

AFFIDAVIT

I, Betty Rubble, of the City of Bedrock of County of Stoneage make oath and say/affirm:

All Rights Reserved without Prejudice.  
Recognizing the Supremacy of God and the Rule of Law.  
All Statements made are facts and are not meant to mislead.  
Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent; Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal

Included Attachments to form part of the Affidavit:

- Page 2 :Letter to Joe Rockhead
- Page 3 - 8 : Statement of Events
- Page 9 & 10 : Conditional Acceptance
- Page 11 : Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960
- Page 12 : Section 366, Criminal Code of Canada
- Page 13 : Ticket #: 1234567B

SWORN/AFFIRMED BEFORE me at the )  
 )  
 City/Town/Municipality )  
 of )  
 Name of Home City/Town )  
 this )  
 day of ,20 )  
 ) Name of Oath taker

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

NOTE: If the testator was blind or signed by making his or her mark,  
 add the following paragraph:  
 3. Before its execution, the document was read over to the  
 testator, who (was blind) (signed by making his or her mark.)  
 The testator appeared to understand the contents.  
 WARNING: A beneficiary, or the spouse of a beneficiary, should not be a witness.

**TO MAKE CLEAR AND KNOWN EARLY ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.  
ALL STATEMENTS MADE ARE FACTS AND ARE NOT MEANT TO MISLEAD.  
NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL, NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

Betty Rubble  
123 Shale St  
Bedrock, ON

Joe Rockhead  
Identification #: 1234  
Acting as Municipal Enforcement Bylaw Officer  
c/o City of Bedrock  
Enforcement Services Branch  
5 Boulder Dr  
Bedrock, ON

TO: Joe Rockhead

RE: Ticket #: 1234567B

I am returning a copy of the ticket issued to me on April 7, 2021 as I do not accept.

In jurisprudence, undue influence is an equitable doctrine that involves one person taking advantage of a position of power over another person. It is where free will to bargain is not possible.

The original has been returned to the Prosecution.

Sincerely,

Betty Rubble

cc Prosecution  
Ontario Court of Justice

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.  
ALL STATEMENTS MADE ARE FACTS AND ARE NOT MEANT TO MISLEAD.  
NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT; NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL**

### **STATEMENT OF EVENTS**

1. ON April 7, 2021, I, Betty Rubble, a sovereign private human living soul, of lawful and legal age of majority and who acts as the conscience for The Bronco Burger received the following ticket: Ticket #: 1234567B from Joe Rockhead, who is acting as an enforcement officer on behalf of the City of Bedrock.
2. Joe Rockhead is enforcing and or administrating law. Regardless of the jurisdiction within which this individual is employed, this individual gains their vicarious liability protection under S25 of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>1</sup>
3. Vicarious liability protection acquired under the Criminal Code of Canada makes this individual an agent of the Federal government. This vicarious liability protection puts them into Federal jurisdiction.
4. Only when an individual acts within their parameters of their employment are they acting in “good faith”, as they are operating as an agent of their employer.
5. The moment the person is made aware that they are in violation of their parameters, or worse commits a crime, “good faith” is lost. They lose their vicarious liability protection as an agent, and the human person becomes personally responsible for their actions.
6. As an agent under Federal jurisdiction this individual MUST adhere to the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, (Bill of Rights)**<sup>2</sup> when enforcing or administrating law in Canada, regardless of jurisdiction. Any violation of an individual’s recognized and protected rights with the **Bill of Rights** by the person acting as an agent that the agent is aware of, or made aware of prior to conviction, the protection of their agent status is lost and the individual acting as agent is personally liable and can be held personally accountable.<sup>3</sup>
7. The **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**, is “*An Act of Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.*”<sup>4</sup> It recognizes and protects the individual’s God-given and/or inalienable rights. It is unconditional and in harmony with God’s law - It is a legal and lawful instrument protecting God’s law.<sup>5</sup>
8. With S1(a) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** I have the right to “*life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;*”
9. With S1(b) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** I have the right to “*equality before the law and the protection of the law;*”
10. With S2(c)(i) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** I have the right to “*be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention.*”

---

<sup>1</sup> R. v. Asante-Mensah, 2003 SCC 38 (CanLII), [2003] 2 SCR 3, <<https://canlii.ca/t/51p4>>, retrieved on 2022-02-21

<sup>2</sup> Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, <<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html>>, retrieved on 2022-02-21

