

COURT FILE NUMBER QBG-SA-00766-2022

COURT OF KING'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN

JUDICIAL CENTRE SASKATOON

PLAINTIFFS CAITLIN ERICKSON, JENNIFER SOUCY (BEAUDRY) and  
STEFANIE HUTCHINSON ~~and COY NOLIN~~

DEFENDANTS KEITH JOHNSON, JOHN OLUBOBOKUN, KEN  
SCHULTZ, NATHAN RYSAVY, DUFF FRIESEN,  
LYNETTE WEILER, JOEL HALL, ~~FRAN THEVENOT,~~  
LOU BRUNELLE, JAMES RANDALL, ~~TRACEY~~  
~~JOHNSON~~, SIMBO OLUBOBOKUN, ~~ELAINE SCHULTZ,~~  
CATHERINE RANDALL, KEVIN MACMILLAN, ANNE  
MACMILLAN, DAWN BEAUDRY, NATHAN SCHULTZ,  
AARON BENNEWEIS, DEIDRE BENNEWEIS,  
~~STEPHANIE CASE~~, DARCY SCHUSTER, RANDY  
DONAUER, JOHN THURINGER, MILE TWO CHURCH  
INC., THE GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN, JOHN  
DOES and JANE DOES

**Brought under *The Class Actions Act*, SS 2001 c C-12.01**

---

## **BRIEF OF LAW**

**ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS**

**For hearing on dates to be set by the Local Registrar**

---

**Lawyers in Charge of File: Grant J. Scharfstein, K.C. / Samuel W. Edmondson**  
Address for Service: Same as below  
Our Reference: 21,835.1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>FACTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>ISSUES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>LAW.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>ARGUMENT.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	A) REQUESTS FOR SPECIFICS ABOUT VICTIMS AND INSTANCES OF ABUSE. ....	26
	B) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT RULES AND PRINCIPLES OF THE SCHOOL.....	28
	C) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE ALLEGED VIOLENCE.....	29
	D) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT PAIN AND SUFFERING AND HARM TO CLASS MEMBERS.....	30
	E) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT THE CONDITIONS CREATED BY MILE TWO.....	31
	F) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP OF TRUST BETWEEN GOS AND THE PLAINTIFF CLASSES.....	31
	G) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT MISFEASANCE IN PUBLIC OFFICE, CONSPIRACY, AND INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF MENTAL HARM.....	33
	H) REQUESTS FOR PARTICULARS ABOUT WHETHER THE ACTION IS SUITABLE AS A CLASS ACTION. ....	40
<b>VI.</b>	<b>COSTS.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>RELIEF REQUESTED.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>AUTHORITIES.....</b>	<b>44</b>

---

## BRIEF OF LAW ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS

---

### I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. There are thirteen (13) applications for further and better particulars currently before the Court, as follows:

- 1) Application dated Feb. 15, 2023, from the Defendant, John Thuringer;
- 2) Application dated Feb 27, 2024, from the Defendant, James Randall;
- 3) Application dated Feb 27, 2024, from the Defendant, Duff Friesen;
- 4) Application dated Feb 27, 2024, from the Defendant, Ken Schultz;
- 5) Application dated Feb 27, 2024, from the Defendant, Mile Two Church Inc.;
- 6) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Aaron Benneweis;
- 7) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Kevin MacMillan;
- 8) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Government of Saskatchewan;
- 9) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Joel Hall;
- 10) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, John Olubobokun;
- 11) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Lou Brunelle;
- 12) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Nathan Rysavy; and
- 13) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the Defendant, Randy Donauer.

2. The Defendants who have served applications for further and better particulars are herein referred to collectively as the “**Applicant Defendants**”. The Defendant, Mile Two Church Inc., is herein referred to as “**Mile Two**”. The Defendant, The Government of Saskatchewan, is herein referred to as “**GOS**”. All other Defendants are referred to by their surname.

3. There are four (4) applications for further and better particulars that were filed but are now moot, as the claim against the Defendant in question has been discontinued, as follows:
  - 1) Application dated Feb 27, 2024, from the former Defendant, Catherine Randall;
  - 2) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the former Defendant, Simbo Olubobokun;
  - 3) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the former Defendant, Anne MacMillan; and
  - 4) Application dated Feb 28, 2024, from the former Defendant, Deidre Benneweis.
  
4. The Plaintiffs emphasize that a view toward judicial economy and efficiency should be at the heart of the Court's analysis when determining whether to order responses to the huge volume of requests for particulars that have been made by the Applicant Defendants. As discussed further below, most of the requests that have been made seek specifics about each victim and each instance of alleged abuse committed by each alleged perpetrator. The ordering of these particulars by the Court would not only create an exceptionally onerous (and arguably, impossible) task for the Plaintiffs, which will continue to delay certification, such order would also be completely contrary to the Foundational Rules of this Court and to the purposes of class proceedings.
  
