

---

**Formal Complaint for Conduct Unbecoming of a Judge**

**Judge Gary Cohen**

---

Complainant: Kari Simpson, Executive Director for Culture Guard, and  
“Lay Advocate” for Mr. Donald Smith

Date: September 16, 2020

Address: Suite#201 22314 Fraser Highway, Langley, BC, V3A 8M6

Phone: 778 277-2201

Email: CultureGuard@gmail.com

To: The Chief Judge, Provincial Court of BC

Address: Suite #337 – 800 Hornby Street, Vancouver, BC V6Z 2C5

Form of Service: Complaint submitted electronically

Re: **Judge Gary Cohen**

Attention: Chief Judge Mellissa Gillespie,

In consideration of the following account, relating to the conduct of Judge Gary Cohen in his capacity as presiding judge on September 9, 2020, in the matter of *Yaniv v Smith* (file# 86323) in the Surrey Provincial Small Claims Court; I request, pursuant the ***Provincial Court Act***, that the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of BC, or her designate, exercise her duty and the powers assigned through this statute to commence an investigation of Judge Gary Cohen for conduct unbecoming of a judge, and conduct incompatible with the execution and duties of the office of a Provincial Court judge.

That on September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020, Judge Gary Cohen of the BC Provincial court, while presiding over *Yaniv v Smith* in the Small Claims court, failed in his duties and did engage in conduct unbecoming of a judge. Specifically:

1. Failed to do his due diligence
2. Impropriety –
  - Openly hostile, condescending, and malicious;
  - Poisonous and abusive toward Simpson (lay advocate);
  - Bullied and threatened Donald Smith to “reinstate the default order”, causing him to be in fear.
3. Denial of a fair and impartial hearing –
  - Refused to listen to Mr. Smith (Defendant);
  - Failed to inform himself about the nature of the proceeding;
  - Denied a disabled man the assistance of his advocate.
4. Abuse of Power – Making an order prohibiting Kari Simpson from assisting Donald Smith without cause or justification. Judicially handicapping a disabled man in future court proceedings.

### **Complaint background –**

Jonathon Yaniv, also known as Jonathon Jessica Yaniv, Jessica Yaniv, and most recently as Jessica Simpson, is a serial litigant and claims to be a “lesbian trans activist” on behalf of the LGBTQ+++ community.

Donald Smith, the Defendant, is an on-line reporter who is disabled and challenged by intellectual and social vulnerabilities. Mr. Smith is the on-going target of the Complainant, Jessica Yaniv, in this Small Claims matter (and others). Yaniv’s orchestrated campaign against of Mr. Smith resulted in his arrest, being charged, and then incarcerated for 39 days. Those charges have now been stayed, and investigations are underway in relation to those events.

Kari Simpson, writer of this complaint, is a long-time lay advocate and was asked to help Mr. Smith, while he was incarcerated, by his on-line friends and supporters. I was successful in getting a new bail hearing for Mr. Smith after he was detained; I then posted bail for Mr. Smith in the amount of \$10,000.00, and acted as Surety. Because of my assistance to Mr. Smith, I soon became a target of Yaniv’s—like so many others. I am also responsible for providing the voluminous binder documenting Yaniv’s campaign of

harassment, torment and death threats of Mr. Smith, to lawyers, the Crown and law enforcement agencies that resulted in the charges against Mr. Smith being stayed.

---

**Note:** Attachment #1 is a copy of my letter to Crown Counsel Natalie Fowlds after I purchased a transcript of the December 31, 2019 detainment hearing. I submit this to you as I will be requesting a broader investigation of the Provincial Court, via a separate complaint, into the conduct of other Provincial Court judges and Justices of the Peace as to how—and why—Yaniv has been allowed, and aided, to abuse court time, tax-payer-funded court resources and people, by the unchallenged and on-going waiver of court fees, the permitting of filing lawsuits—and private prosecutions—that are void of merit or compliance with the law or rules. Further, the concerning events involving the detainment of Mr. Smith and what appears to be a casual willingness to acquiesce to the Crown’s distortions of events that deprived a disabled man, Donald Smith, of his freedom and liberty. The combined events—that continue on—have turned the courts into Yaniv’s personal weapons of harassment and torment.

