

IN THE FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Court File No.: [To be assigned]

Plaintiff: Ben Beveridge

Defendants: Stillman LLP, Gregory R. Bentz, Erik L. Bruveris, John W. Hagg, Christopher G. Hoose, Ara L. McKee, Blair E. Maxston, K.C., Taylor Maxston, Jessie Bakker, Hassin Sam Mraiche, Law Society of Alberta, and Alberta Lawyers Indemnity Association (ALIA)

This is not a private dispute. It is a constitutional challenge to the misuse of legal institutions as instruments of suppression and coercion. The Plaintiff seeks structural remedy to prevent the replication of these tactics across Canada.

JURISDICTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION

1. *This Honourable Court has jurisdiction pursuant to sections 17-18 of the Federal Courts Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. F-7, and section 24(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (UK), 1982, c. 11.*
 2. *This action raises fundamental questions of constitutional law, the protection of democratic discourse, and the systemic abuse of legal process that transcend provincial boundaries and require federal adjudication.*
-

PARTIES

3. *The Plaintiff, **Ben Beveridge**, is a Canadian citizen, strategic systems analyst, and public interest advocate operating under the mandate "Proconsul," with no litigation history or commercial relationship with any Defendant. The Plaintiff claims standing not only as the direct target of the abuse, but as a public agent acting under mandate to preserve legal and constitutional integrity.*
4. ***Stillman LLP** is a limited liability partnership operating in Alberta, holding itself out as providing legal services to the public.*
5. ***Gregory R. Bentz, Erik L. Bruveris, John W. Hagg, Christopher G. Hoose, Ara L. McKee, Blair E. Maxston, K.C., Taylor Maxston, and Jessie Bakker** are lawyers licensed by the Law Society of Alberta and partners or associates of Stillman LLP.*

6. **Hassin Sam Mraiche** is the principal of MHCare Medical Corporation and, upon information and belief, exercises de facto operational control over the legal strategy and tactical deployment of Stillman LLP's services.
 7. **Law Society of Alberta** is the regulatory body responsible for governing the conduct of lawyers in Alberta, including the individual lawyer Defendants, and maintaining public confidence in the legal profession.
 8. **Alberta Lawyers Indemnity Association (ALIA)** is the professional liability insurer for Alberta lawyers, providing coverage that enables and financially underwrites the professional activities of the lawyer Defendants.
-

FACTUAL MATRIX

The Protected Expression

9. On or about February 27, 2025, the Plaintiff published an article titled "No Money, No Power" — a structural analysis of how institutional power operates to shield itself from public accountability through legal and procedural mechanisms.
10. The article made no false statements of fact, and was grounded entirely in publicly available information and analytical framework.
11. The article constituted core political expression protected by section 2(b) of the Charter, addressing matters of public interest including government procurement, regulatory capture, and institutional accountability.

The Coordinated Suppression Campaign

12. On May 23, 2025, Stillman LLP, acting under the direction and control of Defendant Mraiche, issued formal legal correspondence to the Plaintiff containing:
 - a) Explicit demands for the removal of constitutionally protected expression;
 - b) Threats of legal consequences absent any filed claim or identified cause of action;
 - c) Coercive demands for private communications and financial records;
 - d) Strategic references to unrelated litigation involving journalist Nathan Pike, with whom the Plaintiff has no legal relationship.

13. *The correspondence was not grounded in any legitimate legal claim but constituted a deliberate attempt to:*

- a) Circumvent judicial process to obtain discovery-like information;*
- b) Silence public commentary through extra-judicial intimidation;*
- c) Extract private intelligence on third parties for strategic advantage in separate proceedings.*

Institutional Regulatory Failure

- 14. Upon notification of this conduct, the Law Society of Alberta deflected responsibility by claiming "no jurisdiction over law firms" while maintaining jurisdiction only over "individual lawyers," thereby creating an accountability gap that enables coordinated firm-wide constitutional violations.*
- 15. ALIA, despite being formally notified of the constitutional violations being underwritten by their professional liability coverage, failed to investigate, suspend coverage, or take any remedial action, thereby enabling continued Charter breaches through financial protection.*

The Constitutional Violations

- 16. The Defendants' conduct constituted direct and intentional violations of the Plaintiff's Charter rights, specifically:*
 - a) **Section 2(b):** By threatening consequences for lawful expression and demanding its suppression;*
 - b) **Section 7:** By jeopardising the Plaintiff's security of the person through threats to livelihood and professional standing without due process.*

CAUSES OF ACTION

Count I: Charter Breach - Section 2(b) Freedom of Expression

- 17. The Defendants violated section 2(b) of the Charter by:*
 - a) Attempting to compel the suppression of core political expression;*
 - b) Threatening adverse consequences for the exercise of constitutionally protected speech;*

c) Using institutional legal authority to chill democratic discourse.

18. The violation cannot be justified under section 1 of the Charter as it serves no pressing and substantial objective and is neither rationally connected to a legitimate purpose nor minimally impairing of constitutional rights.

Count II: Charter Breach - Section 7 Security of the Person

19. The Defendants violated section 7 of the Charter by:

a) Threatening the Plaintiff's economic security and professional reputation;

b) Subjecting the Plaintiff to psychological stress and coercion;

c) Denying fundamental justice by bypassing judicial process while invoking legal consequences.

Count III: Abuse of Process and Conspiracy

20. The Defendants engaged in a civil conspiracy to abuse legal process by:

a) Using the structure and authority of legal practice to achieve ends unrelated to legitimate legal remedies;

b) Coordinating to suppress expression and extract information outside proper judicial channels;

c) Converting legal infrastructure into an instrument of private coercion.