5. Further, the Plaintiffs submit that each and all of the applications for further and better particulars should be dismissed for the following reasons:
  1. Many of the particulars can be ascertained from reading the Second Amended Statement of Claim (the "**Claim**") as a whole;
  2. Many of the particulars demanded are matters of evidence, not pleading, and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter;
  3. The Applicant Defendants have better knowledge of many of the particulars demanded;

4. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required in order to plead intelligently;
  5. Most of the particulars demanded are particulars which, in the context of a class action, are not known and could not be known to the Plaintiffs;
  6. The Claim affords the Applicant Defendants sufficient information to enable them to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”; and
  7. The particulars sought are frivolous, vexatious, and/or an abuse of process.
6. All of the particulars requested by the Defendants fall into at least one of, and in most cases several of, the above categories.
  7. Attached as Schedule A to this Brief of Law, as requested by the Court, is a chart summarizing each item on each Applicant Defendant’s Request for Particulars that is in issue in these applications. Schedule A also includes the Plaintiffs’ categorization of each request for organizational purposes, as will be discussed in more detail below. The final column of Schedule A has been left intentionally blank for the Court’s use.
  8. The Plaintiffs ask that the each of the within applications be dismissed with elevated costs payable forthwith to the Plaintiffs.

## **II. FACTS**

9. The Plaintiffs filed their Statement of Claim in this matter on August 8, 2022. The Statement of Claim was amended on December 12, 2022 and again on June 29, 2023.
10. The Claim as amended alleges in detail the systematic, persistent, and egregious abuse of students and minor attendants of Legacy Christian Academy (the “**School**”) and Mile Two Church (the “**Church**”) by the Defendants.
11. The Claim as amended alleges that the abuse took place in the province of Saskatchewan during the period from 1982 to present. The Claim as amended defines the proposed Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 and also states at paragraph 44 that

there were numerous students at the School at all material times, with enrolment varying and at times exceeding 250 students, ranging from kindergarten to grade 12.

12. On October 24, 2022, Justice Bardai was appointed as the designated judge to consider certification of this action and appoint representative plaintiffs.
13. On or about July 7, 2023, the parties argued a pre-certification application brought by the Defendants seeking the deferral of defences. In Justice Bardai's fiat dated September 15, 2023, Justice Bardai ordered that defences are not required to be filed by the Defendants until after certification is determined.
14. With respect to the timing of requests for particulars, Justice Bardai made the following order in his fiat dated September 15, 2023, at para 8:

[8] The issue of particulars is to be dealt with as follows:

1. all defendants shall have until no later than October 31, 2023 to serve any and all requests for particulars on the plaintiffs;
2. the plaintiffs shall have until December 31, 2023 to serve all responses to requests for particulars on all defendants;
3. all defendants shall have until February 28, 2024 to serve any and all applications for further and better particulars on the plaintiffs, including all supporting materials;
4. the plaintiffs shall have until April 28, 2024 to serve the defendants with any material they intend to rely upon for the hearing of any applications for further and better particulars;
5. The Local Registrar is to schedule a call with the parties any myself in March 2024 for further case management;

15. By the end of October of 2023, the Plaintiffs were served with voluminous and repetitive requests for particulars by the Defendants (the "**Requests**"). Many of the Requests were identical or were based on what was clearly a common template used, except for names of the defendant in question being substituted.
16. On December 28, 2023, the Plaintiffs served replies to each of the requests for particulars that had been received (the "**Replies**"). The Replies included preambles

with general comments as to why objections were being made to many of the requests.

17. On February 27 and 28, 2024, the Applicant Defendants (other than Thuringer, who had previously served his application) served the Plaintiffs with applications for further and better particulars. Some of the Applicant Defendants filed Briefs of Law which, for the most part, repeat the same law and arguments as each other (with the exception of the GOS Brief of Law).
18. On March 18, 2024, the parties convened for case management where Justice Bardai determined that three days of Court time should be set aside for the hearing of these applications, on a date to be determined by the Registrar in consultation with the parties.
19. The applications are set to be heard on three days to be set by the Local Registrar.
20. Justice Bardai also directed in his fiat dated March 18, 2024 that, in the event any party wishes to apply to the Court for an order that he recuse himself, that application shall be made before the end of April, 2024. As of the date of serving this Brief of Law, no such applications have been made.
21. As set out in the Affidavit of Caitlin Erickson, sworn April 26, 2024, the Plaintiffs have made an access to information request of the Ministry of Education (the “**Ministry**”) seeking all records related to the school operated by Mile Two.
  - A. The Ministry failed to respond to the request within the statutory timeline (*Saskatchewan (Education) (Re)*, 2023 CanLII 26218 at para 17);
  - B. The Ministry committed to prioritizing responding to the request, and to commit sufficient resources to the request for the request to be responded to in a timely manner;
  - C. A request for review of the timing of the Ministry response was made, resulting in the Information and Privacy Commissioner rendering a decision in Review Report 247-2022 (*Saskatchewan (Education) (Re)*, 2023 CanLII 26218 at para 17).