---

Attachment #2 is a more comprehensive backgrounder on the parties.

**Events involving Surrey Small Claims matter *Yaniv v Smith* (file # 86323)**

On March 17, 2020, Yaniv filed two matters in the Provincial Court of British Columbia (Small Claims Court), and made applications for the court to waive his court fees.

Attached as attachment #3 is a copy the *Notice of Claim* filed in Surrey Small Claims, file #86324, against “Kari Simpson”; and attachment #4 is the fee waiver order granted to Yaniv. The fees were waived—despite the fact that Yaniv owns a condo, car, travels often, and has credit cards available to him.

Attachment #5 is a copy of the *Notice of Claim* filed in Surrey Small Claims, file #86323 against Donald Smith; and the fee waiver order is attachment #6.

The lawsuit Yaniv filed against Donald Smith related entirely to the events from July 2019 to December 2019—events that resulted in Yaniv orchestrating the aforementioned arrest, laying of criminal charges and 39 days of incarceration of Donald Smith, whom Yaniv himself has referred to as a “retard”, “homeless loser” *etc.*.... As previously stated, those charges have now been stayed. Attachment #7 is a copy of the Crown’s notice to the court that Mr. Smith’s charges had been stayed.

I am uncertain as to the date Mr. Smith was served with the Yaniv small claims matter, but I was aware that Yaniv had filed the lawsuit against him. I obtained a copy of the claim against Mr. Smith, and he and I worked together on his reply.

On April 7, 2020, I met Mr. Smith at the Surrey Provincial Court for the purposes of filing our reply documents. Copies of both reply documents are attached as attachment #8.

Upon approaching the courthouse, Mr. Smith saw a number of sheriffs outside the courthouse; and was terrified that he was going to be arrested again. This was very traumatic for Mr. Smith, due to the circumstances of his arrest the last time he tried to attend court in Surrey.

I approached the sheriffs and was informed that no one was permitted into the courthouse due to COVID. When I asked about filing court documents, they provided an “Advisory Notice” with general information and a telephone number. I took a picture of the notice. I phoned the number listed, 604-572-2219, numerous times but there was no response. Attachment #9 is a copy of that “notice”.

I endeavoured to find information on-line, but there was no information concerning filing non-urgent information in the small claims court at this time.

I then sent both replies via separate emails. Attachment #10 are copies of those emails.

I was next informed by Mr. Smith’s on-line friends—who monitor Yaniv’s obsessive use of the courts to sue people—that Yaniv had filed an application for a default hearing in the small claims matter. I contacted the small claims clerk at the Surrey Provincial Court, and was informed that there was considerable confusion in the early days of the COVID lockdown; that my case and that of Mr. Smith fell within that period of time; and that it was possible they got lost in the mix. Attachment #11 is a copy of Yaniv’s Application for a Default Order against me.

On August 4, 2020, Mr. Smith met me at the Surrey courthouse to file our respective applications (with accompanying affidavits) to cancel, or for a “dismiss by default” order. Copies of those documents are Attachment #12. I wanted to also file another, more extensive affidavit; but the clerks wanted to leave, as it was late in the day. I was assured that the application presented would suffice.

We were further informed by the clerk that the judges were well aware of the challenges with filing documents, and that a request for a “late reply” would most likely be granted.

Mr. Smith and I then drove together in my car to the Surrey Shopper’s Drug Mart store, and mailed the filed documents, via registered mail, to Yaniv.

As instructed, I called in to join the August 14, 2020, conference call. Mr. Smith, who was in Calgary at the time, also called in. Attachment #13 is a copy of that notice.