<sup>3</sup> Reference Re Alberta Statutes - The Bank Taxation Act; The Credit of Alberta Regulation Act; and the Accurate News and Information Act, 1938 CanLII 1 (SCC), [1938] SCR 100, <<https://canlii.ca/t/1nmz8>>, retrieved on 2022-02-21

<sup>4</sup> Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, <<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/b-4/page-1.html>>, retrieved 2022-02-21

<sup>5</sup> Stand4THEE - Man’s Law vs Gods’ Law, <[https://youtu.be/n0ay\\_UEMvjE](https://youtu.be/n0ay_UEMvjE)>, retrieved on 2022-02-26

11. The **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** begins with a preamble. A preamble speaks to the subject; everything that follows the Preamble must defer to the subject.
12. The preamble states: "*THE Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.*"<sup>6</sup>
13. Joe Rockhead, is claiming that, I, Betty Rubble acting as conscience for The Bronco Burger failed to perform under Reopening Ontario Act 2020, as amended, S10(1)
14. This is an act of legislation created by man. It is man's law.

### **Reopening Ontario Act 2020 as amended, S10(1)**

15. To the best of my knowledge, at no time have I ever knowingly, willingly and without ambiguity ever signed, or consented to, any instrument in law, created by the province of Ontario where I acknowledged and agreed to comply to perform in a specific manner under the Act of Legislation stated. Therefore this negotiable instrument remains open for review and ratification by Betty Rubble, the sovereign private human living soul who is acting at the conscience of The Bronco Burger.
16. If I am to be issued a bill in commerce, I expect a copy of the contract that I consented to, upon demand.
17. I have the right to know how Betty Rubble or Betty Rubble acting as the conscience for the Bronco Burger Inc are lawfully bound to the Reopening Ontario Act 2020 as amended, S10(1).
18. When man's law is in conflict with God's law, God's law is Supreme. "*The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God*"<sup>7</sup>...When man's law is in conflict with any of the individual's Recognized and Protected God-given human rights and fundamental freedoms, the human rights and fundamental freedoms are supreme as they are founded upon the principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God.
19. Under the principles of Natural Justice and Procedural Fairness I have the right to know how I was bound.
20. When this bill was presented, it was used or acted on as genuine by Joe Rockhead.
21. Under the Reopening Ontario Act 2020 as amended, S10(1), Joe Rockhead added a victim surcharge of \$125.00. Who is the victim?
22. Will this victim be receiving this money, or is this alleged victim an additional fraud added to the bill in question?
23. To the best of my knowledge, neither Betty Rubble (one of the many "*free men*" recognized and protected in the Bill of Rights) nor Betty Rubble acting as the conscience for The Bronco Burger (one of the many "*free institutions*" recognized and protected in the Bill of Rights) has ever knowingly, willingly and without ambiguity ever accepted a contract granting authority of the Reopening Ontario Act 2020 as amended, S 10(1) over either of them.

---

<sup>6</sup> Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, <<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html>>, retrieved on 2022-02-21

<sup>7</sup> Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, <<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html>>, retrieved on 2022-02-21

24. Further, a S10(1) charge under the ROA first requires an ordered closure under S9.1 by “a *police officer, special constable, or First Nations Constable [..]*”. At no time did a police officer, a special constable or a First Nations Constable order the premises closed AND no one from the Public Health Office is acting under any jurisdiction that gives him the office of a police officer, special constable or First Nations Constable.
25. Without proof of acceptance, acting as though this penalty is genuine and acting as though the victim surcharge is genuine is to create a false document which is contrary to S366 Forgery of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>8</sup>
26. Additional crimes include, Uttering Threats, Extortion and Assault.
27. Every one in Canada has the right to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention, Recognized and Protected with S2(c)(i) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**.
28. And neither Betty Rubble or Betty Rubble acting as the conscience for the Bronco Burger Inc was promptly notified since at no time was a S9.1(1) order ever issued further making this alleged charge invalid.
29. Acting on this document as genuine to the prejudice of the Bronco Burger Inc is an offence of Forgery, contrary to S366(1), Criminal Code of Canada.
30. “p184 *The proposition that in Canada a member of the executive branch of government does not make the law but merely carries it out or administers it requires no citation of authority to support it. Similarly, I do not find it necessary to cite from the wealth of authority supporting the principle that a public officer is responsible for acts done by him without legal justification. I content myself with quoting the well known passage from Dicey's "Law of the Constitution", 9th ed., p. 193, where he says ...every official, from the Prime Minister down to a constable or a collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen. The Reports abound with cases in which officials have been brought before the courts, and made, in their personal capacity, liable to punishment, or to the payment of damages, for acts done in their official character but in excess of their lawful authority. A colonial governor, a secretary of state, a military officer,*” Roncarelli v. Duplessis, [1959] S.C.R. 12