- D. In the review process, the Ministry estimated the time to complete the request would be “at least six months”, and that the number of records to be reviewed included approximately 3,000-3,500 pages of emails; 113,000 pages of documents; and numerous multi-page attachments to the emails and documents which have not been estimated.
  - E. Over the period from August 11, 2022 when the request was made, until March 28, 2024 when the Ministry advised that its response was complete, the Ministry disclosed a total of 9,027 pages.
  - F. In the responsive records disclosed, the Ministry redacted significant information, purportedly for reasons including but not limited to personal information pursuant to *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, SS 1990-91 c L-22.01
  - G. While not the subject of this application, numerous redactions by the Ministry are inconsistent with the longstanding determinations of the Information and Privacy Commissioner with respect to business card information, and with section 24(2) of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, SS 1990-91 c L-22.01 for information pertaining to licenses to teachers at the School which had been granted by the Ministry.
  - H. A request for review of the response of the Ministry has been made to the Information and Privacy Commissioner.
22. The only affidavits that have been filed in support of the within applications for further and better particulars are:
- a) The Affidavit of Randy Donauer, sworn February 27, 2024; and
  - b) The Affidavit of John Thuringer, sworn February 14, 2023.

Both affidavits state broadly and incredibly that Donauer and Thuringer have no knowledge of the allegations made against them in the Claim.



### III. ISSUES

23. The issue to be determined is:

A. Are the Plaintiffs required to provide further and better particulars in response to the Requests made by each of the following Defendants?

- (1) Mile Two Church Inc.
- (2) John Thuringer;
- (3) James Randall;
- (4) Duff Friesen;
- (5) Ken Schultz;
- (6) Aaron Benneweis;
- (7) Kevin MacMillan;
- (8) Joel Hall;
- (9) John Olubobokun;
- (10) Lou Brunelle;
- (11) Nathan Rysavy;
- (12) Randy Donauer;
- (13) Government of Saskatchewan.

### IV. LAW

#### Underlying Rules and Principles

24. The Foundational Rules of this Court are central to the determination of the within applications. Rule 1-3 of the *King's Bench Rules* reads, in part:

**1-3(1)** The purpose of these rules is to provide a means by which claims can be justly resolved in or by a court process in a timely and cost effective way.

(2) In particular, these rules are intended to be used:

- (a) to identify the real issues in dispute;

(b) to facilitate the quickest means of resolving a claim at the least expense;

(c) to encourage the parties to resolve the claim themselves, by agreement, with or without assistance, as early in the process as is practicable;

(d) to oblige the parties to communicate honestly, openly and in a timely way; and

(e) to provide an effective, efficient and credible system of remedies and sanctions to enforce these rules and orders and judgments.

(3) To achieve the purpose and intention of these rules, the parties shall, jointly and individually during an action:

(a) identify or make an application to identify the real issues in dispute and facilitate the quickest means of resolving the claim at the least expense;

(b) periodically evaluate dispute resolution process alternatives to a full trial, with or without assistance from the Court;

(c) refrain from filing applications or taking proceedings that do not further the purpose and intention of these rules; and

(d) when using publicly funded Court resources, use them effectively.

...

[emphasis added]

25. Rule 3-71 provides the authority for a party to request particulars of a pleading and to bring an application for further and better particulars if they feel the response is not sufficient. Rule 3-71 states:

**3-71(1)** A party on whom a pleading is served may, at any time before the action is set down for trial, serve on the party who served the pleading a request for particulars about anything in the pleading.

(2) If the requesting party does not receive a sufficient response within 8 days after the date on which the request is served, the requesting party may apply to the Court for an order requiring the party who served the pleading to provide the particulars.

(3) If the Court orders particulars to be provided, it may do so on any terms as to costs and otherwise that the Court considers just.

(4) The requesting party must have the same length of time for pleading after delivery of the particulars as the requesting party had when the request for particulars was made.

26. Generally speaking, case law has established that particulars will be ordered:

a) For the purposes of pleading, i.e. to enable the opposite party to plead intelligently;

b) For the purpose of trial, i.e., to define the issues to be tried so as to save the expense of calling unnecessary witnesses and prevent the opposite party from being taken by surprise.<sup>1</sup>

27. An Order for particulars is a discretionary remedy and should be ordered only if necessary.<sup>2</sup> To quote Justice Klebuc in *Driscoll v MacBain*, 2002 SKQB 244, at para 6: “It is well established that an order for further particulars is at the discretion of the Court and generally governed by the need to do justice in the specific circumstances before the Court” [emphasis added].

