent out because Mr. - one of the lawyers wanted to cross-examine Mr. Van Allen and Mr. Kwidzinski and the lawyers fought that. They didn't want that to happen, so there were letters and a series of emails and we know that because I have a couple of them, which I have included as exhibits in some of the affidavits. But we also know that because on November 17<sup>th</sup>, after they hung up on me, they talked about it but the telephone didn't hang up, so I recorded it and I listened.

**THE COURT:** And you wrote a letter that is in your materials.

23 **MR. BEST:** Mm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

THE COURT: I have read it.

MR. BEST: Okay. So, on October 30<sup>th</sup>, after they had done all this work with Mr. Van Allen and they have sent the product of his investigation out to their clients, according to Mr. Silver, and so they've done that, it appears on the Internet with threats, death threats. It just morphs into - it went nuclear. And I must say, Your Honour, and I have put in there are all April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

sorts of guidelines by the Supreme Court and Canadian Judicial Council and the Law Society of Upper Canada and the whole works about putting driver's licence numbers and other identity information into affidavits. Even the Ministry of Transport says in the normal agreement, like it probably has, and I would have asked - crossexamined on this but I wasn't allowed to crossexamine. Even the Ministry of Transport, before they allow you to, for instance, include like the printout or the information from Ministry records in an affidavit, it needs a judge's order and they have to be notified of it and they have to be able to appear to do that and there is all sorts of things about redacting the information too, and that starts at the Ministry of Transport regulations and goes all the way up, you know, to the Criminal Code.

But no, they put it on line. They put it in an affidavit. They distributed it to their clients in an atmosphere where they knew the history of what was happening. So they were well aware.

Now, on November 12<sup>th</sup>, there was an Andrew Roman letter to all counsel regarding Kwidzinski and Van Allen, the cross-examination on November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009 and you know, so - and this letter went out to all the lawyers, all the lawyers, and so everybody knew about it.

Now, on November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009, I called April 30, 2013

Victory Verbatim from a location in the South Pacific. I was out of the country. I had left on November 11<sup>th</sup> and I had discovered on the 16<sup>th</sup>, as Your Honour knows. So when all the lawyers and Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver spoke to me, they knew who hired the private investigator. They knew because of Mr. Van Allen's affidavit where he says that he got the information from the Toronto Police Association and everything and if we Allen's affidavit Mr. Van and compare Mr. Kwidzinski's affidavit with the article on the "Barbados Underground", it's a cut and paste in many areas, Your Honour, just cut and paste. So, they knew and yet when I asked them - and I'm speaking with Mr. Silver, and the transcript's there. I would like to lead you through it and listen to it but - because, once again, it's important in context and to hear the tenor of their voices as they talked to me. Everybody in the room knew. The joke was on me. Everybody knew who hired the private investigator. Everybody knew by what I was saying that the information that I was saying was posted on the Internet whether they knew it or not.

In that same article posted on the Internet, Mr. Silver's firm posted something, Cassels. They posted at an internal address, and I address this in my December 1<sup>st</sup> letters to you and to the court and to the lawyers. They posted, Cassels did, a very special internet address to download documents from Cassels and this was posted in

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

April 30, 2013

"Barbados Underground" and it was also posted in the "Comments" section of "Barbados Underground" which means that multiple people can do that.

Now, bear in mind, we already know Miller Thomson, because of the Internet IP information and forensic information, that they have been active anonymous postings on the Internet. Mr. Roman was cautioned about that in writing, and that's in my affidavit too.

So, that sets the stage for that telephone conversation, Your Honour. And in that telephone conversation, I told all of them that I had not received a copy of the order, your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order or order dated November 2<sup>nd</sup>. And in fact, Your Honour, whether we're talking about a signed copy or an unsigned copy doesn't matter. That's a red herring. Read it and listen to it. You'll see that over a dozen times - and these two quizzed me about it. They cross-examined me about it. "Did you get the November 6<sup>th</sup> package?" "No," said I, "No, no. Send it to me. No." 12 or 16 times I said words that were very direct, very forceful.

And then they walked out of the room and they created their statement for the record. Now, Your Honour, I wanted to go on the record. I begged them to go on the record. That's quite evident in the transcript. I was doing what I could with what I had but they didn't want me on the record. But the minute I got off, they April 30, 2013

81

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

created a record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

What record did they create? They had the ability, as I asked, to do it *verbatim*, to have a real record for Your Honour. They didn't do that. Even if they were going to insist that I appear and they didn't want to do it by phone, they had the ability to do that, to make a record, a proper record for the court, and I asked them to and they didn't.

So what did they say in that statement for the record? That I acknowledged I got it, that I acknowledged I'd got a copy of the November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 dated order. Whether signed or not, nobody discussed it. That was just - that's just damage control afterwards. So they made their statement for the record and then they submitted it and there was a package sent to me and when that package arrived in New Zealand - and I had given these gentlemen the indication of when I picked it up and also when it arrived.

Your Honour, I found that the first time they sent me a copy of your signed order was the 18<sup>th</sup>. It was dated the 18<sup>th</sup>. It didn't hit the post until the 19<sup>th</sup>. And I did not get this sixth package, November 6<sup>th</sup> package they claim they've sent.

THE COURT: Mr. Best, you have five minutes. I am just watching the clock, so if you have got further points, you had better get to them.

MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, I - bearing in mind that and then what I wrote - by the way, they sent me on the - on the 19<sup>th</sup> they sent it to me and I received it I think on the 25<sup>th</sup> in New Zealand, November, 2009. They sent me a copy of their Victory Verbatim transcript, their statement for the record, and I looked at it and I wrote those letters to you and to them, sir, because I could see that they had fabricated evidence.

So when Mr. Ranking spoke for himself and Mr. Silver in front of you on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, it was in context of having received my December 1<sup>st</sup> letter and the jig was up. They were revealed as having created a false statement for the record. **THE COURT:** And you could have come on January the 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

MR. BEST: Your Honour.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

**THE COURT:** Appeared before me and made those submissions.

MR. BEST: Your Honour, I did not know January 15<sup>th</sup> was happening. I was also under attack and in great fear for myself and my family. I haven't even told you about our car being shot up. I have told you about it in the first affidavit but Your Honour, I was on the run because of actions from the cumulative defendants and some of their legal counsel and that can be proven.

THE COURT: You are saying you are on the run as a result of the actions, among others, of Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver. Is that what you are April 30, 2013

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	telling this court?
2	MR. BEST: Well, let me - let me
3	THE COURT: No, no, I am just asking. That is what
4	you said.
5	MR. BEST: Actually, I said some of the lawyers
6	and some of the people and some of the defendants
7	and their supporters. Now, I have not yet had a
8	chance to cross-examine and I
9	THE COURT: You have made that point.
10	MR. BEST: Yes, Your Honour, and also to gather
11	the evidence that would be at their law firms
12	about their communications and such.
13	THE COURT: Whose law firms?
14	MR. BEST: These gentlemen's law firms.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver.
16	MR. BEST: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: Right.
18	MR. BEST: But when they knew what they knew and
19	about who they sent the materials to because that
20	would be another way of tracking down who was
21	responsible for the criminal acts against my
22	family but these gentlemen didn't care. They told
23	me. It's right in the transcript.
24	
25	So all of that together, Your Honour, plus the
26	fact that I didn't receive, because I was on the
27	run in fear for my family, plus what, you know,
28	Miller Thomson was doing and - I didn't know it
29	was them at the time but that was all part of the
30	party. And Your Honour, when I discovered what
31	had happened I started working to try to find a
32	lawyer to get back here to you and it took me
	April 30, 2013

in the second se

5.00

ſ

200

this long. And even now, it just amazes me that I've had so many lawyers who, right in a straightforward way, tell me - and they have listened to the conversation and they don't want to go there.

So, Your Honour, that is an abbreviated version, a very abbreviated, of what - how those - how it was that Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver deceived the court, lied to me and lied to you about things, things to do with this. Now, I have also mentioned about how they tried to - I believe Mr. Ranking, even during cross-examination, he tried to say oh he didn't get the December 1<sup>st</sup> letter. That's right in the transcript and yet, it was a big part of the topic of conversation on that day on December 2<sup>nd</sup> in court with you, Your Honour.

THE COURT: All right, anything else, Mr. Best? MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, I really wanted to give you a comprehensive overview and I - I see it's one o'clock and I really would have liked to have walked you through and it would have taken several hours just on the telephone conversation alone.

**THE COURT:** Well, thank you. Your time is up. We will resume at 2:15. Thank you.

RECESS

(1:00 PM)

30 UPON RESUMING

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

31

32

(2:15 PM)

**THE COURT:** Yes, I found the materials now. They were upstairs. It's hard to believe that I had April 30, 2013

1 more. Is that Volume 2? 2 ... DISCUSSION WITH REGSTRAR ABOUT WHICH DOCUMENTS 3 ARE NEEDED ON THE DIAS THE COURT: Mr. Silver. 4 5 SILVER: Thank you, Your Honour. Firstly, MR. 6 maybe I was remiss for not doing this early but I 7 should reintroduce Carly Cohen, who is our 8 articling student, who has been assisting me so 9 that you know who else is in court with me. 10 THE COURT: There was somebody else before her. I 11 don't know he was and then there was a lady over 12 on the left side of the room. 13 MR. SILVER: I'm not sure who the lady was but the 14 gentleman... 15 MR. RANKING: The gentleman that was here and will 16 be returning is Robert Osborne and he is with PwC. 17 REGISTRAR: And the other woman, Your Honour, was 18 from Durham College, a student. 19 THE COURT: Ι guess she didn't find it too 20 interesting. She didn't stay long. 21

#### 22 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SILVER:

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

Your Honour, I will just quickly go through the material that we filed so that we are certain that you have all of what we delivered. There is a three-volume motion record and I just heard that you have located volumes one and three. THE COURT: I knew I had them. They were up in my chambers. MR. SILVER: And in order to keep the volume down, you will see that in many places we have slip-

sheeted and said that this is a document that had

April 30, 2013

been filed by Mr. Best so as to not duplicate, although it was marked as an exhibit on his cross-examination.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: In addition, you have our joint factum.

THE COURT: Read it.

MR. SILVER: I think that there was some extra photocopying done at the end with the cover page and index to the Book of Authorities and the Motion Record so you can rip that out.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SILVER: That was our mistake. I apologize.
And in addition, there is a Brief of Authorities.
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SILVER: ...that we provided and what we've tried to do is at the front of the Brief of Authorities, we have put in four of your endorsements.

THE COURT: Yes, that was helpful.

MR. SILVER: Your reasons. The most significant one, which I will come back to in a moment is the endorsement that you made on the contempt motion, which is at Tab 4 of the Brief of Authorities. I will come back to it but just as a reference point, you know that you have that.