Count IV: Unauthorised Practice of Law

21. Defendant Mraiche, if not licensed to practice law in Canada, engaged in unauthorised practice by:

a) Directing legal strategy and tactical deployment of legal threats;

b) Exercising control over legal correspondence and demands;

c) Using licensed practitioners as instruments for his personal and commercial interests.

22. If Defendant Mraiche is licensed, his conduct constitutes professional misconduct and ethical breach warranting civil remedy.

Count V: Institutional Negligence and Enabling

23. *The Law Society of Alberta breached its statutory and constitutional duties by:*

- a) Failing to establish adequate oversight mechanisms for coordinated firm-wide misconduct;*
- b) Creating jurisdictional gaps that enable Charter violations through deflection of responsibility;*
- c) Permitting the weaponisation of legal credentials without accountability.*

24. *ALIA breached its duty of care and enabled constitutional violations by:*

- a) Providing financial protection for conduct it knew or ought to have known violated Charter rights;*
- b) Failing to investigate or remedy constitutional violations brought to its attention;*
- c) Creating moral hazard by making Charter breaches financially risk-free for perpetrators.*

DAMAGES AND CONSTITUTIONAL HARM

25. *As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, the Plaintiff has suffered:*

- a) **Constitutional harm** through the violation of fundamental rights;*
- b) **Economic damages** including loss of business opportunities and professional relationships;*
- c) **Reputational injury** through public association with threatened litigation;*
- d) **Psychological harm** including stress, anxiety, and interference with personal security.*

26. *The Defendants' conduct represents a systemic threat to democratic discourse, requiring both compensatory and structural remedies to prevent replication.*

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff claims:

Constitutional Declarations

27. *A declaration that the Defendants' conduct violated sections 2(b) and 7 of the Charter;*

28. *A declaration that law firms may not weaponise legal process to suppress constitutionally protected expression or extract information outside proper judicial channels;*
29. *A declaration that regulatory bodies and professional insurers have constitutional duties to prevent and remedy Charter violations by their regulated members;*

Monetary Relief

30. *General damages in the amount of \$50,000,000, representing five years gross revenue, based on publicly estimable income subject to forensic validation at discovery of Stillman LLP and its equity participants, for constitutional violations and civil conspiracy;*
31. *Special damages to be proven at trial for economic loss, business interference, and reputational harm;*
32. *Punitive damages of \$25,000,000 to denounce the Defendants' conduct and deter similar constitutional violations;*

Structural and Equitable Relief

33. *An order vesting 100% of the voting shares and equity interests of Stillman LLP in a federally incorporated public interest trust, with the Plaintiff appointed as trustee, for the purposes of:*
 - a) *Institutional reform and transparency;*
 - b) *Public education on legal ethics and constitutional boundaries;*
 - c) *Compensation to victims of similar abusive practices;*
34. *An injunction restraining all Defendants from engaging in similar conduct against any person exercising Charter rights;*
35. *An order requiring the Law Society of Alberta to establish and implement comprehensive oversight mechanisms for coordinated firm-wide misconduct within 90 days;*
36. *An order requiring ALIA to implement mandatory Charter compliance protocols and suspend coverage for verified constitutional violations within 60 days;*
37. *An order permanently barring Defendant Hassin Sam Mraiche from participating in any legal proceedings in Canada in any capacity, whether as party, witness, director of litigation strategy, or advisor, due to his demonstrated abuse of legal process and constitutional violations;*
38. *An order that in any future legal proceeding where Defendant Mraiche has a material interest, the Court shall appoint an independent trustee to represent his interests, with all costs of such*

trusteeship to be borne personally by Defendant Mraiche;

Costs and Interest

- 39. Solicitor-and-client costs;*
 - 40. Pre- and post-judgment interest;*
 - 41. A declaration that institutions which certify legal professionals have ongoing constitutional obligations to ensure their graduates understand and respect Charter rights, with failure to meet this standard constituting grounds for civil liability;*
 - 42. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court deems just.*
-

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

Pursuant to section 57 of the Federal Courts Act, the Plaintiff raises the following constitutional questions:

- 1. Do sections 2(b) and 7 of the Charter prohibit law firms from using legal threats to suppress constitutionally protected expression outside of legitimate judicial proceedings?*
 - 2. What remedies are available when legal professionals systematically abuse their institutional authority to violate constitutional rights?*
 - 3. Does the principle of access to justice require structural remedies when legal institutions are weaponised against democratic discourse?*
 - 4. Do regulatory bodies and professional insurers have constitutional duties to prevent and remedy Charter violations by their regulated members and insureds?*
-

PLACE OF TRIAL

The Plaintiff requests that this action be tried at Ottawa, Ontario.

DATED at Calgary, Alberta, this 27th day of May, 2025.

Ben Beveridge

Proconsul

Plaintiff

This Statement of Claim is filed in the public interest to preserve the constitutional foundations of Canadian democracy and ensure that legal institutions serve justice, not suppress it.

Upon successful resolution of this constitutional challenge, the Plaintiff reserves all rights to pursue similar claims against any institution—educational, regulatory, or financial—whose certification, oversight, or enablement contributed to the systematic constitutional violations documented herein. This includes, without limitation, institutions that granted credentials, provided professional formation, or failed to instill constitutional literacy in the individual Defendants. This action will establish binding precedent for institutional accountability across Canada's entire legal system.

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/money-power-proof/>

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/no-money-no-power/>

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/stillman-llp/>

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/the-system-becomes-the-weapon/>

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/lawfare-for-hire/>

<https://proconsul.ghost.io/canada-v-stillman/>

<https://thebreakdownab.ca/>

<https://ln5.sync.com/4.0/dl/416c35ec0?ref=proconsul.ghost.io#42brixu5-vdtbnx97-dj9nryxy-fhbm9yku>