### ***Fiduciary Responsibility***

31. Government is meant to serve the people. Representatives of the government are meant to serve the people. Government agents are meant to serve the people. Government has a fiduciary responsibility to the people.
32. While political representatives may have the authority to create legislation, regulations and bylaws (a social contract between government and the citizen), what these representatives don't have, without direct consent from the individual, like a power of attorney, is the legal right to accept and bind any individual to these contracts. Without the individual's consent to be bound to the legal instrument, the legal instrument remains open for review and ratification by the individual and/or the person.
33. If a representative is claiming the authority to bind the individual or the person, a sworn statement along with proof of that individual's consent that has been granted to the representative would be required to support the validity of the alleged authority; an affidavit would be required to make it a

---

<sup>8</sup> Section 366(1), Forgery, Criminal Code Canada, <<https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-366.html>>, retrieved on 3/15/2022

true copy thereof. This applies when proof of direct consent by the individual or the person is absent.

34. It is the practice of the agent when prosecuting tickets to ignore an individual's request for the copy of the contract that the individual knowingly, willingly and without ambiguity acknowledged and accepted with a signature.
35. These agents refuse to acknowledge an individual's right to proof that the individual was aware and agreed to perform under any social contract, they fail to prove how we are bound. These agent's use their positions of "authority" and impose Undue Influence over the individual to create inequity.
36. The instruments these agents claim have authority can only acquire force if all parties consented to the contract prior to the failure of performance. First the agent(s) fail to provide the contract upon request and then they subsequently present an argument regarding the performance under the alleged authority which is fraud.
37. Typically, these agents proceed to perpetuate the fraud by presenting a case arguing not the validity of the alleged authority but the failure to perform under it. This is an intentional deflection. Almost no one understands that by defending the performance is to ambiguously acknowledge the authority; most victims fall prey to this fraud.
38. Dismissing the existence of any contract or claiming ignorance with respect to how the alleged authority gains its' force is fraud and this ignorance is not protected.
39. Under S19 of the Criminal Code of Canada, Ignorance of the law by a person who commits an offence is not an excuse of committing that offence.<sup>9</sup>

#### ***Voiding the Undue Influence - Conditional Acceptance***

40. Undue influence has been defined as the unconscionable use by one person of power possessed by him over another in order to induce the other to enter a contract.
41. To void the Undue Influence, a conditional acceptance is being submitted. The conditional acceptance is being made, because neither Betty Rubble nor the Bronco Burger Inc want to argue this before a court.
42. The conditional acceptance is being submitted with consideration attached and under sworn oath. Under oath, this matter is now before God. The "*Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God*", Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960.
43. Any rebuttal or response to the conditional acceptance by any government agent MUST adhere to the Bill of Rights and the Rules of Civil Procedure, the response MUST be in kind, under sworn oath; before God. No one is believed before God but upon his oath.
44. If the court first ignores the conditional acceptance with both a promise to perform and consideration attached, and which is given freely and then should second submit a plea on behalf of the defendant, the court would be acting *ultra vires* and subsequently assuming personal liability as explained in S 2 - 11 in this statement of claim..
45. The court CAN NOT submit a plea on behalf of the defendant without the consent of the defendant, consent given knowingly, willingly and without ambiguity, nor can the court while

---

<sup>9</sup> S19 Ignorance of the Law, Criminal Code of Canada, <<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-19.html>>, retrieved on 3/15/2022

acting as a neutral third party act as a representative on behalf of the defendant and submit a plea.

46. Under S118 Definitions of the Criminal Code of Canada all courts of justice fall under Federal Jurisdiction and therefore MUST adhere to the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**.

47. Criminal Code of Canada, Definitions, S118

**“Judicial proceeding means a proceeding**

**(a) in or under the authority of a court of justice,**

**(b) before a court, judge, justice, provincial court judge or coroner,**

**whether or not the proceeding is invalid for want of jurisdiction or for any other reason”**

48. So any proceeding in any court of justice in any province in Canada is under Federal jurisdiction and MUST adhere to the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**.