Let me first deal, Your Honour, with the four points that you raised at the outset this morning. You sought from us an explanation of paragraph 49 and 55 of the factum in respect of Mr. Best's assertion that he has complied with the April 30, 2013

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Silver)
1	November 2 <sup>nd</sup> order in respect of the delivery of
2	documents in advance of an examination and you
3	will recall that on January 25 <sup>th</sup> , Mr. Best came to
4	court with USB keys and he didn't want to hand
5	them over without it going through you or in
6	front of you and we got those on the 25 <sup>th</sup> and the
7	memory key is in this envelope.
8	
9	We have looked at the documentation on that
10	envelope and as stated at paragraph 49, which you
11	picked up on, we say:
12	Best has made some documentary production.
13	However, it remains to be determined whether
14	such is in compliance with Justice
15	Shaughnessy's order.
16	
17	Without going through exactly what's on that USB
18	key, it's a compilation of stuff from different
19	places, it would appear, and we propose to
20	examine him on it when we get the chance to
21	examine him in accordance with the November 2 and
22	December 2 orders. And so we are not seeking for
23	any further production from him before that
24	examination but will challenge or test the
25	sufficiency of the production on the cross-
26	examination. And so that's why we worded it the
27	way we did in 49 and 55. And so at the end of my
28	argument, I am going to be handing up a draft
29	order of the relief that we think is appropriate
30	following today and it doesn't include any
31	further production from Mr. Best before the
32	examination that we're still asking for. So I
	April 30, 2013

hope that clarifies that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

THE COURT: Well, yes and no. I guess, as I read Best's factum and as Ι Mr. was reading his materials, Ι was under the impression that effectively he did comply to the best of his ability with my orders. That's the impression I was left with. So, you can see I am sort of looking at you wide-eyed right now because it comes back to has he or has he not?

#### MR. SILVER: Yes.

**THE COURT:** And that is what - I mean purging has a lot to do with - it has to do with a lot of factors but one of them is maybe late compliance but compliance. So, I guess that is what I was really trying to focus on.

MR. SILVER: So for the purposes of today, I would say that he has complied with that term of your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order that required him to produce documents in advance of the examination that was ordered for November 17<sup>th</sup>, and he did that on January 25<sup>th</sup> by delivering the USB key and had he made that production a week before November 17<sup>th</sup>, we would have dealt with it on the examination and so we are in that same position.

But vis-à-vis the balance of that position, which Mr. Best taking the position that is he's answered all questions that were ordered to be dealt with back in November and December of 2009, in my respectful submission, what's happened is sometime between the two dates of crossexamination, being January 11<sup>th</sup> and January 23<sup>rd</sup>, April 30, 2013

it is my submission that Mr. Best got it in his mind that rather than just take the position that this should all be set aside for all the reasons that he's got in his materials, he will also take the position that he's complying with the requirement to be cross-examined and that arose during the cross-examination on January 23<sup>rd</sup>.

We have the transcripts from those two days of cross-examination at Tabs 1 and 2 of our motion record. So the transcript for January 23<sup>rd</sup> would be behind Tab 2. Because they are four to the page and not the customary form that should be delivered to the court, I also have the court copy of each transcript. So I don't know if you want that or not. They are one to a page and they are prepared by the reporter for the court.

**THE COURT:** Whatever works for you. I probably can work on either basis but perhaps I should go with what I am used to.

MR. SILVER: I will pass them both up but I am just going to be referring to the January 23<sup>rd</sup> transcript for the time.

THE COURT: Got it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: And if you turn to page 280.

**THE COURT:** January 23<sup>rd</sup>, page 280?

MR. SILVER: Tab 2 of the Motion Record. It's Tab 2 in there and page 280 of the transcript. It's the bottom right corner of the four-to-a page and the way they work, it works across and then down. THE COURT: All right, so I am actually looking at the transcript you handed up.

MR. SILVER: Okay, page 280, question 1176, hopefully.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SILVER: And I am asking the questions, Your Honour.

Question: Are you prepared, sir - for example, once we've had an opportunity to review the documentation on the memory stick, satisfy ourselves whether it complies with paragraph 4 of Mr. Justice Shaughnessy's order, are you prepared to attend on an examination to deal with the questions and areas set out in paragraph 3 of Justice Shaughnessy's order?

So stopping there, he had the memory stick with him on the 23<sup>rd</sup> but he wouldn't give it to us. That only took place two days later when he appeared before you. So I was trying to get at what he was prepared to do to purge his contempt and so I ask, "Once we get these documents and we review them, are you prepared to be examined on them?" And then we get this answer:

23 Sir, what we've been doing here for two days
24 now is answering questions to fulfill Justice
25 Shaughnessy's November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 order.

26 Question: No, we haven't.

27 Answer: Are you sliding something in on me?
28 What have you done? I mean what kind of -29 Question: Sir--

30 Answer: No, that's -- no, no way.

31 Question: -- you brought an application to set 32 aside Justice Shaughnessy's order and you April 30, 2013

filed affidavits and we've exercised our right to examine you on those affidavits. You know this. So we've exercised our right to crossexamine you on those affidavits. You filed three. We started on the 11<sup>th</sup>, we didn't get finished so we're here to complete the crossexamination on three affidavits that you filed in support of an application to set aside Justice Shaughnessy's order. I'm encouraged to hear finally that you're willing to comply with Justice Shaughnessy's November 2<sup>nd</sup> order. I think that's a step in the right direction. But we don't think you've fulfilled it at all yet. To the extent that we get to review those documents -- because you need Shaughnessy's order which respectfully I say is ridiculous but, you're going to make your own bed in that regard -- we then have the right to examine you pursuant to paragraph 3 of the order and we're going to exercise that right. It would be nice to know that you agree that we're going to have that right and we're going to complete that examination. Instead what I'm hearing from you is you think that we've been doing this for the last day and a half. I'm telling you you're wrong. Answer: All right. May I respond to that... Question: Sure. I mean --. . . Question: Not really but my saying that no response is required won't stop you so qo ahead.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1	Answer: The whole purpose of the application
2	and of me being examined here and of
3	everything I've been answering and everything
4	I've done is to fulfill the order and purge
5	whatever contempt there is and that's the
6	whole reason why
7	Question: I'm glad to hear
8	Answer: I came back to this country and
9	it's what I've been doing. Now, I think
10	Question: Well then why don't you give me
11	those documents if that's a true statement?
12	Answer:Please let me continue. I think
13	there's some - I think you're - I think you're
14	trying to have some theatre here.
15	Mr. Ranking:
16	Theatre.
17	Theatre for Carol?
18	Who is the court reporter.
19	The Witness: I fulfilled the order of Justice
20	Shaughnessy and that's what we're here now.
21	Now, if there's some question I need to answer
22	to fulfil it more let's give me the next
23	question, sir.
24	Question: I'm not going to do that.
25	Answer: You're not going to answer or ask
26	me questions to allow me to fulfill the
27	judge's order?
28	Question: I did. I did. I said can I have the
29	documents so that I can review them and your
30	answer was no. So I'm not going to be sucked
31	into this game that you are playing that
32	to start asking you questions on an
	April 30, 2013

(galaotture

All and a second

Shippin ...

1000

لى - دەرە

and and

April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

examination that we're not even here to conduct.... Answer: I don't accept that at all...

And so what Mr. Best is asserting is that the two days that we spent with him, cross-examining him on his affidavits filed in support of this motion, decided were really two days of he crossexamination or the opportunity to cross-examine him in accordance with your order and had made that perfectly clear on the 23<sup>rd</sup> before we had the documents. He wasn't providing them to us that day. We made that clear to him on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, and yet - which was the last day of examination and yet, he stands up here today and puts in a factum that we've asked all the questions and if we had any more, we should have asked them and he would have answered them.

In my respectful submission, it's all contrived. It's Mr. Best carrying on in the manner in which he's decided to act in this matter, which is to make it appear that he's doing everything he can and yet that not being the case. You only have to look at the answers to undertakings to realize that that's the game that's being played here. It's all orchestrated by, "You give me the questions and then I go off and write stuff that I think helps me and re-argue my case and send 119 pages," and then stand up in the face of a clear indication that he's wrong about what he is there to be cross-examined on, stands up here and April 30, 2013

says, "I've done everything and I have complied."

In my respectful submission, he's complied with the obligation to produce documents and there hasn't been a single question asked of him by Mr. Ranking or I in respect to the obligations as set out in your November 2 and December 2 orders. So that's the third point that you raised this morning.

The fourth point that I will deal with that you raised was that - and I suppose it's in his materials that the costs were paid previously and now we're double dipping, is the way you put it, I think, this morning.

**THE COURT:** I think I was using his words.

**MR. SILVER:** His words. If you could turn, please, to the motion record, Volume 1, Tab 23.

THE COURT: Okay, just one second. Motion record.

MR. SILVER: Volume 1.

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

THE COURT: Volume 1.

MR. SILVER: Tab 23. You will...

THE COURT: Just one second. I am not there yet.

MR. SILVER: You will recall that Mr. Ranking and I, on behalf of our clients, sought that costs be awarded not just against Nelson Barbados Group Ltd. but we also brought in other parties, including Mr. Best and Mr. Allard and McKenzie and his law firm, and we had actually started to argue that before you in February when Mr. Dewart announced that he couldn't carry on because of professional obligations and that ended those April 30, 2013

attendances. And then we were, I think, scheduled to come back to you and we reached a settlement with all of the respondent parties other than Mr. Best.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: And the agreement that was reached with those other parties is reflected in the Minutes of Settlement that were filed with the court on June 8<sup>th</sup>. So you've seen these before. THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SILVER: And there's a couple of points that I want to make but staying on point, if you look at paragraph three and four with me, you will see that my clients and Mr. Ranking's clients, and it's agreed to by all the parties to this settlement agreement, which included Allard through his counsel, and Mr. McKenzie through his counsel and the law firm through their counsel, agreed that the payments being made, as indicated in paragraph one, resolve and satisfy all claims for costs in respect of the action against all the respondents listed - those are the new respondents - except that, and I'm reading now: PwC, Cox defendants do not release Mr. Donald Best and shall be at liberty to pursue him for the costs, respectively \$50,632.90 and \$13,230, and contempt reflected in the order made by Justice Shaughnessy dated January 15<sup>th</sup>. And it is attached as Schedule B.

So those numbers may be familiar to you. Those are the numbers that you awarded for costs in April 30, 2013

favour of Mr. Ranking's client and mine on January 15<sup>th</sup>.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: And then we also agreed Faskens and Cassels - this is paragraph four - "confirm that they do not currently have instructions to pursue Donald Best for the costs and contempt reflected in the order made by Justice Shaughnessy dated Jan. 15, 2010 and do not currently expect to obtain such instructions in the immediate future, but such instructions may be forthcoming in the future depending on the circumstances."

