

Montréal, August 28, 2019

Attention : Hon. David Lametti
Minister of Justice
Department of Justice Canada
284 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0H8

Subject: Looking forward to an answer to my registered letter of May 21, 2019 to your attention.

M. Minister

In light of your refusal to even acknowledge receipt of my last letter to your attention, sent by way of registered mail on May 21, 2019, I thought writing you a few words.

As Justice Minister, you're responsible for matters connected with the administration of justice that fall within federal jurisdiction. By definition, the concern of the **administration of justice** is the fair, just and impartial upholding of citizens' rights, and the punishment of wrongs.

Moreover, your mandate is clear and encompasses, working to ensure that Canada is a **just and law-abiding society** with a fair system of justice. If so, my question to you is, and help me to understand; but would a law-abiding society accept to have RCMP members lying under oath about the death of a colleague and judges closing their eyes to this? I'd like to hear you on that.

This being said, by the present, I wish to reiterate again to you my demand for a public inquiry to see what motivated judges of the Court, including Chief Supreme Court Justice Richard Wagner, to close their eyes on what basically amounts to 163 pages of perjuries from RCMP members related to the circumstances surrounding the death of their colleague, the night of February 19, 1989 in Chiang Mai, Thailand.

The fact that you were unable to reply to my last query is much revealing of your uneasiness at answering me, and for obvious reasons.

- Number one, the Attorney General is in no position to contradict the documentation emanating from its own file, documentation used to put together the Analysis of RCMP Flanagan's death; documentation that was, in fact, filed into court records by counsels for the Attorney General, including RCMP members' testimonies given under oath at trial.
- Number two, if you agree with the content of the Analysis of RCMP Flanagan's death, you can't admit it without incriminating the Attorney General, in one form or another, when using the power of the state to help the RCMP to cover up the true circumstances surrounding the death of RCMP Cpl. Derek Flanagan. **If not, why refusing to act?**

- Number three, if you admit that the content of the Analysis of RCMP Flanagan's death corroborates my allegations, this would involve turning the spotlight on the judges who were sitting on this case. some of whom, who coincidentally benefited of what could be interpreted by Canadian taxpayers, as very substantial promotions for their work.

The question that cries out for an answer is; was it for closing their eyes or due to incompetence?

Either way, the facts surely don't speak in favor of the judges involved in this case. It's enough to make Canadian taxpayers wonder if this isn't the sign of an even greater malaise that directly relates to the integrity of few judges of the Court more concerned about protecting the interest of the Attorney General, than applying the rule of law? If judges of the Court were ready to say that I'm not credible and that there isn't any evidence of RCMP members lying about the death of their colleague, which, as we know now, is totally false, as minister of justice, you do have the duty to act, rather than risking to be associated to what amount to cover up.

Although I've mentioned it in my last registered letter to your attention, in your position as justice minister, you also do have all the necessary power and tools to insure a complete judicial review of this case under article 696.1–696.6 of the criminal code. This power has been part of Canada's justice system since the original *Criminal Code* of 1892, and surely, it is something familiar to you.

By definition, a judicial review is a procedure by which a person can seek to challenge a **decision, act or failure to act of a public body**. This could be a government department or local authority, or **another body** exercising a **public law function**.

Among grounds for judicial review are errors of law, errors of mixed fact and law, and errors of fact. Examples of errors of law include:

- breaching a principle of procedural fairness
- bias of the decision-maker
- applying the wrong legal test
- acting contrary to law
- misinterpreting statute or case law or ignoring statute or case law
- ignoring evidence

Considering the fact that judges of the Court have closed their eyes to what amounts to a mountain of false RCMP statements, lies and perjuries into the death of a Force members, the aforementioned points could be considered as a starting point to delineate what went wrong in the present case (*re: Alain Olivier v. Attorney General of Canada*).

Without the pleasure of a reply from your part, it remains to see if you would be ready to use such avenue to determinate what went wrong in the present case involving the RCMP and the Attorney General and to do so in a way that would insure avoiding any bias and potential situation of conflict of interest.

- If I haven't heard from you within the next fifteen days, it will be taken as an admission from your part before the law that you do agree with the information found through the content of the Analysis of RCMP Derek Flanagan's death and that it reflects the truth, namely; that RCMP members have lied about it, while giving testimonies under oath.
- If I haven't heard from you within the next fifteen days, it'll be taken as an admission from your part before the law that you also agree that judges of the Court have, willingly or not, closed their eyes on all the evidence corroborating that RCMP members have lied about the circumstances surrounding the death of RCMP Derek Flanagan.

If you don't agree with the aforesaid, I would appreciate you telling me the parts you don't agree with and why, including any evidence that could support your position. In fact, I'm challenging you and your office, Mr. Minister, to bring forth any evidence that could disclaim my allegations to the effect that RCMP members have lied about the circumstance surrounding the death of RCMP Cpl. Derek Flanagan, and I do expect you and your office to do so in a very detailed manner.

Whatever the results of the next federal election, the truth will come out, Mr. Minister, and I'm looking forward to have the media reminding you of my demand for a complete judicial review or for a public inquiry into this, after the election.

It is now up to you to show Canadian taxpayers the extent to which the truth and the rule of law mean to you. If more transparency and accountability from Ottawa was a promise made by the liberal party during the last federal election, it remains to be seen what value, you, as minister of justice, attach to such promise with regard to the present case.

Lastly, I've made a mistake in my last letter when announcing that the movie based on the story my treatment at the hands of the RCMP would come out next September. It will rather be presented in world premiere in the US next January to insure touching an even greater audience.

Thank you for your time. Looking forward to the pleasure of a reply from your part. I remain...

Respectfully

Mr. Alain Olivier
4493 rue De La Roche
Montréal, P.Q.
Canada, H2J-3J2

C\c to file and to media