It was clear to me that the judge knew the merits, or lack thereof, within the claim made against me by Yaniv. I wasn’t required to say much. Any informed reader of the

claim made by Yaniv had to conclude that Small Claims court had no jurisdiction, and his suit was certain to fail. During the proceeding Judge Gaffer kindly schooled Yaniv in some fundamental aspects of the law as it related to the jurisdiction of the Small Claims court, and then asked if he wanted to “withdraw” his claim against me. Yaniv agreed to withdraw.

Prior to my own matter concluding, I informed the judge that I was a also lay advocate for Donald Smith, and asked permission to assist him, because he has difficulty expressing himself accurately, and I was familiar with his case. Judge Gaffer refused to allow me to assist, and then ordered me off the phone. (Judge Gaffer, had some insight into the challenges Mr. Smith suffers from as she was the judge that granted Mr. Smith bail. At that hearing I was permitted to address the court and provide some background on the case and specific information about Mr. Smith.)

---

**Note:** *Judge Gaffer’s conduct of ordering me off of the phone was unlawful, and I will make a separate complaint against her for this conduct; but I complied.*

---

Mr. Smith called me at the conclusion of his matter as was distraught, frustrated and highly excited (not in a good way). I tried to find out what happened, believing that the case would end like mine; but it didn’t. Ordering me to hang up the phone, and my not being able to help Mr. Smith was very upsetting to him—and unfair. Mr. Smith was unable to inform me as to what transpired, except for general recollections—“the judge said the same thing”, “Yaniv wouldn’t stop”, “another hearing in September”, “I don’t have to do anything with papers; I asked the judge.”

When I tried to question Mr. Smith more about what transpired or “what instructions did the judge give you”, he was adamant that he didn’t have to do anything, and that another date had been set but couldn’t tell me when. Working closely with Mr. Smith on his case, I have come to know that when Mr. Smith says he is sure about something that he is correct, even if you don’t get the details.

I contacted Small Claims registry to find out when the next date was set, and was told that it was set for September 9. The clerk didn’t have any other information she could provide on what had transpired, nor about the nature of the September 9 hearing.

I immediately called Verbatim Transcriptions, and ordered a transcript of the September 9, 2020 proceeding. I was informed that they were backlogged due to the courts opening up and the number of requests for transcripts being ordered, and that there might be delays.

Mr. Smith received a notice about the proceeding on September 9, 2020. Attachment #14 is a copy of that notice.

On September 9, 2020, the date of the hearing Mr. Smith came to my office. I wrote out the dates associated with the filing of documents, and some other possible things that could be helpful like “ask for an adjournment until the transcripts arrive”, *etc.*, to help Mr. Smith in the off-chance that the judge might not let me assist.

The phone was on “speaker”, I could hear the all the proceedings, and I was at first generally encouraged by the demeanor of Judge Cohen. He was patient and informative with parties proceeding the *Yaniv v Smith* matter. Of course, Small Claims Court is structured to be less formal than superior courts, so I thought Mr. Smith might do OK.

**I was wrong.**

---

**NOTE:** *This part of the complaint is being made from my notes, I have ordered the transcript and will amend if necessary. Any quoted statements are meant as a general recollection and taken from my notes.*

---

The *Yaniv v Smith* matter was called, and it became clear that Judge Cohen either didn’t know what the matter before him was for, or he was willing to give Yaniv a simple win. He did acknowledge that the default order had been dismissed. I knew when Judge Cohen asked Yaniv to inform him about why this matter was before the court that something was wrong and things were not going to go well.

Yaniv took advantage of the Judge Cohen’s self-declared ignorance about the proceeding and misinformed Judge Cohen as to why Judge Gaffer had scheduled the proceeding. Then, being prompted by Judge Cohen, Yaniv stated that it was to set a trial.

Judge Cohen invited Mr. Smith into the discussion and Mr. Smith tried to explain the events as best as he could. Judge Cohen became fixated on reply documents and asked Mr. Smith if he had filed one. Mr. Smith tried to answer, and soon became frustrated and agitated; he knew that he didn’t have to file anything for this proceeding but couldn’t explain that. Mr. Smith asked Judge Cohen if his “disability advocate” (meaning me) could speak.