Well, the change in circumstances is that Mr. Best has resurfaced looking to set aside the contempt and in response to that, Mr. Ranking and I both received instructions that given that change of circumstance, we would pursue the costs of 50,000 and 13,000 that specifically were not released as part of this settlement. In fact, it's even stronger than that. They were specifically identified as not being released and open to us to pursue down the road.

Secondly, the cost recovery reflected in these Minutes of Settlement was not a full recovery and so to the extent that additional amounts would be paid, that still wouldn't bring our respective clients to full recovery of costs. So there is no double dipping and it was specifically provided for in Minutes of Settlement that those costs could be pursued against Mr. Best as April 30, 2013

circumstances afforded.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

THE COURT: Thank you.

**MR. SILVER:** I am going to make my argument and Mr. Ranking and I have discussed splitting up the argument and so we are attempting not to repeat what each other has to say, although there will be a little bit of that.

Part of the argument that I am going to cover is factual detail relating to this assertion the that Mr. Best didn't get notice and didn't know what was going on and that Mr. Ranking and I consciously and deliberately misrepresented the truth to the court; an allegation, I might add, that it wouldn't surprise you that Ι find personally offensive. Having practiced for as long as I have and maintained an integrity and a reputation, for it to be alleged in black and white that I consciously and deliberately, as part of a plan and a strategy, misrepresented and lied to the court is about as offensive an allegation that could be made against a lawyer as any. And I say that not because I want sympathy. I say that because I am going to come back to that when we examine Mr. Best's conduct in attempting to purge the contempt and argue that his conduct is really just a further abuse of the process that's been going on throughout this proceeding and should attract a sanction from the court.

Mr. Best's position is that - sorry. Our position April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

is that Mr. Best knowingly and willfully breached your orders of November 2 and 4[*sic*]. The January 15<sup>th</sup> order was perfectly appropriate. The court bent over backwards to avoid the consequences that we are dealing with now both in November, then again in December and even in January, you will recall that while you made a finding of contempt, your order also said that he could still come in and purge that contempt at any time before February 22<sup>nd</sup>, which was the date set up for the arguments.

Mr. Best did none of that. Instead, he set upon rather than purging his contempt in a remorseful and honest and meaningful way, he set upon a course of conduct which attacks lawyers, their clients, Your Honour, quite frankly, and the court system. I mean it extended to the court staff this morning. The attack is on credibility and integrity and it should not be countenanced.

And I say that in light of the direction that Your Honour gave to Mr. Best and we have covered It this in the factum. was apparent to Your Honour on the motions for directions that Mr. Best was setting off on a path that you thought wouldn't assist him and wasn't relevant to the issues that had to be decided. So for him to stand up today or for him to deal with the stuff in the "under advisements" or for him to deal with it at all is bad enough but it's worse when it's in the context of direction from His April 30, 2013

Honour, from the judge who told him unequivocally, "That isn't relevant. This isn't about what the lawyers did. This is about what you did and how you acted and how you are acting now." And in the face of that, we still hear the arguments that we heard. We have 119 pages that's laced with the lies and the deceit and the cheating that Mr. Ranking and I are responsible for and so Mr. Best has no regard, in my respectful submission, for this court, for court processes, for directions provided by the court and certainly for court orders.

You will recall - and it might be helpful, just for markers, to turn up Tab 25 of the first volume of the Motion Record, which is your November 2<sup>nd</sup> order, and Mr. Best's complaint that he didn't get a copy of this order and didn't know what he had to be examined.

Of course, Your Honour, that has to be considered in context. I agree with Mr. Best that context is important and the context that I want to highlight is that Mr. Best knew that all of this was going on while it was going on and that evidence is reflected in his own correspondence starting with, in this regard, a letter to you dated October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009. That you can find as Exhibit D to Mr. Best's April 18<sup>th</sup> affidavit, April 18, 2012.

31 **THE COURT:** One second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

32

MR. SILVER: It's a letter dated October 30<sup>th</sup> to April 30, 2013

you and it doesn't appear to have been copied to us. That may have been the case with the first one and then subsequent letters got copied to us. But Mr. Best knew that the motion was coming on on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 and he says a number of things but he says, "I know that I'm going to be treated fairly and so I leave it in your hands, Your Honour," is effectively what he's saying, although he doesn't say that effectively because he's also got to say that, you know, people have wrongfully attacked McKenzie and this and that. the point that I'm making is But that on October 30<sup>th</sup>, he knew that something was going to court on November 2<sup>nd</sup> that could directly affect him.

Then we attend on November 2<sup>nd</sup> and prior to November 2<sup>nd</sup>, Mr. Ranking obtained an affidavit from Jim Van Allen. It was sworn on October 21<sup>st</sup> and he also obtained an affidavit from his associate or junior, Mr. Kwidzinski, and both of those affidavits were included in an amended Motion Record, further Amended Notice Of Motion that was served and filed on October 29<sup>th</sup> in advance of the motion returnable on November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

And so I thought I heard Mr. Best say that, you know, this blog of October 30<sup>th</sup>, which I won't be spending much time on, was prior to the public filing of the Jim Van Allen or Kwidzinski affidavits. That's false. Those affidavits were filed in support of the November 2<sup>nd</sup> order. And in April 30, 2013

101

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

consequence of that information with respect to service, you made the order that you did on November 2<sup>nd</sup> at paragraph two dealing with service of materials will be effective four days after mailing and couriering to these post office boxes. That's where the information came about the post office boxes was from the Van Allen and Kwidzinski affidavits.

And then that issue is re-addressed on December 2<sup>nd</sup> but then, as we've seen, you order him to be examined on November 17<sup>th</sup> in paragraph three and it's very specific what he's being examined on. That's set out at (a) to (e) of paragraph three. And then paragraph four is the order that requires him to deliver documents at least one week before.

And if it sounds like I am being repetitious, it's because I am because all of this was dealt with by you on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, December 2<sup>nd</sup> and most significantly, on January 15<sup>th</sup>, and that's why I said to you that I'd make reference to your Reasons in our brief of authorities at Tab 4. You will see that all of these issues that I'm about to talk about were considered by you on January the 15<sup>th</sup>. And that's important because in my respectful submission, Mr. Best hasn't raised anything new today, anything at all new today.

Following November 2, all services thereafter were effected in accordance with your orders and April 30, 2013

102

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

in cross-examinations of Mr. Best, Ι asked specifically whether he was taking any position at all that the services that were effected after November 2<sup>nd</sup> were not in compliance with the protocol set out in your order and I got no information. And so in my respectful submission, all of the services - and there's affidavits of service to support them all and Mr. Ranking is a careful lawyer his very and secretary, Jeannine Ouellette, does affidavits of service every time something was served or sent to Mr. Best. All of the services were in accordance with the protocol and so to the extent that Mr. Best argues, "I didn't get it. I didn't get the document," in my respectful submission, it's - I make two submissions.

> My first submission is it's irrelevant as long as it complied with the protocol because the protocol was determined by you to be a protocol that would bring the documents to his attention and service of those documents.

Secondly, to the extent that he didn't get them, it was his own situation or his own carelessness. I mean if he chose not to check the box that these things were being sent to, that's up to him but he can't then come to court and say, "I didn't get it." I will come back to that point because it's dealt with with him in the telephone conversation on November 17<sup>th</sup>.

103

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Following November  $2^{nd}$  - and for this, I would like you to turn to - I quess it's in Volume 2 of our motion record, Tab 26. The careful lawyer that he is, Mr. Ranking sent a letter to Mr. Best on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2009 and that's at Tab 26 and it directly follows up on the attendance before you on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, which was a Monday, and he tells Best that you're ordered - he, Mr. being Mr. Ranking, tells Mr. Best that he was ordered to attend on the 17<sup>th</sup> and that the order became valid and enforceable on November 2, the day it was made and "you must attend" and he enclosed a copy of the draft order. And he says, "We expect to have the draft order approved substantially in the same form," and he gives him a whole bunch of other records and it was boxes of stuff.

We subsequently find out that there were boxes of stuff that arrived in New Zealand and that's reflected in the documents at Tabs 20, 21, 22 of our motion record. We had gotten production on cross-examination of - I guess it's UPS delivery to New Zealand of stuff that went to boxes here in Ontario, although we could never get a clear answer from Mr. Best as to what was in the box, what was in these deliveries, although I think there is some indication that one of them was an eight pound box of material. That's the third one.

And so it all makes sense. I mean Mr. Ranking sent his letter of November 6<sup>th</sup>. He sent what's referenced in the letter. It appears to have April 30, 2013

104

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

arrived in New Zealand later in November an	d
notwithstanding that, Mr. Best still takes th	е
position, irrelevant as it is because of th	е
subservice order, that he never got it. And jus	t
for your bench book, Ms. Ouellette's affidavit o	f
service in respect of the November 6 <sup>th</sup> letter an	d
delivery is found at Tab 27 of the Motion record.	

Then the next event is November 16th. Mr. Best, I guess, if he is to be believed, says, "I called Jackie Traviss out of the blue. I didn't know about November 17<sup>th</sup>. I knew about November 2<sup>nd</sup> but I didn't know about November 17th and I just decided to call Jackie Traviss out of the blue." And I think he calls her the court reporter in certain places but I think we all know he's about the trial coordinator talking who apparently told him for the first time that he had to attend the next day and he sends a confirming letter to Jackie Traviss that is found at Exhibit E to his April 18<sup>th</sup> affidavit. And he says, "I informed you I have not seen any order, nor did" - and Ms. Traviss sort of says, "Well, you really need a lawyer. There's a lot going on here."

26 But the bottom line is, respectfully, it's an 27 incredible position to say that, "I just happened 28 to call her out of the blue and that's when I 29 found out about the examination the next day." 30 He had either received the materials through Mr. Ranking's effort or spoke to Mr. McKenzie, we 31 32 don't know, but he knew enough that on April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

November 17<sup>th</sup>, he calls in to Victory Verbatim and tapes a telephone conversation. Mr. Ranking and I were out in reception, just arriving at Victory Verbatim that day, and the receptionist indicated that there was a call for Mr. Ranking and Mr. Best was on the phone and he's recorded that transaction, that conversation.

The recording, or one of them, is at Tab F or Exhibit F to his April  $18^{th}$  affidavit and you have indicated that you've read it.

#### THE COURT: Yes.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: But it's there and he talks about concerns about his safety and he's told, "Well, you'd better file an affidavit about all of that." That doesn't happen and it's important to point out that no one knew where he was on the 17<sup>th</sup>. He didn't come clean the way somebody who honestly wants to comply with their obligations and say, "Hey, listen, I'm in New Zealand." If he had done that, there wouldn't have been this exchange on the telephone about, "Can you be here for two o'clock? How about tomorrow? What about Thursday?" there's an answer here. It's kind And of incredible. He says, you know, how long - "I won't be able to get there that quickly," he said. I mean that's an incredible answer when you're in New Zealand and you're not prepared to be honest with people who are focused on allowing him to comply with a court order as opposed to playing games. That's what happened. "I can't be there and I don't want to - I can't tell you where I am. April 30, 2013

I can't tell you how far away I am," etcetera, etcetera. It's all in the transcript and my friend, Mr. Best, suggests that we don't care. I mean it's all there.