49. Under S118 Definitions of the Criminal Code of Canada, Joe Rockhead once again falls under Federal Jurisdiction. His position as “official” under provincial jurisdiction is recognized and acknowledged under Federal Jurisdiction with the Criminal Code of Canada.

50. Criminal Code of Canada, Definitions, S118,

**government means**

**(b) the government of a province,**

**office includes**

**(a) an office or appointment under the government, or**

**(c) a position or an employment in a public department;**

51. **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** is an unconditional instrument in law. It recognizes and protects God's law by imposing limits on government activity so as not to infringe, abridge or trespass on an individual's human rights and fundamental freedoms.

52. Failure to present the contract under sworn affidavit will commit an offence of Fraud, contrary to S380(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>10</sup>

53. Failure to present the contract under sworn affidavit will commit an offence of Forgery, contrary to S366(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada<sup>11</sup>

54. Failure to present the contract under sworn affidavit will commit an offence of Assault, contrary to S265(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>12</sup>

55. Failure to present the contract under sworn affidavit will commit an offence of Uttering Threats, contrary to S264.1(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Fraud, S380(1), Criminal Code of Canada, <<https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-380.html>>, retrieved on 3/16/2022

<sup>11</sup> Fraud, S380(1), Criminal Code of Canada, <<https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-380.html>>, retrieved on 3/16/2022

<sup>12</sup> Assault, S265(1), Criminal Code of Canada, <<https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-265.html>>, retrieved on 3/16/2022

<sup>13</sup> Uttering Threats, S264.1(1), Criminal Code of Canada <<https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-264.1.html>>, retrieved on 3/16/2022

56. Failure to present the contract under sworn affidavit will commit and offence of Extortion, contrary to S346(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Abuse at the hands of the City of Bedrock***

57. Since March 2020, the City of Bedrock has continuously violated my, Betty Rubble, right to earn a living.
58. I have repeatedly and consistently been forced against my will to close my place of business without due process of law.
59. These closures have impacted my income which impacts my life, liberty, security of the person and have denied me my right to enjoyment of property and not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law.
60. Denied by the City of Bedrock was my right to equality before the law and protection of the law, I have been threatened, coerced and bullied by persons acting as agents on behalf of the City of Bedrock.
61. Regardless of what the legislation states or who wrote and passed it, if the **enforcement** and / or the **administration** of that law violates my Recognized and Protected Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, then those human persons acting as agents are violating me and causing me harm.
62. As far as I can recount, I have never signed a contract with the Province of Ontario agreeing to forfeit my God-given rights when I registered the Bronco Burger Inc.
63. I have never agreed to forfeit my right to life, liberty, security of the person, enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law. And yet, my income was damaged by those people acting as agents on behalf of the City of Bedrock. My ability to maintain my life, liberty, security of the person was harmed.
64. First the City of Bedrock damages my income by ordering my business closed and then they send out their agents to bill me, Utter Threats at me, Extort me and Assault me in order to prevent me of trying to maintain my right to life, liberty, security of the person, and enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law.
65. I don't want a trial. I don't have time and I can not afford the time to go to trial, therefore I am swearing before God my conditional acceptance. Put in the hands of Joe Rockhead and the Prosecution, it is up to them to meet the conditions or withdraw the claim.

### ***To Summarize***

66. Joe Rockhead has not provided any proof that Betty Rubble or The Bronco Burger agreed to comply to any man-made act of legislation created by the Province of Ontario. Only meritless accusations. He violated S2(c)(i) of the ***Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960***.
67. A victim surcharge has been added to this bill. Who is the victim? Is this another fraud?

---

<sup>14</sup> Extortion, S346(1), Criminal Code of Canada < <https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-346.html>>, retrieved on 3/16/2022



68. Joe Rockhead violated Betty Rubble's and Betty Rubble acting as the conscience of The Bronco Burger's right to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law recognized and protected with S1(a) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960** when he tried to unlawfully bill The Bronco Burger and add onto it a victim's surcharge fee.
69. Joe Rockhead violated Betty Rubble's and Betty Rubble acting as the conscience of The Bronco Burger's right to equality before the law and protection of the law recognized and protected with S1(b) of the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**.

