

-DRAFT-

Title: Non Persons - Less than Homeless
Author: Douglas C. Wilson
Projected publication date: 2011 APR 26
ISBN 978-0-9680166-9-5

Chapter 6

BMO Goldberg Letter

An example of a criminal activity by agents of the Federal Government

The Canadian Federal and Nova Scotia Provincial governments waged an abusive lawsuit against my wife but she won a legal appeal as the defendant and is owed the compensation specified in the court documents now claimed to be "lost". The judgment has been ignored and instead fraudulent tax assessments have been fabricated by the Federal Government and its agents and used to generate counterfeit third party demands which were then used to seize our assets and prevent us from obtaining legal assistance or earning income or paying legitimate debts. The objective appears to be: to do as much harm to us as possible.

The following is our objection to Bank officials aiding and abetting criminal activity. This is criminal activity that must be stopped and corrected.

-DRAFT-

Douglas Wilson
5941 Hwy#3 RR#1
Glenwood, NS B0W 1W0

2010 JAN 22

Attn: N. Goldberg
Personal Checking Services
BMO Bank of Montreal
354 Main Street
Yarmouth, NS B5A 4B2

Bank of Montreal
354 Main St
Yarmouth, N.S. B5A 4B2
1-210

I CERTIFY THIS TO BE A
TRUE COPY OF THE
ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Dear N. Golberg,

Your letter of 2010 JAN 06 concerning overdraft protection ignores the Cause of this issue in our Case, although the President of the Bank of Montreal, with the other Principals in this Case, do know of it and have, from the start. They are aware that the documents submitted to the Bank of Montreal by Revenue Canada are **counterfeit and that as parties to fraud, extortion and theft from our accounts**, due to the counterfeit demands submitted by Revenue Canada, the **Bank of Montreal's proper role is to assist in resolving this unjust -- indeed, criminal- situation as soon as possible, or, themselves be held liable for persisting in this crime..**

This is to notify **you** that although **you** may presume and/or claim to have acted in good faith by **your** actions taken in response to the third party demand from Revenue Canada -which has permitted theft from our accounts, and threatens our property-, the third party demand that **you** received from Revenue Canada is **counterfeit**, being based on a fraudulent document fabricated by Revenue Canada, and itself based on income and information which all the principals, **and especially those at your bank, KNOW TO BE COMPLETELY FALSE.** This was documented in correspondence immediately following two separate meetings at the Yarmouth branch last year, during which two separate bank officials, in those separate meetings, both of whom know our Case well and have also long known of our hardship --each laughed at Revenue Canada's **counterfeit** claims and demands. All who know of this and take part in this criminal activity are **liable**, and named as **liable**, in this Case., because , whether coerced or unwitting, as agents of those **officials** who extort payments, and do harm by committing such a crime, those who act on their behalf are just as guilty..

The concept of enforcement of third party demands is based on the presumption that the alleged debt is legitimate and if the third party does not comply with the extortion demand, then they will be considered to be a "party to the alleged criminal, assisting the criminal after the fact, aiding and abetting criminal activity" and therefore equally responsible for the debt.

The reverse concept would equally imply that if a debt owed to us were legitimate, as in our Case, based on a Supreme Court ruling that Kathleen WON as Defendant in a lawsuit brought against her, by two levels of the Canadian government, federal and provincial, then a third party demand by us for the compensation owed to us by Revenue Canada et al, would mean that the third party who aids and abets the fraudulent extortion based on the **counterfeit** demand by Revenue Canada, then they are equally responsible for the debt owed to us.

As you have access to our account records, you are aware that there has already been an interruption in our account service, (account frozen, negative net funds stolen) and I was told

Pg 1 of 2

-DRAFT-

by staff that if I bring our account into positive balance, these additional funds will also be seized (stolen)...

So,

Re your offer of other borrowing solutions or financing options - Since you have access to our account records, you must be aware that at the time funds were seized from our account, there was a net negative sum balance of the checking plus savings account. This means that the funds seized were seized by an act of the Bank of Montreal, which increased our overdraft using additional funds inadvertently "loaned" to us, and freezing the account then blocked my attempts to pay our "mortgage" loan, deposit future earned income [non-existent] or to even make payments against the overdraft "loan" that the Bank of Montreal extended.


IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT "BORROWING SOLUTIONS OR FINANCING OPTIONS", AS YOU PUT IT, ARE MOOT, UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED.

We encourage you to assist in resolving this situation without further participating in criminal counterfeit activity, which is your current status. Your own records and knowledge of our financial activities clearly show that we did not receive the outrageous sum alleged as nearly \$350,000.00, when your bank's employees and officers know that we have never experienced anything other than privation.

If the alleged income is legitimate, then you should be able to find out who did receive the approximate \$350,000.00 alleged income and via a third party demand, recover it for us and transfer it to us. In fact, we are owed an amount significantly greater than \$350,000.00, as a result of having won the lawsuit brought against my wife, by the governments of Canada and Nova Scotia...This letter, though, is to state, within the time frame stipulated of **fifteen [business] days from receipt of your letter** that the income claim was a fraudulent document fabricated by Revenue Canada et al, and that seizure of funds and/or assets owned by us, is therefore criminal activity you should shun, as a corporate institution, and abhor, as an individual and a group of individuals.

Sincerely,

Douglas C. Wilson


THIS TO BE A
TRUE COPY OF THE
ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Pg 2 of 2

Notarized Index & Addenda

Stamped/notarized ["TRUE COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT"]; stapled, separate; 2010 JAN 22 letter of Douglas C. Wilson to 'N. Golberg', BMO, Yarmouth, N.S. - "Pg 1 of 2, Pg 2 of 2"

Original letter, sent by fax, Friday, Jan. 22, 2010 -described above, and also marked, "Pg 1 of 2, Pg 2 of 2"; stapled, separate

I certify this to be a true copy of the original document.

Notarized Index & Addenda to notarized copy and original letter, Pg 1 BMO (page numbers are hand-printed, DCW)

Copy of cover of Jan. 22, 2010 faxed letter, Pg 2 BMO

Copies of original Court Document said by the Court to have been "Lost" [and extant as notarized originals], Pg 3, 4, 5 BMO

Stamped receipt of this Document by the Provincial Court, Pg 6 BMO

Copy of Affidavit of personal service (said by the Court to have been "Lost"), Pg 7 BMO

Handwritten fax to BMO, w/verification of sending [sent to lawyer], Pg 8, 9, 10 BMO

Fraudulent Notice of Assessment [resulting in Counterfeit 3rd party demands sent to BMO] from Rev. Ca., Pg 11, 12 BMO

Stamped cover of my first book, Pg 13 BMO

Copy of book review, Pg 14 BMO

Copy of cover to Sequel, Pg 15 BMO

Introductory pages, w/first page of Chapter One, Pg 16-31 BMO

**: This Document is presented, January 27, 2010, because on January 25, 2010, we had the opportunity to communicate with an attorney, which caused this delay.

I certify that on
January 27th / 2010
Douglas Wilson appeared
before me & presented
me with this
Notarized Index
& Addenda

Pg 1 BMO