To the extent that I said I didn't care about his safety, I said as a lawyer, "I don't care. You've got an order that requires you to attend and that's what you need to do. If there's problems with your safety, as a lawyer, I can't really help you." And so there's a twisting and a parsing which is symptomatic of what we hear from Mr. Best, but there's nothing in this transcript that is a misrepresentation.

He asked about the private investigator and do I know - and when you look at this transcript, specifically, if you go to page 13 for a moment I'd and Т mentioned come back to this. Mr. Ranking asked him, "Have you gone to your post office box?" This is in the middle of the page. Mr. Ranking says, "I wanted it noted for everyone's record that Mr. Best has refused to answer the question as to where he is. He's also refused to answer the question that I posed numerous times as to whether he's gone to his post office box to pick up the materials that were sent to him pursuant to Justice Shaughnessy's order and in compliance with Justice Eberhard's order," which was the address for service. "I must have asked the question three times and I'm noting that you're refusing April 30, 2013

107

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

أستحاشك

Ľ

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Silver)
1	to answer, but - but," and so, I mean we weren't
2	getting told the truth by Mr. Best. He was
3	playing games with us.
4	
5	And then on the next page, there's this dialogue
6	with - it starts in the middle. He's highlighted
7	it. It starts at B:
8	Well, it says they have a copy of a report
9	from a private investigator from the firm of
10	Cassels. Silver chuckling.
11	I must have said, "Ha ha, from the firm of
12	Cassels?" because Cassels didn't hire any private
13	investigator.
14	Best: That's what it says.
15	Silver: Okay. Well, I can tell you that the
16	firm of Cassels doesn't have a report on (a)
17	on you.
18	Best: Yes, does anyone?
19	Silver: Whoever posted it, posted the wrong
20	information.
21	I didn't even know what he was talking about and
22	I hadn't seen this October 30 <sup>th</sup> blog. I mean this
23	came as a complete surprise to me.
24	Best: Well, how did this come to be?
25	Silver - he wasn't sure if it was Silver or
26	Ranking. It was probably me.
27	I have no idea, nor do I care.
28	Best: Oh, well they are calling for - I see,
29	yes, guys, I get it. Whoever put this on,
30	whoever let the Ministry of Transportation
31	information into the public, they knew what
32	they were doing, identity theft, intimidation.
1	April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

109

I'm intimidated. I know exactly what you guys have done. Silver: I guarantee you, sir, that it wasn't me or Cassels Brock. Well, well, who was it then, sir? Who hired the private investigator? I have no idea anyway, so... because I'm trying to get on with it, not realizing that what he was talking about was Van Allen. That, of course, I knew, that Mr. Ranking had hired Mr. Van Allen and put an affidavit in. And so all of this gets twisted and parsed and Cassels Brock has put blogs on and you recall this October 30<sup>th</sup> blog, which is at Tab A of the same book, once we're at it - I think it's at There's a blog on October 30<sup>th</sup> and you'll Tab A. recall that this side of the litigation wasn't paying any attention to these blogs but this is from the "Barbados Underground" and somebody, whoever wrote this - I don't know who it was said at page - well, I guess it's the fifth or sixth page in. They said that Mr. Best is a habitué of Barbados. Are there any Barbados Underground readers who may be able to assist in tracking down Mr. Donald Best? Please either the

Mr. Donald Best? Please either post the information here for all to read or alternatively, send it by email to any one of defence counsel that Keltruth has been so obliging as to list for us, all in the past.

Keltruth was the blog that the Knox family kept. THE COURT: I remember that.

MR. SILVER: If you prefer not to have to brave the cyberspace premises of Keltruth, please be advised that Barbados, our country, is represented in Ontario by Mr. Lorne Silver of the law firm of Cassels Brock (and we are indebted to Keltruth for this information) and his email address which we have obtained on the internet from the Cassels Brock website is lsilver@CasselsBrock.com

From that comes this allegation back in 2009, continuing to today, that Cassels Brock is responsible for the posting of intimidating, of threatening, breach the Criminal Code disclosures on websites concerning Mr. Best. It's nonsense, Your Honour. It was nonsense back then when you heard it and dealt with it accordingly and it continues to be nonsense today. And yet, today, it's a little bit more grave in that when somebody comes to court and says, "I want to purge my contempt. I want to be a good guy. I failed to comply with your order back then but now I want to be a good guy," it's laced with the same nonsense and the same game playing and the same distain for court process and court orders as it was back then.

I am going to be another 10 or 15 minutes.

**THE COURT:** That is fine. Mr. Ranking just surrendered that time.

MR. SILVER: And then we have the statement on the April 30, 2013

110

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

record that we felt that it was appropriate to put some statement on the record. We attempted to be fair and forthcoming as possible. as Ms. Rubin was there, who was acting for the law firm. There was an exchange about whether or not Mr. Best said he got the order or not but in my respectful submission, it doesn't matter because submission is important the that the one Mr. Ranking made before you on November 2<sup>nd</sup>. Let me see if I can't find that. I had marked that. One moment, Your Honour.

If you go to our motion record, Volume 2, there is a transcript from the submissions made before you on December  $2^{nd}$ .

**THE COURT:** December 2<sup>nd</sup>?

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. SILVER: Yes, December 2<sup>nd</sup>, sorry, at Tab 50. Yes, December 2<sup>nd</sup>, the next time we were before you after November 17<sup>th</sup> and Mr. Ranking is making submission about what should happen а as а consequence of the failure to attend and then at page 38, in the middle of a submission, in the middle of the page, and it serves to highlight that these issues have been dealt with before, but Mr. Ranking is making a submission and then he says "So". Do you see the sentence that starts with the word "So" in the middle of the top... THE COURT: "So I don't want there to be any suggestion..."

MR. SILVER: So I don't want there to be any suggestion that I provided - I didn't provide him with a signed order, and I want Your April 30, 2013

Honour to know that, but the reason for that because, as I say, there was delay getting approvals to form and content and rearranging it and finally getting it done, and then I don't think - you know - so to the extent that Mr. Best says he didn't have a copy of the order, that's not fair. I gave a draft copy of the order, as I've indicated, but he did not have a copy of the signed order.

And so, in full response to the assertions that there is misrepresentations and lies, this puts that completely to rest. Mr. Ranking said to you on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, "He didn't have the signed order. That was had a draft. sent to him on He November 6<sup>th</sup> but the signed order he didn't yet have." And so my friend's submissions that this is all a nullity because of misrepresentations and cheating, in and lies my respectful submission, has no merit.

I add, going back a bit, because Mr. Ranking is as careful as he is, after November 17<sup>th</sup>, there was a letter to Mr. Best sent on November 18<sup>th</sup>. That's at the motion record, Tab 31, so in Volume 2. It sets out the positions of what happened in the telephone call but significantly, says, "We don't want to have it to bother Justice Shaughnessy with all this. How about November 25h?" Of course, we don't know he is in New Zealand and so there is an attempt to get the examination of the 17<sup>th</sup> conducted on November 25<sup>th</sup>, April 30, 2013

112

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

but Mr. Ranking makes it perfectly clear that, "If that's not the case, then we are going to court on December 2 and we're seeking a finding of contempt against you."

That letter was sent out on its date and Mr. Best acknowledges receipt of that letter in a letter that I am going to come to dated December 1. So there is no doubt that he got that letter before December 2. Actually, that letter is the next tab and he sends a letter to Mr. Ranking on December 1 and he also sent a letter to you on December 1. That is at Tab 33.

He says in his letter to Mr. Ranking, the third paragraph down:

I am in receipt of your package of November 18<sup>th</sup> ... and the manipulated "transcript" of our conversation that you created after the fact.

... I find it appalling...

All the things that he is still raising today he had known about prior to December 1<sup>st</sup> and addressed with Mr. Ranking and subsequently with you, if you look at the next letter, on December 1<sup>st</sup>.

And then we come before you on December 2 and at Tab 30 of this same book is the order that you made on December 2<sup>nd</sup> and you will see - and from your endorsement, by then you were satisfied that there was an attempt to evade service and so you April 30, 2013

113

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

made a more specific order for substitutional service in paragraph two, indicating that it is served on him four davs after mailing or couriering to that post office box, and you gave him another chance to purge his contempt. And you talk about fairness. We were asking you to find him in contempt on December 2. That was clear. Your Honour was more careful and wanted to give more chance, for whatever reason, all good, and ordered that he appear before you on January the 15<sup>th</sup> to give his evidence and that he produce all documents that you had ordered previously and it is the same listing of areas to be cross-examined on as the December 2 order.

Mr. Ranking, at Tab 34, immediately sent a letter to Mr. Best, serving your endorsement on him, as well as a copy of your order of December 2, 2009 and he says the order validates service and that you have ordered him to appear before you to be cross-examined in open court and that date is 15<sup>th</sup> and "if January you don't attend, the contempt motion will proceed in your absence," and he copies everybody and there is no denial that Mr. Best received that letter. And I believe there is also, which isn't in the record, an affidavit of service of Jeannine Ouellette in respect of that letter and its enclosures.

And so he knows. Mr. Best knows what is going on. To the extent that he doesn't, it's his own carelessness. We come to January 15<sup>th</sup>. He fails to April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

appear, a finding of contempt made, cost order made reflected in endorsements and in the order and then we don't hear from Mr. Best until two and a half years later when we first hear from Mr. Greenspan telling us that he had appeared before you ex parte and the bench warrant was lifted and we now need to deal with it. So that is the background to how we got here today, including the Minutes of Settlement of January 15<sup>th</sup>, which I have already taken you to, which reserve the right to go after these costs.

Instead of purging - I don't want to repeat myself - there is a series of complaints, misrepresentation, lack of service attack on lawyers, His Honour, notwithstanding the warning that you gave us. I have addressed that at paragraph 30 of my factum and specifically, for your bench book, you addressed Mr. Best on that specifically on January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at pages 5 and 13 and that transcript can be found in our motion record, Tab 54.

The direction was ignored by Mr. Best and we cross-examined him over two days. The transcripts are available to you. To say that he was less than cooperative is an understatement. Yes, he quiet, collected way but in mγ spoke in a respectful submission, he did everything he could to avoid his obligations under the order that he was seeking to set aside. He took opportunity after opportunity to put statements on the record, April 30, 2013

to read from John Knox's affidavit. Notwithstanding how hard I tried to control him, that's what we heard.