**Witnesses and Proof**

**Hitchens' razor** is a law in epistemology (philosophical razor), which states that the burden of proof or onus in a debate lies with the claim-maker, and if he or she does not meet it, the opponent does not need to argue against the unfounded claim. It is named for journalist and writer Christopher Hitchens (1949-2011), who formulated it thus.

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.  
ALL STATEMENTS MADE ARE FACTS AND ARE NOT MEANT TO MISLEAD.  
NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT; NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL**

**CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE**

I, Betty Rubble, of the City of Bedrock in the County of Stoneage and acting as the Conscience of The Bronco Burger will accept the contract and honour the conviction for failure to perform under Reopening of Ontario Act 2020 as amended, S10(1) and I further agree to pay a penalty not exceeding \$1.00 (one dollar) providing that Joe Rockhead, acting as an agent under the identity of officer #5678 on behalf of the City of Bedrock Enforcement Services, and who is known personally as Joe Rockhead, provides the following evidence under sworn affidavit.

1. Proof that Joe Rockhead and his employer have a direct claim to this matter and that they have the lawful right to profit from it.

**Rights and Freedoms in Canada.**

The Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960 Recognizes and Protects:

- 1(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;
- 1(b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law;

**Maxim - Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit.**

Legislation is based upon acquiescence is acceptance to the social contract principal and is therefore a benefit of the social contract. Any other basis of legislation would not be free and democratic as stated with the **Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960**, it would be oppressive and administrative as acceptance would not be intentional and voluntary.

**Maxim - Where there is no act, there can be no force.**

Where there is no law, there is no force, it becomes law only upon acceptance.

**Maxim - The laws sometimes sleep, but never die.**

Failure to protect my rights in the past does not prevent me from protecting my rights in the present.

**Maxim - Those awake, not those asleep, the laws assist. [1 Timothy 1:9]**

Those aware of the law, can use the law to help protect their rights.

2. Proof that anyone acting on behalf of the government, operating in man's law, has the right to supersede God's law and use their position of trust as an authority to harass, intimidate and coerce individuals in order to profit by it and create servitude.
3. A victim surcharge was added. I want proof of who the victim is with an opportunity to question them.
4. A breakdown of the administration fee and how each cost is distributed with the right to review for rebuttal.

5. A copy of that signed contract that We, Betty Rubble or Betty Rubble acting as the Conscience for The Bronco Burger would of had to of knowingly signed and agreed to with full understanding as to the penalties attached and would have stated that I waive (forfeit) my God-given rights and of which the terms of the contract have in no way changed since the original agreement was made.

Maxim - **The essence of a contract being assent, there is no contract where assent is wanting.**  
If I have not willingly signed the bill given to me by the police officer, waiving my rights and accepting the judgment and consequences of the court, then I am not bound by that contract.

Maxim - **Consent makes the law. A contract is a law between parties, which can acquire force only by consent.**

Maxim - **Consent makes the law: the terms of a contract, lawful in its purpose, constitute the law as between the parties.**

Maxim - **Agreements give the law to the contract.**

Maxim - **In the agreements of the contracting parties, the rule is to regard the intention rather than the words.**

#### MAXIMS OF PROOF

1. **When the plaintiff does not prove his case, the defendant is absolved.**
2. **When opinions are equal, a defendant is acquitted.**
3. **It is in the nature of things, that he who denies a fact is not bound to prove it.**
4. **The burden of proof lies upon him who affirms, not on him who denies.**
5. **The claimant is always bound to prove: the burden of proof lies on him.**
6. **No man is bound to produce writings against himself.**
7. **No one can be made to testify against himself or betray himself.**

#### MAXIMS OF COURT AND PLEAS

1. **An act of the court shall oppress no one.**  
The court must abide by the law and not force its will upon an individual.
2. **No one can sue in the name of another.**  
The one to charge formally with a wrong-doing must institute proceedings against (a person) for redress of grievances.
3. **No one is believed in court but upon his oath.**

#### MAXIMS OF LAW

1. **The government is to be subject to the law, for the law makes government.**  
Each individual representing the government is subject to the principle that make the laws which are universally accepted, by the authority of the people that they serve.
2. **The law is not to be violated by those in government.**  
The government and individuals representing the government, are subject to the same laws as every one, and therefore must abide by them.

#### 6. Forgery

- 366 (1) Every one commits forgery who makes a false document, knowing it to be false, with intent
- (a) that it should in any way be used or acted on as genuine, to the prejudice of any one whether within Canada