CITATION: Park v. Attorney General of Ontario, 2026 ONSC 2284
DIVISIONAL COURT FILE NO.: 1023/25
DATE: 20260417

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
DIVISIONAL COURT

RE: TENNYSON PARK, Applicant

AND:

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO, Respondent

BEFORE: Matheson J.

COUNSEL: *Tennyson Park, Self-Represented*

Adam Mortimer, for the Respondent

HEARD at Toronto: In writing.

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Tennyson Park has been given notice that the Court is considering making an order staying or dismissing this proceeding under r. 2.1.01 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*. The following directions were given in this regard:

> The applicant Tennyson Park has submitted a document entitled "Notice of application for judicial review and determination of legal validity". The document names the Attorney General as the respondent. The document seeks to challenge the court orders of certain Justices and Associate Justices in what appears to be ongoing civil litigation. Those orders have not been listed but some have been submitted with the Intake form. It appears from those orders that Tennyson Park seeks to challenge court decisions relating to a mortgage dispute with Manulife. The application document says that it is grounded in "peremptory norms of international law (jus cogens)" and numerous articles from the ICCRP (which appears to be a reference to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) are listed as well as the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. A stay is also sought.
>
> The court orders that have been submitted include a decision of the Court of Appeal (2025 ONCA 815) recounting court proceedings regarding Ms. Park's default on a mortgage loan, resulting in a

> default judgment and writ of possession for Ms. Park's house. According to that decision, after not attempting to challenge the default judgment, Ms. Park re-entered the house, changed the locks, and started a separate action against the lender for trespass. That action was struck out as an abuse of process because it was a collateral attack on the default judgment. Ms. Park appealed and sought a stay in the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal denied the stay pending appeal.
>
> The proposed application for judicial review appears to be an attempt to challenge court decisions indirectly, while also pursuing available appeal rights to properly challenge those decisions. This application may therefore be dismissed as an improper collateral attack on those orders. The Attorney General has submitted a request to invoke the process under r. 2.1 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* to dismiss this application as frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of the process of the court.
>
> The Registrar is directed to send out a notice under r. 2.1 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* regarding this proposed application. The respondent is not permitted to make submissions.

[2] The applicant has made lengthy submissions in response to the r. 2.1 notice, indicating that her proceeding is not a "regular" judicial review. She submits that it seeks a judicial determination of legal validity and an official notice of systemic violations and recognition of law and rights such as Universal Law & Order, and specifies the remedy of a writ of mandamus. The applicant submits that: "It is a rebellion against true lawful order" and she sets out in detail the instruments and legal principles relied upon, some of which are listed in my directions above. The submissions conclude as follows:

> Domestic institutions are **acting in contradiction to international binding norms** and have the lawful and Moral obligation; the erga omnes obligation to acknowledge the structural Violations embedded in the system including the enforcement process, to cease all continuing Violations of Non-Derogable rights (Jus Cogens), to Compel Evidentiary Disclosure as a matter of due process and to provide Remedy.
>
> The Court must enforce Writ of Mandamus and end all actions inconsistent with the rule of law and fundamental justice and end the violations of Jus Cogens.
>
> [Emphasis in original]

[3] Subrule 2.1.01(1) authorizes the Court to dismiss a proceeding as frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court. However, r. 2.1 should only be used for "the clearest

of cases": *Scaduto v. The Law Society of Upper Canada*, 2015 ONCA 733, at para. 8. This is such a case. The applicant seeks to compel the Attorney General to take steps in relation to the court orders of certain Justices and Associate Justices in civil litigation regarding a mortgage claim. The issues regarding the mortgage proceedings ought to have been raised before the justices presiding over those proceedings. Further, there were appeal rights in those proceedings, which were available to directly challenge the court decisions. This application is an impermissible collateral attack on the court decisions that are the subject of the proposed application for judicial review.

[4] This Divisional Court proceeding is dismissed under r. 2.1 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.

Matheson J.

Date: April 17, 2026