And then in respect of the substantive questions on his affidavits that he filed, virtually every one of them was taken under advisement and that's why we couldn't get finished in one day. We had to go back a second day and that is why you see 119 pages of all these listings of "under advisement". Virtually every substantive guestion was taken under advisement. Why? Because it's Mr. Best's way. "I won't answer this question now. I'll answer it later when I can put a book together. I can put four pages of what liars Silver and Ranking are rather than answer the questions." And that's what we got in respect of the questions that we asked on this motion. And those answers to "under advisements" have been provided to you.

What makes this all a little bit more remarkable, if that's possible, is that it's amazingly consistent with a strategy that seems to have developed between Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Allard back in 2009 when the issue of costs against individuals first arose and in that respect, I take you to Tab 29 of our motion record. There is an email exchange between McKenzie and Allard. Mr. Best says he didn't know anything about this but that is for another day, I suppose, to decide. But you will see on the second page of six - I April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

117

won't read the whole email trail to you but at the bottom, "lawyerbill", who we know is Bill McKenzie, writes to Peter Allard and says: Gerry Ranking for PwC is the lead lawyer for those who are attacking me and you - see attached letter to all counsel and memo to you identifying counsel for the discontinued and other parties.

You will remember that Mr. Ranking's client - the claim was discontinued against him right before the jurisdiction motion so he didn't appear before you on the jurisdiction motion. It says:

As per my earlier memo I want to gear up for attacking any lawyers who attack me and you best defence is offence. In the meantime I am planning to approach the bit player lawyers and tell them that they really don't want to get involved in the dust up that seems about to happen so why not settle...

So Mr. Best's conduct, I say, is remarkably similar to the strategy that Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Allard were discussing at the time we first sought costs against individuals. That really takes me through the factual part of

our joint factum.

THE COURT: If we can, I would like to just take a short break now and then I will come back in. MR. SILVER: Thank you.

RECESS

(3:20 PM)

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1	UPON	RESUMING (3:30 PM)
2		THE COURT: Yes, sir.
3		MR. SILVER: Thank you. I will just be a couple
4		more minutes. I had taken you through our factum
5		really dealing with the factual - part two, the
6		facts. The statement of issues starts at page 14.
7		I am going to leave much of this to Mr. Ranking
8		to deal with to the extent required. At page 20,
9		paragraph 61, we highlight Rule 60.11(8) which
10		should be reproduced - it is - in Schedule B and
11		it deals with contempt orders and sub (8) says:
12		On motion, a judge may discharge, set aside,
13		vary or give directions in respect of an order
14		under (5) or (6) and may grant such other
15		relief and make such other order as is just.
16		
17		In analyzing it, it seems as though it's a
18		substitute for an appeal, that it's permitted,
19		pursuant to the Rules, that you don't have to
20		appeal a contempt order. You can ask the judge to
21		vary, discharge and there are other judges who
22		said, "That's kind of odd but that's what it
23		provides for."
24		THE COURT: Read it and considered it.
25		MR. SILVER: And so in our respectful submission,
26		it would be just to allow Mr. Best one final
27		opportunity to purge his contempt by complying
28		with your order and paying our costs. In our
29		respectful submission, it would be unjust to
30		allow him to avoid compliance and/or allow him to
31		comply but without paying costs.
32		April 30, 2013

di Kilon

Stadeous of

and the second

all have been a

Shawa I. . .

11000

	Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Silver)
1	Costs in contempt proceedings are prima facie
2	awarded at a substantial indemnity basis. In fact,
3	that is what you did on January 15 <sup>th</sup> . What we
4	have done for you is we have put our bills of
5	costs at the back of our factum. You have seen
6	that.
7	THE COURT: Seen them and reviewed them.
8	MR. SILVER: Both Mr. Ranking and I have done that
9	and it sets out partial, substantial and full
10	indemnity because it is always in your discretion
11	to award a scale higher than substantial and in
12	my respectful submission, given the conduct - and
13	I am limiting it to the conduct in this professed
14	attempt to purge contempt - by making the serious
15	allegations that he does against counsel, their
16	clients and the court deserves the further
17	sanction of the court.
18	
19	And so I want to finish by handing up to you - I
20	passed a copy to Mr. Best just when you took your
21	break this afternoon but it's a draft judgment
22	and I have styled it as a judgment because I
23	always thought judgments follow applications.
24	THE COURT: I think you are right.
25	MR. SILVER: Hmm?
26	THE COURT: I think you are right.
27	MR. SILVER: Right. So, in effect, we have left
28	some blanks and I guess we didn't number the
29	paragraphs either, so it's really draft.
30	Paragraph number one isn't numbered. That got
31	missed. But we are asking that there be an order
32	that Mr. Best appear - we put it before you and I
	April 30, 2013

ŀ

l

remind you on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, you had ordered that Mr. Best appear before you on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January to be examined. Obviously that is subject to your agreement and your availability. We have left the date open. "To give evidence in open court on" and we have left the date open, and at that appearance, he will answer all the questions and we have just taken (a) to (e) that appeared in the prior orders.

Paragraph two, we're seeking an order that by a specified date, which, in our submission, should be before the date fixed for the examination, if you are so inclined, and that Mr. Best, before that date, pay the fine and the costs ordered by you on January 15<sup>th</sup>, and we particularize what they are, the fine and then the four amounts that you ordered on January 15<sup>th</sup>.

And then we also ask that you make an order for costs. That is paragraph three. We have left the amounts blank for each of Kingsland and Pricewaterhouse and we say "within a specified number of days of the date of this judgment.

And in paragraph four, we say that the bench warrant or the warrant for committal shall continued to be stayed provided that Mr. Donald Best remains in compliance with this judgment and the warrant of committal shall be lifted upon Best's full compliance with paragraphs one to three hereof.

April 30, 2013

120

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

And thus, the sanction of incarceration would stay in place as a possibility until after he complies with all his obligations, including the payment of the costs of this application. I know that I have debated with you, you know, that sanction in respect of costs before but in my respectful submission, and Mr. Ranking may little bit develop this а further, in the circumstance of this kind of conduct that's gone on for this long and the amount that Mr. Best has put my client to in terms of the costs of responding to this with the plethora - with the volume of material and plethora of irrelevant yet aggressive allegations of impropriety and lying and cheating, all in an attempt to so-called purge his contempt, should lead you to the conclusion that the only way that the costs will get paid for certain is if the sanction of incarceration applies if he doesn't pay and in these circumstances, we respectfully submit that that's appropriate.

> So subject to any questions that you have, I have gone over my time and I will turn it over to Mr. Ranking.

THE COURT : Well, I should say Ι did not understand one statement in the factum but I do Ι had circled to which ask you or now, Mr. Ranking, page 21, paragraph 62 and 63. So, I thought it was a backhanded submission with the court giving further attempts to Mr. Best. I should have properly read it in the context of April 30, 2013

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

#### 122 Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

which you are arguing it now. I didn't read it that way. I didn't know that you were going to suggest that he be given yet a further attempt to comply. However, I do now.

I should stop before Mr. Ranking begins just to say, Mr. Best, without - and we are going to have to go into tomorrow. I have already called the trial coordinator. It is perfectly obvious to me we are not going to get through this evening and I sure can't do a marathon here until six or seven o'clock and there will have to be right of reply.

But let me ask this, Mr. Best, right now. You have seen this draft judgment. Are you prepared to enter in to such a judgment on consent at this time, at this point? And to be quite candid to you, I was not looking forward to an ongoing and continuing involvement with this matter. I don't even know what time I could give you because I have a murder trial that I will be doing now and in the fall. They are taking months and then I am supernumerary January 1<sup>st</sup>. qoing Now, supernumerary doesn't mean I am fully retired but that is how far out we are going with me. So, I, frankly, was of the viewpoint coming into this that this is it. I mean after six to seven years of the same case, I have pretty well had it and this has taken up an extraordinary, extraordinary number of court hours, not just me but court on what was originally a jurisdictional hours, April 30, 2013

motion. 1 2 3 However, let me come back to the guestion I asked. 4 Mr. Best, are you prepared to enter into, on 5 consent, the judgment as proposed by Mr. Silver 6 now? 7 MR. BEST: No, I'm not, Your Honour. THE COURT: All right. Well, that answers that. 8 9 Thank you, have a seat. Mr. Ranking. 10 MR. RANKING: Thank you, Your Honour. 11 THE COURT: So you don't know what I will be doing 12 and notwithstanding this may be your proposal, I 13 have other - I can make any decision I wish at this point in time. I think I recognize that. 14 15 SILVER: That's absolutely right. I should MR. 16 have said that. We are telling you what would be 17 okay for us but it is up to you. The only thing that I want to add is that I can't - I am in 18 19 court in front of Justice Matlow tomorrow. Maybe 20 we will talk about that at the end. 21 THE COURT: Well, it's a judge's conference week, 22 just so you know, and so I made a call to the 23 trial coordinator asking that the staff stay on, 24 so we're going to have issues all over the place 25 here. In any event, let me hear from Mr. Ranking. We will use the time that's available. 26 27 MR. RANKING: Thank you, Your Honour. 28

#### 29 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RANKING:

30

31

32

Your Honour, what I want to do, and I will go through this quickly, and it's from this perspective. My friend and I agreed that he April 30, 2013

should provide you with more detail in respect to the specific issues that were raised concerning your November and December and January orders and I was going to provide a broader framework for reasons, should you be inclined to draft them, in the context of what's happened over the last number of years relative to this lawsuit because there are a number of factors which I urge upon you to take into consideration. I ask you to consider this when taking into consideration the submissions that you have heard from Mr. Best and Mr. Best's conduct, and I start with the fact that he is the principal of Nelson Barbados and the lawsuit that was commenced. I am not going to dwell on that but I am simply going to remind you, and in your bench brief it is Tab 55 and 56, the Statement of Claim for hundreds of millions of Best commenced by Mr. it's dollars. and uncontroverted now, he being the sole officer and director of the company, and the nature of the claims and the allegations that were made.

The reason I start there, Your Honour is because - not because for any moment you will forget because you have an incredible alacrity to remember the facts of this case, but it's worth simply refreshing your memory and going back to a case that started in February of 2007 and then proceeded. And the reason Ι start there is because it's Mr. Best who comes here and who professes not to be able to do anything. And so when I start, there are two things - really three

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

April 30, 2013

things that I focus on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

The first is the nature of the proceeding and your findings that have already been made, and I am going to comment on that.

The second is the background and sophistication of Mr. Best, notwithstanding his professed ignorance and his repeated comments that he is without a lawyer and needs help.

And the third is his approach to the contempt order, the steps he has taken or hasn't taken. **THE COURT:** Can I say this? Mr. Silver raised - I think he said it in so many words. There is nothing new.

MR. RANKING: Right.

THE COURT: There is nothing new. I covered all of this. I wrote extensively written Reasons. I covered the background and history of Mr. Best in my Reasons. I have covered what has gone on all the way up to that day, January 15, 2010 and what happened after that is an unfolding or a wrapping up of the case into Minutes of Settlement. But there is nothing new. The attacks are the same.

MR. RANKING: Yes.