I introduced myself and tried to explain the events that had transpired, court being closed, and the exchange with the clerks at the registry. I tried to explain that the reply information was to form part of the evidence at the hearing for the dismissal of the default order and that the Affidavit filed on August 4 stated that such evidence would be presented. Judge Cohen became condescending, rude, and was belligerently harping on about the reply.

Judge Cohen refused to allow me to state the events, and soon began attacking me personally. He sarcastically asked if I were a lawyer. At no time have I ever claimed to be a lawyer (nor do I have any desire to be one). In all documents, I have purposely and

deliberately identified myself as a “lay advocate”; and Mr. Smith refers to me as his “disability advocate”.

Judge Cohen then permitted Yaniv to make a number of false, slanderous and misleading statements about me without chastisement (but later in the hearing, when Mr. Smith asserted his views about Yaniv, he was threatened by Judge Cohen).

Judge Cohen refused to let me state important information. When I asked a number of times to be able to state important information “for the record”, the hostility of Judge Cohen was concerning; next he ordered me off the phone. I refused, reminding him that these proceedings are public and open—or something to that effect.

Judge Cohen then demanded the I cease speaking and required Mr. Smith speak to the issues. Mr. Smith tried to inform the judge, with my prompting, that the transcripts had been ordered so we could know understand why Judge Gaffer had scheduled the September 9, 2020 proceeding. Judge Cohen’s hostility increased and he refused to hear, let alone consider, Mr. Smith’s request.

There were a number of other malicious and poisonous remarks about me made by Judge Cohen—including, at one point, suggesting to Mr. Smith that “Ms. Simpson, who seems to get you into trouble...”, and “...poor job...”, that I “abused my privilege in court”, and something about “pretending to be a lawyer...” (which was untrue).

During this time, Mr. Smith was frustrated and desperately trying to explain things to the judge. I was now writing notes to Mr. Smith telling him to tell the judge again that we have ordered the transcripts.... Judge Cohen continued in his hostility, refusing to listen to Mr. Smith.

Next Judge Cohen wrongfully lectured Mr. Smith about not replying, threatened to reinstate the dismissed default order, thus terrifying Mr. Smith with the prospect of having to pay Yaniv. At this point it was clear to me that Judge Cohen was going to give Yaniv a reinstated Default Judgement so I just wrote a note to Mr. Smith instructing him to ask for an extension to file his reply. He did.

Judge Cohen then asked how long Mr. Smith would need? “A month,” was Mr. Smith’s response; but Judge Cohen only gave him 3 days. The judge praised Mr. Smith for doing well on his own, failing to realize that Mr. Smith was still being assisted by me.

Judge Cohen, still clearly hostile, then asked the clerk questions about my attendance at the proceeding, “did she check in....?” and then wrote the order. Judge Cohen then took it upon himself to deny a disabled man (Mr. Smith) the ability to have as an advocate the person who is fully informed about the numerous legal matters that Yaniv has launched against him (Smith); and Judge Cohen then created an order prohibiting me from helping Mr. Smith in this matter before the Small Claims court.

Those listening in were shocked by the judge’s behaviour. One of the listeners in my office immediately Googled him. The results provided an explanation. Attachment #15

is a copy of the August 14, 2012 *Xtra Magazine* article written about “A gay judge in BC has been given a Hero Award by the Canadian legal community.” That judge is Gary Cohen.

The ***Canadian Judicial Council’s Ethical Guidelines for Judges*** warns judges against being compromised by political activity:

#### D. Political Activity

1. *Judges should refrain from conduct such as membership in groups or organizations or participation in public discussion which, in the mind of a reasonable, fair minded and informed person, would undermine confidence in a judge’s impartiality with respect to issues that could come before the courts.*
2. *All partisan political activity must cease upon appointment. Judges should refrain from conduct that, in the mind of a reasonable, fair minded and informed person, could give rise to the appearance that the judge is engaged in political activity.*

In the article (and numerous others) Judge Cohen is clearly identified as winning the award due to his activism as a “gay judge”, asserting that he won the award due to his work in “advancing the cause for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and two-spirited people.” An accolade of Judge Cohen goes on to declare, “Other members of the queer community have turned to him for advice, and other judges turn to him for help with gay and lesbian issues.”

