

Live Updates - refresh the page to see the latest update:

- [Justice Alan Ross](#) presiding.
- Hearing has started and the lawyers are doing their introductions and walking through the [statement of claim](#).
- Lead defense counsel (Witten) is arguing the claim is spurious convoluted and rife with conspiracy theories and vexatious beyond what the court should consider.
- Defense is arguing, BC 12-17 year old's lack of informed consent, parental consent, medical experimentation and implicit negligence, that these claims and international law / Nuremberg codes don't apply and are 'non justiciable' citing precedents, and Willoughby vs Chong.
- Defense now citing Fowler, saying defense can't separate material from immaterial facts and conspiracy theories sprinkled throughout. Plaintiff therefore claims case doesn't reach standards of reasonable clarity to be able to respond, and fails to establish actionable causes of negligence etc.
- Defense is declaring claim is scandalous, confusing and impossible (pg 391) and citing irrelevance of Bill Gates etc and allegations re others not a party to this claim. Frivolous, fanciful and groundless re conspiracy etc so not worth court's consideration.
- Defense calls NWO allegations groundless and irrelevance vexatious and abuse of process.
- Rocco will have his turn to respond after the defense has laid out their full response.
- Defense claiming case is vexatious and abuse of court and designed to harass govt health officials. Also believes some of the criminal claims don't belong in a Civi claim or court.
- Defense arguing that the claim is intended to harass and or slander defendants
- Simultaneously arguing that the A4C NOLs are compromising case because of the NOL non-legal status.
- Defense is citing pages from the A4C website, and claiming the fundraising is somehow the motive behind the case.
- NOLs are a second prong: citing Employer NOL page and how to take action and how to's. Saying that to a lay person these look like a legal document so defense is asking judge to see a vaccine NOL as intimidating.
- It appears that the defense is trying to argue that the NOLs are also an intimidation tactic and so that confirms that the case is just for intimidation.
- Defense now citing how many Twitter followers Rocco has sent the claim to saying that the purpose is improper and abuse of court process they're also asking for no recourse to appeal.
- On a break.
- Defense lawyer for Vancouver Island Health: Arguing scandalous claim and absence of evidence.
- Saying convoluted and hard to pick out which claims vs which defendant so not reasonably argued against and should be struck.
- Now trans link lawyer and Peter Kwok argued claims not directly vs his client(s).
- TL lawyer saying claim safe policy and if constitutional nature then beyond the scope of his client, citing vaxx discrimination case precedent from last year where case was struck.
- Citing other precedent Mansouri (Ontario COVID case) citing narrative as fact and judge can take judicial notice of how anti narrative claims in this action can be assumed to be unfounded [not much of an argument so circular].
- Now taking early lunch break.
- Rocco's arguing vs conspiracy narrative asking them to address facts
- Walking through case law precedents now.

- Arguing amendments should allow amendment.
- Saying this case is too much work is no reason to strike.
- He says that there are tons of conspiracies happening but they are not theories. Scientific fact: no one has isolated the virus. PCR is the only tool which has been thrown out as credible and it has a 96.5% false positive result.
- Constitutional questions are justiciable arguing from Supreme Court precedent.
- Arguing the right to be heard and submit evidence.
- Rocco says that almost all of his cases have had motions to strike. The 1st lawyer tried to say that Rocco has had 10 motions to strike but failed to mention that was out of almost 600 cases. The judge said he didn't realize that.
- Re constitutional rights re vaccines and measures and citing US and India Supreme Court and applying to Bonnie Henry and access to Canadian Health Care. Judge asking for clarification on these other national Supreme Court precedents.
- Arguing the banning discrimination of unvaxxed and coercion of vaxx to access public places and work or medical care makes it a rights / constitutional matter.
- Rocco saying the defense's claim of conspiracy theories, not based on fact, amounts to baseless smear against his client and claim, and they have provided no facts to support said smear campaign.
- Cited the Ontario judge in favor of mother to not vax her kids.
- Arguing admissibility of relevant international law and/or treaties, where these align with the provisions of the constitution are justiciable, whether they're signed to Canada or not.
- The constitution does not bend, kneel and kiss the feet of judicial legislators.
- Calls out government for wasting money in so many areas but now the government can't spend a little bit of money to discuss people's constitutional rights? It's lazy for the defendant to say it is a waste of time and would take too long.
- He doesn't understand why "his friend" the lawyer doesn't understand rights such as the right to religion and he's willing to give him a free 14 hour course on constitutional rights! These are rights!
- He understands that the claims they are making are not very nice and are somewhat uncomfortable but the court has never been about being comfortable.
- Rocco talks about the run around he has had from courts when A4C tried to first file. Then when Rocco got sick the court agreed to file. Then court said Rocco dragged his heels, which was not the case.
- This is an issue of public interest.
- In their affidavit the defence is trying to call Rocco out over a couple of tweets written about him, which is absurd. If you look up Rocco's name you will find thousands of times his name is mentioned. He has won and lost cases, as have many others. Rocco gives credit to who he is and his experience and that this case has warrant and has merit.
- None of the defence lawyers reply and none of them rebut his testimony.
- Court is now adjourned for a decision.