**THE COURT:** The issues that Mr. Best raises are, if not identical, very very similar. I have heard it, heard it. Now I am not trying to cut you off but I am saying...

MR. RANKING: No, that's fine.

THE COURT: ...there is just not a whole lot April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32 different other than more - I say the attacks against you and Mr. Silver and your law firms has been ratcheted up even more so in written materials but...

MR. RANKING: I know, and that's fine. I am more than happy to take the instruction and direction that you are giving me.

THE COURT: No, no, I am not trying to - I'm just basically saying I hear you. I certainly - by reading your materials, I understand too what has happened subsequently. I am reading the factums of both sides. I read the cross-examinations. I got clarity where I needed clarity today on just exactly what was being cross-examined on because I was, frankly, let to believe from Mr. Best's material that he had answered - he was seeking compliance with my orders of November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> and that is not the case at all. That has been clarified.

The issue of costs, which I was concerned about and what is so-called double dipping, that has been clarified.

MR. RANKING: Right.

**THE COURT:** But you go ahead now and argue what you want.

MR. RANKING: No, and I appreciate your direction and I was not going to spend a lot of time there but there are a number of things that I would pause simply to emphasize is the fact that Mr. Best was a police officer for some 15 years and certainly no...

April 30, 2013

THE COURT: On the Fraud Squad, he says.

MR. RANKING: On the Fraud Squad and going as high as Sergeant. One point that wasn't raised, but it does go, Your Honour, to the invective and the maliciousness that we've seen, is that following our attendance on September 11<sup>th</sup> - and this is in Mr. Best's material - he tried to charge me criminally, and that is in the material.

But the reason I pause on some of these is that what it does is it supports what my friend is saying with respect to a lack of contrition and why what we are seeing on our side for our clients, leaving aside our own professional reputations, is a complete lack of candour and an ability to come to this court with clean hands and do what we believe is right.

And after December 11<sup>th</sup>, and this is in Exhibit X of Mr. Best's affidavit - I don't need to take you to it.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. RANKING: But I'll just simply refer you to it. It's Exhibit X of his affidavit sworn January 10<sup>th</sup>. I lined up to get a transcript of this court's proceeding of the earlier attendance. I did that at the request of Mr. Silver because I have to come and pick it up and when I go to the front of the queue to ask the chap behind the counter because I saw Mr. Best there - if I could get the same transcript that Mr. Best was asking for, Mr. Best went to the Durham Police and attempted April 30, 2013

to charge me criminally with intimidation of a justice system participant.

Ι interviewed by the Durham Police. was The Durham Police listened to me and said, "Mr. Ranking, your evidence is exactly the same as the evidence I got from the man behind the counter. We are not proceeding." But Mr. Best not only did they have to conduct an interview of the court staff in this building, they in fact went to the limits of actually taking the videotapes and watching the videotapes, etcetera, etcetera.

And I stand before you as an officer of this court and I am offended in the highest degree and I have never used those words in a court, but for this man to come before you with a motion to say, "Let's waive the contempt," when he himself is taking steps which are in furtherance of the very same steps we saw taken by Mr. McKenzie, which are quoted by you, whether it be the Barbados justice system and the salacious comments that he made about the Barbados justice system, whether it be Niton Amersey without notice, trying to put that in, this is a complete replication and in my respectful submission, and I know you don't want to hear it because I know it's not nice to have officers of the court speaking ill of their adversaries but this is an exceptional case and I don't feel comfortable making the submissions I am compelled to do so. This is not a case where April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Mr. Best has shown any contrition whatsoever. It is a case where he has flaunted your orders and with the greatest of respect to Mr. Best, the fact that he could criticize Your Honour, and I speak both on my own behalf and on behalf of Mr. Silver with respect to the patience and the hours you have spent, is unbelievable.

I will comment on one other issue and that is with respect to Mr. Best having no ability to be contrite and now saying that I don't act for a client, a client who Mr. Best, Nelson Barbados, chose to sue, a client who he knows conducted the audit of Kingsland, a client who he delivers material to say "Yes, this is an international entity and they have separate partnerships all over the world," but if I can just ask you - I will take one more minute on this because...

**THE COURT:** No, no, I don't want to pressure you. Just go ahead. We are going over.

MR. RANKING: The material demonstrates four square that my friend, Mr. Best's submissions are completely without merit.

If I could ask you to turn to Tab 4 of the binder that was handed up by Mr. Best.

**THE COURT:** Yes, Tab 4 of this new blue binder that we saw today, right.

29MR. RANKING: Thank you, Your Honour. Page four of30thatbindermakesreferenceto31PricewaterhouseCoopersEastCaribbean. You will32see that at the bottom of the page and the dateApril 30, 2013

129

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

	130 Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Ranking)
1	of registration was June 30, 1998.
2	THE COURT: Sorry, "Information Registration of
3	Partners"?
4	MR. RANKING: I apologize, it's Tab 5, Your Honour,
5	my mistake.
6	THE COURT: Five.
7	MR. RANKING: Page four of Tab 5.
8	THE COURT: Yes.
9	MR. RANKING: PwC, as you well know, is a
10	partnership for professional accountants. What
11	that reflects in Mr. Best's own materials is
12	PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm, the
13	business name of a professional partnership
14	having been registered in Barbados on June 30 <sup>th</sup> ,
15	1998.
16	
17	If I can then take you to the next document which
18	my friend - I should call him Mr. Best.
19	<b>THE COURT:</b> Mr. Ranking, I have a recollection -
20	but of course, I should be very careful about my
21	recollections because they get replicated here.
22	But I have a recollection even when these
23	proceedings were on that you went through an
24	explanation
25	MR. RANKING: I did.
26	THE COURT: of these corporations for the
27	benefit of Mr. McKenzie.
28	MR. RANKING: I did.
29	THE COURT: because I recall.
30	MR. RANKING: Yes, and it was the subject matter
31	of Mr. Hatch's cross-examination but I simply
32	bring you to Exhibit 32.

ł

131

THE COURT: All right. Sorry, now we're back to...
MR. RANKING: This is Tab #10.

**THE COURT:** ... of the materials Mr. Best put forward today?

MR. RANKING: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. RANKING: And I do so because it concerns me no end that my friend will say something which the documents don't support. This document shows that PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean Firm has been registered in the Register of Business Names under #18309 as of the date 30 June, 1993, which is entirely consistent with the document I just provided to you. It is entirely consistent with my representations to this court and the date, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup> [sic] is when the Registrar gave his seal to confirm the registration.

It's as the plain as the nose on my face and when cross-examined Mr. Best to Т sav, "You are relying upon the affidavit of Mr. Alair Shepherd. Would you please inquire of Mr. Shepherd to ask him if he did a business name search or did he restrict his search to corporate names?" remarkably, none of those questions were answered. And if you want the reference again for your... THE COURT: No, I don't.

MR. RANKING: Let me turn to one other issue, which is the issue of the lack of counsel and then I'll speak to costs and briefly touch upon the cases.

Clearly Mr. Best is seeking the sympathy of the court but let's look at the history of this. When Mr. Best needs counsel, Mr. Best gets the best counsel in the country. Mr. Brian Greenspan is one of the finest criminal counsel and he had one of the finest criminal counsel. So for Mr. Best don't then to come back \_ we know the circumstances under which Mr. Greenspan was dismissed. We don't have any of those details.

**THE COURT:** Oh, I do. He stood up before me and made submissions that he did not feel comfortable in the civil area. That is not his area of expertise. I think there is maybe even a transcript of this. I can remember it clearly.

MR. RANKING: I was not...

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

**THE COURT:** I really wasn't surprised at his submissions but in any event, that is what he put on the record. It wasn't my suggestion.

MR. RANKING: Oh no, I wouldn't suggest that. What I actually find quite remarkable...

THE COURT: I thought it was when you consider the findings I have to make are very similar to the criminal requirement in terms of proof, I thought, frankly, he was well suited but then he chose otherwise. But that is neither here nor there. That is his decision.

MR. RANKING: Fair enough.

THE COURT: And is the best one to judge.

MR. RANKING: Fair enough. My only point - and I do actually attribute this in part to Mr. Best is we have Mr. Best, who is not incapable of retaining counsel. He then moves *ex parte*, which, April 30, 2013

in my respectful submission, was most unusual when he knew that Mr. Silver and I were engaged. He obtains what he wants, which is the contempt order to be lifted and thereafter, for reasons which are not fully explained, Mr. Best can't have counsel and can't locate counsel. I suggest to you that the inference is entirely reasonable that Mr. Best obtained what he wanted, which was a lifting of the contempt. He is now in Canada. He does not have the bench warrant hanging over his head. It has been delayed and this has been moved on and on and on. So, my only point was that I did want to make the point that I find it disingenuous of my friend to say that he cannot have counsel. If my friend wanted counsel, he could have got counsel, simply put.

The other point that I wanted to make - I only use one example and this is a point - we don't have time to go through everything but the one point which is extremely important here is the allegation that Nelson Barbados took security over the shares of Kingsland. You will recall that that was an allegation in the Statement of Claim and we put some questions to Mr. Best about that and I'm only going to deal with one instance. But before I do that, the April 18<sup>th</sup> - it's paragraph 40 of the Statement of Claim. It refers to the security over the shares in Kingsland.

What we then see is Mr. Best swears an affidavit on April 18<sup>th</sup> in this proceeding and he says, at April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

1 paragraph 11: 2 This litigation concerns a long running 3 dispute over an estate in Barbados known as 4 the Kingsland Estate. The plaintiff 5 corporation, Nelson Barbados, has asserted a security interest in the shares of the estate. 6 7 8 I then, together with Mr. Silver, am interested 9 in that, and this is one of the subject matters 10 that you ordered to be answered had Mr. Best January 15<sup>th</sup>. It's an answer 11 attended on to 12 advisement number 89. Excuse me, it's a refusal 13 at 20 at the bottom of page 83. The question is 14 there asked: Refusal 20: 15 Do you know whether Nelson Barbados has any 16 security documents? 17 Answer: I am not a lawyer. I don't know what a 18 security document is. 19 20 And he goes on with respect to refusal 37 to 40 21 at page 88. Refusal 39 - excuse me, I'll start at 22 37: 23 From whom did the plaintiff obtain the rights 24 described in the sentence I have just read, 25 has security over the ownership rights in the 26 common shares of the defendant? 27 This answer has been answered above. 28 When did Kingsland obtain security over the 29 rights in the common shares of Kingsland? 30 This has been answered above. 31 32 And those are the references to the fact he's not April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

a lawyer and he doesn't know what a security interest is.

So the reason I bring that, simply as an example, to the court's attention is one of the very issues that Mr. Best says he's answered that is the subject matter of your orders dated November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> have to do with these trust documents and the security over the shares of Kingsland and he has not answered them.