The article (and others) becomes more damning, as it illuminates Judge Cohen’s political activities as a judge within the Canadian Bar Association, the judiciary and other organizations. The “SOGIC” Award (the Canadian Bar Association’s ‘Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Conference’) being given to a judge—and that judge, Judge Gary Cohen, accepting—it raises more concerns and questions that will be addressed with a request from all three courts for an investigation into the privileged political role this one group, “LGBTQ++ activists, is receiving.

The conduct of Judge Cohen in the September 9, 2020, proceeding was clearly an abuse of power by a judge who is blinded by his own political activism, and is willing to use the courtroom as weapon for silencing, demeaning and undermining someone whom he views as a political adversary. Such “cancel culture” tactics by activist judges cannot be tolerated, even when the judge has been labeled a “hero” by the politically powerful movement of sex activists within the Canadian Bar Association.

Yaniv, now armed with Judge Cohen’s order prohibiting me from assisting Mr. Smith in the small claims matter—a new weapon to harm and further harass and torment Mr.



Smith—pounced. The very next day, Yaniv filed an application, full of lies, defamatory comments and mistruths about me in an already existing lawsuit Yaniv filed against Mr. Smith in the Supreme Court of BC (BCSC) in December of 2019 —*Yaniv v Smith* Number S1914124, seeking a similar order to Judge Cohen's. Attachment #16 is a copy of that *Notice of Claim* and attachment #17 is a copy of the September 10, 2020 application in the BCSC to prohibit me from assisting Mr. Smith in the BCSC matter.

By his own hand, Judge Gary Cohen has become complicit in furthering Yaniv's criminal campaign of terror and harm against a vulnerable disabled man named Donald Smith—and continue in his abuse of tax-payers that fund the courts.

In addition to the filing in BCSC, Yaniv filed **another** *Application to a Judge* in the Small Claims matter (86323) stating:

*Due to harassment and abuse from a third party by the name of Kari Simpson interjecting themselves (sic) into court proceedings, and a court order requiring to be issued from Judge Gary Cohen to prevent Kari Simpson from participating, assisting, or being part of these proceedings, and Kari Simpson refusing to comply with that order, that the settlement conference be done in person due to the continued abuse that consists of: Recording and publishing of proceedings, photographing in court. Also, that Ms. Kari Simpson due to her hateful and aggressive outbursts due to Judge Gary Cohen's sexual orientation, and Kari being an anti-LGBTQ advocate, that Kari Simpson be also barred from entering these proceedings*

Yaniv continues, and states as the 'facts' on which his application is made, more lies and defamatory comments:

- The court order issued by Judge Gary Cohen*
- Kari Simpson belittling and being aggressive and abusive towards Judge Cohen due to his sexual orientation.*
- Kari Simpson outright not complying with the issued court order, and not willing to comply with it.*
- Fair process for the settlement conference.*

Attachment #18 is a copy of the above referenced September 10, 2020, application filed in Small Claims registry by Yaniv.

---

**Note:** *It should be stated that I was unaware of Judge Cohen's sexual orientation and political activism as a gay judge until the conclusion of the hostile and troubling proceeding when another attendee Googled him, and informed me about his published activities and self-declared activism.*

*Sex activists like Yaniv, who like so many falsely claim to speak on behalf of the entire LGBTQ+++ community, indulge in defaming anyone who challenges the political movement that works under the banner of "Pride." And no one to date has been*

*able to support, with any form of evidence, any assertion of “hate” for which I am responsible; or any other form of speech or action that diminishes any member contributing to our civil and diverse society. Please find as attachment #19 a copy of my commentary “Pride is Political,” that states my position on the increasing problems and abuses associated with ‘Pride Privilege’.*

---

On September 10, 2020 I received a call from the transcription company, advising that my August 14, 2020 transcripts were ready. The transcripts proved Mr. Smith right: he was **not required** to file any documents.

