



# Canada Court Watch Report



Published by the Canadian Citizen's Free Press – By the citizens and for the citizens of Canada  
Website: <http://www.canadacourtwatch.com>

## Justice Craig Perkins – The Grinch who stole one little girl's Christmas!

**Ontario Judge's bizarre ruling orders that young girl cannot see her loving father and the sister and brothers she so much loves and wants to be with!**

**By Mike March, Justice Reporter**

**December 20, 2006**

According to one Ontario family and many of their friends and neighbours in the community, including professionals, Mr. Justice Craig Perkins, who normally sits in the Newmarket, Ontario court, has overstepped his lawful jurisdiction as a judge and committed a judicial act that many would say only a heartless and cold-blooded Grinch could do to a family just before Christmas.

In a recent ruling, Justice Perkins of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice issued a court order which basically stripped a young 10-year-old girl of her rights to associate or even speak with her loving father and siblings until she was at least 18 years of age!

The judge ordered a restraining order preventing other family members from approaching the youngest member of their family without ever once asking the girl herself what her wishes were.

In fact, the restraining order said that family members could not come within 100 meters of the child or mother, something that would be difficult to do given the small size of the community and limited shopping area in the community in which they live.

The restraining order was made at the request of the mother and her lawyer who wanted to ensure that nobody would get the chance to speak to the girl, including the girl's own school age sister and brothers.

The older siblings said that they loved their sister and all had shared a close and loving bond up until the family court got involved and their mother forcefully isolated their younger sister.

The older siblings said that their mother was trying to cover up all the abuse she had subjected the family to and that she just wanted to have her revenge against the father who the older children described as the far better and more sensible parent.

Friends and neighbours in the community who

knew this family's circumstances well were shocked when they heard about the ruling and described the ruling as absolutely bizarre and unjust.

Some who knew the child and family said that Justice Perkins should be tarred and feathered and run out of town for ever issuing such a ruling which would have devastating effects on the young child and her family.

Instead of giving this girl the security of her whole loving family, Justice Perkins imprisoned the girl into the clutches of a mother who many described as an abusive and controlling mother who would stop at nothing to seek her revenge on her ex-husband, even if it meant acting against the best interest of her own children.

This ruling by Justice Perkins falls on the heels of the other recent highly publicized cases in Barrie, Ontario where children were harmed after the family court had placed children in the care of abusive mothers.

In one case, the mother murdered both of her two children and in another case, the court and the CAS determined that it was OK for a child to be given back to a mother who had just been charged for murdering the baby's twin.

The girl's older siblings indicated that their mother had been physically and emotionally abusive to both her husband and the children.

It was uncovered in court under cross examination that the conniving mother had committed a break and enter and had broken into the father's apartment after they had separated and personally installed spyware on the father's computer which allowed her to illegally monitor the personal affairs and communication of the father and the children while they were at their father's home.

However, the mother's illegal and unethical

criminal acts did not seem to bother Justice Perkins who after listening to the testimony about how the mother had broken the law in a very premeditated manner, granted her immunity for her testimony.

The mother told Mr. Justice Perkins during trial that her father was a once respected Canadian judge but judging from her admitted illegal acts, it was clear that even having a father as a respected judge is no guarantee that the children of a judge will turn out to be law abiding citizens themselves.

The order by Mr. Justice Perkins to strip this girl from most of her loving family is an insult to the administration of Justice in Canada and an assault on freedom and democracy.

The actions of Justice Perkins amounts to the state taking children away from their parents by force, something which was done under the law in Nazi Germany during World War Two

At no time did Justice Perkins do what any reasonable and logical parent could see was the most obvious thing to do – have a neutral party ask the 10-year-old girl what she wanted in respect to her relationship with her family members.

But the most obvious and simple thing was not done and Justice Perkins miserably failed to protect the rights and freedoms of this young girl.

Leading up to the trial and during the trial, although the father requested, nobody in the court system wanted the girl's wishes and preferences to be brought to the attention of the court.

Family members knew that the girl's mother and her lawyer were opposed to having anyone speak to the child for obvious reasons that some were trying to conceal the truth and to silence the little girl.

Everyone, including the mother and her lawyer knew that the child had a loving relationship with her father and siblings and wanted to spend quality time with them, not to be locked away by her mother.

Why did Justice Perkins not do the obvious and have the girl's wishes made known?

Why was Justice Perkins so lax in his duties as a judge to protect this child's rights and freedoms?

The refusal of Justice Perkins to have this 10-year-old's wishes brought before the court speaks volumes as to his competency to sit as a Judge.

Based solely on the fact that he failed to solicit the young girl's wishes should be grounds enough to declare him as incompetent and unfit to sit as a family court judge.

Children's lawyers are routinely appointed in many family court cases yet the children's lawyer was not called in to just do a simple interview with the

girl.

If she had been asked, this young girl would have gladly expressed what she wanted if only given the opportunity to do so.

Instead, Justice Perkins, thwarted justice and helped to ensure that this young girl's wishes to be with her father and siblings were kept hidden by an unscrupulous mother who was intent on keeping the girl silent and torn apart from her other loving family members.

To further keep the truth from being known to the public, Justice Perking also took the draconian step of sealing the court file until the young girl was 18 years of age.

In addition he ordered that the names of the family could not be published and not even the names of the solicitors or any of the witnesses involved.

Such a gross and widespread publication ban in a regular family court matter is unprecedented in Canada.

To many in the community who knew the family, this publication ban was nothing more than an attempt to hide the truth and to keep the media and members of the public from finding out about this horrible injustice done under the shady veil of the law.

Although the publication ban was bizarre, this case seemed riddled with other examples of judicial interference and impropriety.

In an earlier court hearing before the trial, the judge ordered the police to padlock the court doors and to keep members of the media out of the court.

This was done illegally and without a court order.

On more than one occasion, the father was denied transcripts after being told that he could get them.

On another occasion a court hearing was suddenly turned into a case conference on the day of the scheduled court hearing without prior notice and again, the father was refused transcripts.

Court Watch volunteers spoke to a number of residents in the community where this trial was held and asked what their thoughts were of the family court system.

The vast majority of people questioned said that they had lost faith in the justice system and that the people who worked in the court had lost touch with hearts and minds with those in the community.

Many said justice was a joke in family court.

This article cannot even mention the name of the community in which people were canvassed because according to the court Order of Mr. Justice Craig Perkins, it would be a criminal offense to do so.

It's time to put an end to this Judicial Tyranny.