The only other point that I wanted to raise - and it has to do with the payment of the fine and the payment of costs. It has to do with the evidence that Mr. Best gave as the sole officer and director and he has made clear that in fact he has been responsible for the cost awards that have been made and he has paid them. He has also indicated that he paid Mr. Greenspan and you will also recall in your contempt reasons, that you made reference to the fact that he had paid the earlier cost awards of some \$250,000 and that was a factor in your reaching the decision that you did.

**THE COURT:** Oh, that's right. There was a much earlier order.

MR. RANKING: There was and that was your finding. When it comes to costs - and this is the last point that I want to make on costs because I know we are pressed for time. There is not a shred of evidence, despite all the books, that Mr. Best can't pay. Not one piece of evidence has been April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

tendered to this honourable court to say either that he can't pay the costs that were awarded by Your Honour on January 15<sup>th</sup>, that he can't pay the fine or that he can't pay the costs that are the subject matter of both the expenses that have been incurred by PricewaterhouseCoopers and Kingsland. And indeed, the evidence that we have is just to the contrary and you will have seen, and I will take you to it - it's in the answers undertakings and it's consistent to with paragraph 40 where Mr. Best is saying that he has security, Nelson Barbados has security over the shares. At page 66, in answer to advisement number 89, he says, when talking about the assets because the assets were the subject matter of our cross-examination he says, and I quote, and this is referenced in the factum:

On the high end, the assets of Nelson Barbados could be worth tens of millions of dollars.

So, to summarize that, what I say is not only has my friend not tendered evidence that he cannot pay but rather, the evidence that he has proffered to the court is that the security that Nelson Barbados has over these shares in Kingsland are worth tens of millions of dollars.

Your Honour, the only two other - well, one other point before I turn to the law, and it is this. This is not an academic motion. There are proceedings extent in both Barbados and Florida dealing with Kingsland and there are expenses April 30, 2013

137

that are being incurred. PricewaterhouseCoopers, thankfully, is not a party to either proceeding. We hope that that remains the case. But the reason that I bring that to your attention is that Mr. Allard - if we go back to the Minutes of Settlement, Mr. Allard agreed not to fund any further litigation...

**THE COURT:** I read that today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. RANKING: ...in Ontario. The only inference to draw from that - and those were negotiated with Mr. Allard being represented by the Paliare Roland firm and I was against Mr. Roland who said, "Mr. Allard is not giving the same undertaking with respect to litigation outside the province.

So, Mr. Allard is clearly still involved and for whatever reason, the fact that Mr. Best refuses thus far to be contrite and to come to answer questions with respect to Nelson Barbados, the inference is that Mr. Allard continues to fund and for whatever reasons, he or the McKenzie or is behind this machine whatever team that continues to litigate against Kingsland, they don't want the evidence to come forward.

Let me very briefly look to the law, and I won't take long. I only want to draw your attention to three cases. They are the cases that appear under Tab 5 and I can simply refer you, if you wish, Your Honour, to the paragraph numbers. The case from the Supreme Court of Canada under Tab 5. The relevant has been highlighted at paragraph 50.

**THE COURT:** Didn't I recite that case in my original Reasons in January? I might be wrong but go ahead.

**MR. RANKING:** What I wanted to bring to your attention was not the highlighted portion but also the last sentence in paragraph 52 at the bottom of page 21.

THE COURT: Oh, 52, sorry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MR. RANKING: ... where the court there states:

The gravamen of the offence is rather the open, continuous and flagrant violation of a court order without regard for the effect that may have on the respect accorded to edicts of the court.

I bring that to your attention.

I equally go to the next tab, Your Honour, the Pal Magder Furs, the decision of Justice Chilcot, and draw your attention to the highlighted in paragraphs 41 through 43 and in portions particular, the dicta of Justice Dubbin. And finally, I wanted to bring your attention to Mr. Peter Cumming's decision under Tab 7 in Sussex Group because it may be instructive to draw your attention not only to those areas that have been highlighted but equally to that portion of the case ...

28THE COURT: I read it. To be honest with you, I29read it. Also, looking back at my reasons of30January 2010 at paragraph 28, the United Nurses31of Alberta case I made reference to and I have32read Justice Cumming, as he then was - I read hisApril 30, 2013

139

decision.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. RANKING: That's fine, Your Honour. Т appreciate that. I just refer you to paragraph 55 where even though the contemnor may have purged his contempt, that the court still retains jurisdiction to consider and punish for contempt notwithstanding that.

THE COURT: A little different, the facts there.

MR. RANKING: The facts were different but I make that submission more with respect to the appropriateness of a cost award. Your Honour, I appreciate your time. Thank you.

THE COURT: So let's understand something here, Mr. Best. This is reply, right? So it is reply to submissions made by Mr. Silver and Mr. Ranking. It is not a re-argument of your case. Do you understand, sir?

MR. BEST: I - I...

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. BEST: I think I do, Your Honour, and...

**THE COURT:** What don't you understand? You are doing a reply argument to the submissions they made. That is what the purpose of reply is. So I am just telling you...

MR. BEST: Your Honour, I would...

**THE COURT:** I don't know how to say it more simplistic than that.

**MR. BEST:** I would ask you to guide me if I fall astray from what you want.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

(April 1

ľ.

ľ

ľ

	Lopij Suomissions on ripphonion to runge Contempt (Best)
1	REPLY SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEST
2	Your Honour, first of all, Mr. Ranking has once
3	against wrongly added the word "Firm" orally when
4	reading a paper that only says
5	PricewaterhouseCoopers East Caribbean. Your
6	Honour, we all know with corporations, the little
7	bracket at the end that says 1996 or "limited"
8	versus "incorporated" is everything.
9	<b>THE COURT:</b> Mr. Best, here is what I don't
10	understand
11	MR. BEST: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT:on your entire submission. You are
13	the president of Nelson Barbados.
14	MR. BEST: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: You instructed Mr. McKenzie to begin a
16	case against a number of defendants, including
17	the Chief Justice of Barbados, the prime minister,
18	the former prime minister and against
19	Pricewaterhouse - whatever the name was at that
20	point.
21	MR. BEST:Coopers East Caribbean Firm.
22	THE COURT: The fact that the name changed or
23	altered or was referenced in different forms, the
24	fact is the entity existed. That is who you
25	brought your lawsuit against. The fact that the
26	corporation name changed doesn't matter anything
27	in terms of this matter before the court, which
28	is your contempt, your failure, your acknowledged
29	failure to attend before me on three separate
30	occasions. That is what this is about, Mr. Best.
31	MR. BEST: I understand, sir, and I'll say one
32	more thing.
	April 30, 2013

THE COURT: So, please, you seem to think that is technical there some argument about а corporation entity's name and the change in the name or any reference of how it was referred to in the process of the litigation. It is just illfounded and without merit. I tell you that, sir, because I have listened to it and vou are repeating the same argument. Mr. Ranking has taken you - I think it is as much for your benefit as much as mine - to the same documents that you produced to show you how that is arrived at. Now for goodness sakes, Mr. Best, you have much more ability than you pretend from time to time. You understand that and I am telling you if you got advice that somehow that is a significant issue on this application, well, you did not get very good advice. But ago ahead, sir.

MR. BEST: Your Honour, I've heard you and most respectfully, sir, even though I maintain my position and we disagree, I will leave it.

Mr. Ranking, when he was talking about how terrible it was when I - on December 11<sup>th</sup> when I asked for the police to investigate him, does not tell you that I asked him very politely twice to give me privacy, very reasonably, "Give me privacy." It's in my materials. Twice I asked him and he refused to leave. So it's not exactly as portrayed, Your Honour.

Your Honour, I have fulfilled the orders of the court. I would just - in the transcript of April 30, 2013

141

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

# Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al

Reply Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)

October 23<sup>rd</sup>, I would note two things but - there are many others, as you can see here, but just two.

**THE COURT:** October 23<sup>rd</sup>, two thousand...

BEST: MR. I'm sorry, sir. January 23, 2013. during my cross-examination, right on page 272, Question 1133, and I had been saying, "Let's get the questions. "So we agree I've fulfilled your orders?" Mr. Silver said: "No, we don't, of course we don't." I said, "Then dictate what we've done, sir. I'm here." "So these are the questions directly pertaining to the fulfilling of the November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 order that I want to do right now. I do not want to be accused of being in default of the judge's order when I believe I've now fulfilled the judge's order. So let's deal with that before we deal with anything else." They wouldn't let me, and Your Honour...

THE COURT: Mr. Best.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

MR. BEST: Yes, sir.

**THE COURT:** By your own material, you provided a - I'm sorry, the technical jargon I am not used to - a stick, a computer stick.

MR. BEST: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: ...with what you say contains 100,000 documents and you hand that over and then you say to them, "All right, so ask me questions," and how would they ever possibly, from any sense of reasonableness, digest...

30 MR. BEST: Because those documents had been in 31 their possession since at least 2010, sir. The 32 vast majority had been in their position and one April 30, 2013

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

would think that they could have asked me a question and indeed, some of the questions they asked me could be said to be entirely about everything but they - they didn't want to. They constructed a situation. That is my position, sir, and when we consider how they conducted that cross-examination - I wish you could hear the tape, Your Honour, because the transcript's pretty bad but the tape would really really tell you what happened.

So I will say also that Mr. Silver, I think, said that I gave no information regarding the service, that the service was not under the protocol. This is when Τ was served the documents and Ms. Ouellette, I think her name, and some other people served affidavits. Yes, sir, on page 45, Under Advisement number 60, I address that. I do not accept her service and I - I mean there's a whole bunch of things that the court was told I was served with. I was not and I haven't been able to cross-examine on it and I wish I could have.

Mr. Silver makes it sound like it was such a reasonable cross-examination regarding the documents and the questions and everything but in fact, both of them - it was just theatre. Mr. Ranking yelled at me and I won't say it in the voice but I was just making notes and he goes, "LOOK AT ME," and this was unbelievable, sir. I've never seen it before. It was all done to April 30, 2013

have a theatre.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

In terms of costs, Your Honour, I wanted to cross-examine re: the costs, check the files and the invoices, the hours. Sir, there was two million dollars on the table and there's no way -I just can't believe they left such a small amount on the table. I believe that they've double-dipped and I believe that crossexamination and a real look at their outlook and everything would show it.

I'm the only one who's put in evidence since June 10<sup>th</sup> or June 2010. I'm the only one. My evidence is uncontroverted.

Your Honour, I'd also let you know that prior to November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009, the most I had been out of the country was only a few weeks. I've never been a resident of any other country. My action in leaving the country with my family was real. It was forced, it was necessary and many people, defendants and some law firms and personnel from law firms were part of that large campaign that caused me to leave.

I have been convicted on false evidence, Your Honour, and Your Honour, I have fulfilled all your orders, sir, and I worked hard to try and fulfill them and the purpose now for these gentlemen is improper. They're talking about other - other venues. They want evidence for April 30, 2013

other venues. Your Honour, this is... THE COURT: Is that how you perceive it? MR. BEST: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That's how you perceive this? MR. BEST: That's how I perceive why they're doing what they're doing, sir.