***Regrettably for Judge Cohen, the purpose of that hearing was to give an opportunity to withdraw or if he wanted to proceed, make submissions showing that the Small Claims Court had jurisdiction to hear his claim, nothing more.***

According to the transcript of the proceeding Judge Gaffer made an oral ruling and informed Mr. Smith that his application to set aside the default order was unnecessary at this point, as she found it “moot”. She invited Mr. Smith to withdraw it. Judge Gaffer had done this same thing in the small claims suit that Yaniv launched against me, and Mr. Smith heard me agree to the withdraw. Mr. Smith did the same and agreed to withdraw. Judge Gaffer then directed her attention to Yaniv and states (page 5 lines 9 —35):

*Ms. Yaniv, I have examined the body of your Notice of Claim and similar to the comments that I made with regards to your Notice of Claim concerning Ms. Simpson, I note that your Notice of Claim speaks of harassment by Mr. Smith of you, as well as violations of his bail order concerning the deletion of content relating to you from social media. And you are seeking damages for emotional damage and financial loss as a result of the postings to social media by Mr. Smith.*

*As I indicated to you in the earlier hearing, Ms. Yaniv, the matter concerning harassment is a criminal matter and that is properly dealt with by the police and in the criminal court. The matter concerning emotional damage due to items posted to -- emotional and financial damage deals with possible slander and libel (sic) which are matters that are specifically excluded from the jurisdiction of the Provincial Court.*

*The allegations of breach of a court order are matters again that are dealt with in the criminal court and not in Small Claims court. So, at this point the crux of your Notice of Claim against Mr. Smith does not appear to be within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Court.*

Judge Gaffer goes on at lines 36 –39 of the transcript to ask if Yaniv wants to withdraw his Notice of Claim:

*Do you wish additional time to consider your Notice of Claim, and whether you're going to proceed with it? Or do you wish to withdraw your Notice of Claim and seek redress elsewhere?*

Yaniv fails to answer the judge's question and instead informs the court that he has already commenced a Supreme Court action. Beginning at line 40:

*Thank you, Your Honour. There is already a Supreme Court action in relation to Mr. Smith's continuous defamation and libel, so I will be—I'll be following up with the Supreme Court registry in regards to that.*

Judge Gaffer rephrases the question; Page 5, lines 45 – Page 6, line 1–2

*Ms. Yaniv, my question to you is: What would you like to do? Do you want to have additional time to try to convince the court that it does have jurisdiction on these matters? Or do you wish to withdraw your claim?*

Judge Gaffer then adjourns the matter and seeks the next applications date in Small Claims. During the time the clerk is determining the requested date Yaniv informs the court about the “fire” in his building and how he needs time to put this all together because he is now having to deal with “a large insurance thing here...”

Page 6, lines 26 – 33, Judge Gaffer clarifies what is transpiring:

*Ms. Yaniv, just to be clear, this additional time is for you to determine whether you are going to proceed with your claim and wish—and for you to determine whether you would like to have the opportunity to make submissions to the court about whether the court has jurisdiction over your claim, so that we are absolutely clear.*

While Judge Gaffer is waiting for the date, Donald Smith asks if he can ask a question, the judge allows him to ask it.

Page 7 lines 46-47, page 8 lines 1-2

*For this court date coming up—for this court date coming up and all that stuff, do I need to file more paperwork or something like that or—*

The court responds with “No, Sir”.

Donald asks “No, Sir?”

And again, Judge Gaffer assures him by saying “No.”

The clerk come back with dates and September 9, 2020 at 11:00 a.m. is set.

Judge Gaffer again confirms with Yaniv once more about the proceeding. Page 9 lines 20, states to Yaniv,

*And at that time, Ms. Yaniv, you are aware of what you need to be—  
what information you need to provide to the court.”*

Judge Cohen not only engaged in conduct unbecoming a judge, but was clearly ill-prepared, incompetent and wilfully gullible to Yaniv’s tactics of lies and misinformation as to what was ordered by Judge Gaffer to happen at this proceeding.

Needless to say, an appeal of Judge Cohen’s order will be forthcoming and this complaint will form a part of that record and other court matters adversely affected by his abusive order.

I am most certain that anyone who hears the actual recording will agree that a mere transcript would not suffice in conveying Judge Cohen’s depth of hostility, facetiousness and poisoned commentary that support this complaint.

On September 9, 2020 Judge Cohen ordered Mr. Smith to file a reply within three working days. I went to the Surrey Provincial Courthouse on September 14, 2020, to assist Mr. Smith in filing his reply and two other applications: The first to set a date for Yaniv to make submissions to the court as ordered by Judge Gaffer; the second to obtain copies of the audio recording for the appeal of Judge Cohen’s order.

When we tried to file the required paper-work at the Small Claims counter, we were informed that I couldn’t help Mr. Smith do his filing. Of course, the scene was ludicrous: the poor clerk trying to deal with Mr. Smith and the chaos associated with his enthusiastic volume and repetitious expressions — while other people tried to deal with their filings — was most amusing. Finally, I suggested to the clerk that I speak to Mr. Smith and then he would direct the clerk. The clerk apologized but said she had to abide by the order. I agreed with her.

Mr. Smith obtained a copy of the Cohen order. Judge Cohen’s handwritten order states:

PERMISSION TO DEFENDANT TO FILE  
REPLY BY 4:00 pm MONDAY SEP 14, 2020 OR  
DEFAULT JUDGEMENT REINSTATED.

THIS COURT ORDERS THAT KARI SIMPSON  
NOT ACT FURTHER IN THIS MATTER.

Attachment #20 is a true copy. Fortunately for Mr. Smith, for some reason I was allowed to pay the fees associated with obtaining the order and copies obtained, I suppose financing court fees is not considered a form of assistance.

Any reader of this complaint can see that the conduct of Judge Cohen is now taking up valuable time in the Supreme Court of BC, costly expenses to Smith (Simpson) as I have had to purchase more transcripts because Judge Cohen failed in his duties of

knowing what the September 9, proceeding was about, and more still yet transcripts to undo the damage he has caused with his abusive order. And of course, attendance and costly travel to yet more ridiculous proceedings that are providing nothing more than a court room stage for Yaniv to continue his on-going tax-payer funded campaigns of harassment against Donald Smith and others.

Judge Gary Cohen's conduct cannot be dismissed. He owes Donald Smith and me, Kari Simpson, a public apology; and he owes every party on the teleconference that day a personal written advisement that his demeaning conduct and unfounded accusations directed at me were uncalled for.

Judge Gary Cohen has brought the administration of justice into disrepute, and is complicit in furthering Yaniv's criminal campaign of terror and harm against a vulnerable disabled man: Donald Smith.

I believe it prudent of the investigator in this matter to also review the conduct of Judge Cohen in the matter following Mr. Smith's case involving Yaniv and the Rebel News Media on September 9, 2020, as it will bolster the case of favouritism, bias and aiding Yaniv in his campaigns to terrorize anyone who exposes his predatory, illegal and anti-social behaviours.

Immediately following Judge Cohen's instructions to him during the Small Claims proceeding in *Yaniv v Rebel News* about filing defamation claims against Rebel media, another file was opened by Yaniv in the BCSC against the Rebel News Media. Fortunately, Yaniv's attempt to con the BCSC into waiving his fees on this file failed, and he was finally denied a free "fee" ride in the BCSC.

Please be advised that I will amend this complaint if necessary, once the transcripts from the September 9, 2020, matter are received.

Respectfully submitted,

Kari Simpson.