THE COURT: I see.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. BEST: And they've said as much.

THE COURT: So is that the reason that you don't want to consider the proposal - and I can put it at no higher level than that - the proposal that is contained in this draft judgment put forward by Mr. Silver, which gives you a further stay on the bench warrant. It gives you the opportunity to attend and answer the questions that they say have not been answered that relate to my November 2<sup>nd</sup> and December 2<sup>nd</sup> order. Oh, and it also directs you to pay costs, costs which have already been awarded in any event as it relates to January 15, 2010 and of course, costs to be assessed by me based on the material.

MR. BEST: Well, Your Honour, most respectfully, sir, I will, of course, fulfill anything you order me to do, of course I will.

THE COURT: No, no, I am asking you...

MR. BEST: But I cannot enter...

THE COURT: I am giving you this - they are surprising me. I say it's my fault. I should have picked up on it in the joint factum. I didn't. I read it as a slight. I should not have read it as a slight, but I did, that somehow I have been giving nothing but further chances and further April 30, 2013

chances, as I thought they perceived that that's what was occurring in this case, to you. Ι probably have been. Looking back on it, there's been requests for costs, and security for costs and I have refused those because I have wanted to give you the opportunity to stand before the court and make your argument and not have you in a situation where you would be found immediately in default. But now - now it is coming from - and I have got to believe this is a joint proposal by Mr. Ranking and Mr. Silver: "All right, judge, please, using your discretion under Rule 60.11(8), give Mr. Best yet another opportunity to attend and answer questions and oh, by the way, pay the costs, costs that have already been put in place penalty, plus costs and а of this present application." You don't want to avail yourself of that, Mr. Best? MR. BEST: Your Honour, I don't think they - that their proposal is just and so I can't do that, but I'll do whatever you order, sir.

22 THE COURT: No, no. No, it is - you understand 23 that if I did not accept your arguments - and I 24 haven't decided the case yet. I haven't given my 25 Reasons, but I just want to make sure that you 26 understand this. If I decide that you have not 27 purged your contempt, then I lift the bench 28 warrant and you go to jail. Then it doesn't mean 29 that anything is expunged. It means you are back. bring 30 further They will applications to 31 cross-examine you all in relation to productions that relate to the November  $2^{nd}$  and December  $2^{nd}$ 32 April 30, 2013

146

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

	Reply Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best)
1	orders. Nothing goes away, Mr. Best. It isn't
2	that you do the time and if you do the time,
3	everything else is now forgiven and forgotten. I
4	am saying that is if you don't purge your
5	contempt. That is what is being served up here.
6	MR. BEST: Your Honour, I thought I
7	THE COURT: And I just say to you, sir, with the
8	greatest of respect, that would cause me, if I
9	was in your shoes, to stand back and reflect on
10	my position.
11	<b>MR. BEST:</b> Your Honour, I - I thought I had purged
12	my contempt.
13	THE COURT: I said to you, sir, if you are not
14	successful in purging your contempt because that
15	is my decision, Mr. Best.
16	MR. BEST: I understand that, Your Honour.
17	THE COURT: I want you to understand what happens
18	if you have not been successful.
19	<b>MR. BEST:</b> But I've attended and I - I've put
20	hours and hours and hours into answering their
21	questions. Even when they didn't want me to, I -
22	I went down all through the transcripts, sir, and
23	I listed every question and I answered it to the
24	best of my ability.
25	THE COURT: You are not answering my question. I
26	don't suppose there is an answer to my question.
27	I just
28	MR. BEST: Maybe I didn't understand, sir.
29	THE COURT: asked you to pause and reflect upon
30	your position, sir. I can do no more. I can do no
31	more. I am not here to be your advocate and I am
32	sure that the counsel are thinking, "Yes, but he
1	April 30, 2013

has transgressed that line several times." Having said that, I can say no more to you other than to outline what is in front of me, what is available and then the consequences flow depending on my findings.

MR. BEST: I wish I was better, Your Honour, and I wish I had more time.

THE COURT: I don't think it is a matter of being better, Mr. Best, which is sort of a play on words. I think the difficulty right now is for some reason, I sense that you have decided to pursue a certain path and whether that has been with the advice and direction of others, I don't know. I don't know. The fact is the consequences all flow for you, sir, nobody else.

MR. BEST: I'm all alone here, sir, and I'm well aware of the consequences. I mean...

THE COURT: Well, I would have thought you were properly advised about this litigation as it progressed and how it progressed and the manner in which it progressed. After all, you were the bills president paying as the of Nelson Barbados.

MR. BEST: Your Honour, I...

THE COURT: And it's hard for me not to reflect back on this history. It's been an - I don't say that to be dramatic or to provide theatre. I could not tally the number of hours...

MR. BEST: The number of...

30 **THE COURT:** ... I have been personally involved in 31 this matter and I think the cost awards, which 32 were not complete indemnity, are reflective of April 30, 2013

148

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

what happened in this case and I think it's the
involvement of the counsel then that moved into
the Minutes of Settlement so that everyone was
represented on those cost orders. I think it is
representative of just what kind of a matter was
put before this court and I cannot lose
perspective that this was all a motion about
jurisdiction. That's it.

MR. BEST: Your Honour, I've been to see a bankruptcy trustee and I mean I can't tell you what this has done to me. It's just...

THE COURT: Well, sir...

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. BEST: ...destroyed me.

THE COURT: You have never said in one affidavit that you are impecunious, that you can't pay this. You have disclosed information about your payment Mr. Greenspan, which is none of even to my business. You disclosed it in affidavit material. You have disclosed - and the fact is I have a very clear recollection now of the order that I made back - oh, I can't even remember the year now where I ordered costs in excess of 200,000 that were paid. I don't know where you are going, Best, in the sense that you can't argue Mr. impecuniosity and frankly - well, I say no more. I have done my very best. I want to stop. There is no more I can say to you to ask you to reconsider or to consider your position more carefully. I have given that invitation probably five to six times in the last 15 minutes and if you are not interested, well then, you are not interested and sir, that is your decision and April 30, 2013

that is fine. I can say no more. 1 2 Is there any further points you wish to raise in 3 reply to the arguments of either Mr. Ranking or 4 Mr. Silver? 5 BEST: Your Honour, an innocent man cannot MR. 6 plead guilty when someone has fabricated evidence 7 against them. I cannot do that. 8 THE COURT: Fine. Anything else, sir? 9 MR. BEST: Well, I had - just that I had things I 10 was going to say over a number of days but it 11 doesn't - it hasn't worked out and... 12 THE COURT: I don't catch you by surprise. I even 13 made an endorsement this would be one day and 14 quite surprisingly, it is going to be more than 15 one day because I am going to have to bring you 16 back. I am going to give an oral judgment. I am not typing a judgment. I am afraid I have got 17 18 enough on my plate right now that I cannot 19 possibly - and to be quite candid with you, my 20 typing is... 21 MR. BEST: I apologize, Your Honour. I didn't mean 22 to... 23 THE COURT: It is not up to speed and I have got

THE COORT: It is not up to speed and I have got many other matters I have to deal with. So it will be an oral judgment and we will now have to talk about a date, unless there is anything else you wish to say to me, Mr. Best.

MR. BEST: Well, I just had no intent to offend the court, Your Honour. I - I did the best I could possibly do to answer - to fulfill your orders and I - I knew that nothing I did would be good enough for these gentlemen and it's their April 30, 2013

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

151

prosecution. They are the prosecutors and - and 1 2 well, that's - that's it, sir. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. BEST: Thank you, Your Honour. 4 THE COURT: Well, it is now 4:30, 4:31. You say 5 you can't be here tomorrow, Mr. Silver. You are 6 7 in front of another judge. ... DISCUSSION RE: SCHEDULING A TIME ΤO GIVE 8 REASONS FOR JUDGMENT 9 ... MAY 3, 2013 AT 9:30 A.M. IS THE DATE AGREED TO 10 11 THE COURT: I think for the purposes of the - I 12 don't know if it is really necessary. I think I 13 identified the affidavit of Mr. Donald Best sworn 14 vesterday which began this entire process. Ι would think it is part of the court record now. I 15 16 don't think I have to mark it in any other way. I 17 will leave it there with you. 18 19 So there is the application, that endorsement on 20 top. I think what I would like, though, is for 21 the purposes of appellate review, I would like Mr. 22 Best's draft order that he asked the court to 23 make to be marked as Exhibit A on this motion and 24 the respondent's draft order proposed marked as 25 Exhibit B on this motion. 26 **REGISTRAR:** Yes, Your Honour. 27 EXHIBIT NO. A: DRAFT ORDER PREPARED BY DONALD 28 BEST - Produced and Marked. EXHIBIT NO. B: PROPOSED DRAFT ORDER PREPARED BY 29 30 RESPONDENTS - Produced and Marked. 31 RANKING: Your Honour, if we MR. are marking 32 exhibits, would it make sense to mark Mr. Best's

152 Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al Reply Submissions on Application to Purge Contempt (Best) 1 affidavit as Exhibit C? 2 THE COURT: Well, maybe because we did refer to it 3 and it's not in any of the materials. Yes. EXHIBIT NO. C: AFFIDAVIT OF DONALD BEST SWORN 4 5 APRIL 29, 2013 - Produced and Marked. 6 THE COURT: I think also, since we are marking 7 exhibits, the "Answers to Undertakings, Under 8 Advisements and Refusals by Donald Best", which 9 was also introduced today to me will be exhibit 10 number D. 11 EXHIBIT NO. D: ANSWERS TO UNDERTAKINGS, UNDER 12 ADVISEMENTS AND REFUSALS ΒY DONALD BEST \_ 13 Produced and Marked. 14 THE COURT: I guess the binder was referred to, so 15 we will mark it as an exhibit. **REGISTRAR:** Exhibit E. 16 17 THE COURT: That's the blue binder put in by 18 Mr. Best. 19 EXHIBIT NO. E: BLUE BINDER - COMPENDIUM INDEX -20 Produced and Marked. 21 THE COURT: Okay, thanks everyone. So I will see 22 you Friday. 23 (4:35 PM) RECESS 24

153 Nelson Barbados v. Cox et al

all and

l

adapting.

and the

1	FORM 2
2	Certificate of Transcript
3	Evidence Act, subsection 5(2)
4	I, Maxine Newell, certify that this document is a true and
5	accurate transcript of the recordings of <i>Nelson Barbados v. Cox et</i>
6	al in the Superior Court of Justice held at 150 Bond St. E.,
7	Oshawa, Ontario, taken from Recording number 2812-206-
8	400668-20130430-090859, which has been certified in Form 1.
9	
10	5 May, 2013
11	Maxine Newell, C.C.R.
	April 30, 2013