28. Most of the body of law that has developed in this area relates to actions that are not class action proceedings. While the general rules for pleadings and the general rules for applications for further and better particulars are informative, the nature of a class action lawsuit is unique, and special attention should be given to the underlying purpose of class action proceedings when determining the principles to apply.

29. The Supreme Court of Canada stated in the seminal case of *Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v Dutton*, 2001 SCC 46 [*Dutton*] that the fundamental purposes of class proceedings are:

(a) To serve judicial economy;

(b) To improve access to justice;

---

<sup>1</sup> *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Association v Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 WWR 293 (Sask QB); *Wassermann v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17.

<sup>2</sup> See *Wassermann v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17 at para 22.

(c) To serve efficiency and justice by ensuring that where wrongdoing is found, wrongdoers modify their behaviour.<sup>3</sup>

30. As stated by Justice Bardai in the recent case of *Gardiner v Saskatchewan (Attorney General)*, 2023 SKKB 237 at para 41, some of the same basic principles and concepts set out in the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Dutton* are also now part of *The King's Bench Rules*, Foundational Rules.

## V. ARGUMENT

### Grounds for Objection

31. In general, and as noted by the Defendants who filed Briefs of Law, the Plaintiffs object to responding to all requests for particulars in issue on the following grounds:

1. Many of the particulars demanded are matters of evidence, not pleading, and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110);
2. The Applicant Defendants have better knowledge of many of the particulars demanded (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703);
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Applicant Defendants in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293);
4. The Claim affords the Applicant Defendants sufficient information to enable them to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about” (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Dutton* at paras 27 to 29.

32. The Plaintiffs also object on the grounds that:
  1. Many of the particulars demanded can be ascertained from reading the Claim as a whole;
  2. Most of the particulars demanded are particulars which, in the context of a class action, are not known and could not be known to the Plaintiffs; and
  3. The particulars demanded are frivolous, vexatious, and/or an abuse of process.
  
33. The Plaintiffs submit that each of the requests for particulars in issue fall into at least one of these categories, and in most cases fall into more than one, for the reasons further described below. Several of these grounds overlap. The ultimate conclusion, based on all of these principles taken together, is that the particulars requested are not necessary or appropriate and should not be ordered in these circumstances.
  
34. The logical place to begin this analysis is with the Court's Foundational Rules and the purposes of class proceedings, as set out in the section above. Those are the underlying principles that inform this action. The point is this: judicial economy and efficiency are key concepts in all court proceedings, but especially in class action litigation. If the Plaintiffs are ordered to respond to hundreds of requests for particulars, especially the many requests seeking specific information about each instance of abuse, these principles are undermined.
  
35. The very nature of class action litigation is that not all instances of conduct captured by the pleadings are, or can be, known to the Plaintiffs at the pleadings stage. To ask the Plaintiffs to attempt to identify every instance of abuse at this stage is unreasonable and absurd. Particularly pre-certification, the Plaintiffs do not, and cannot, know of all conduct carried out against all of the members of the Plaintiff Classes.
  
36. Only after a class action is certified does advertising go out to notify all potential class members of the proceedings. At this stage, and even well down the road in these proceedings, it is absurd to expect that the Plaintiffs know the identity of each and

every victim of the alleged abuse and each instance of abuse that occurred. That is not how class proceedings work.

37. The allegations have been made. Every allegation in the Claim that implicates a Defendant by name or applies to a defined group of Defendants (i.e. Defendants generally, Individual Defendants, Principal Defendants, etc. as those terms are defined in the Claim) of which a particular Defendant is a member, is an allegation made against that particular Defendant. The named Defendants need only enough information to know the case to meet and to be able to plead intelligently. The Defendants already have that information.
38. If the Defendants deny that they abused children or participated in the abuse of children as alleged, then they can defend on that basis. If they deny that the alleged conduct constituted torts or caused harm as alleged, then they can defend on that basis. If they only abused some children in some circumstances, or only had certain knowledge or involvement in the alleged abuse, they can defend on that basis. If they abused children or participated in the abuse of children as described in the Claim, then they should certainly admit that. This may be a complicated action in terms of scope, but it is not complicated in terms of potential defences.
39. The recent authority of *Wassermann v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17 [*Wassermann*], and the case of *Bellan v Curtis*, 2007 MBQB 221 [*Bellan*], which is cited therein, are a complete answer to the applications for further and better in the instant case. These authorities are directly on point for determining, and disposing of, the within applications.
40. *Wassermann* was a proposed class action arising from the catastrophic Humboldt Broncos bus crash in April of 2018. Prior to the certification hearing, one of the proposed defendants, Premier Horticulture Ltd. (“Premier”) applied pursuant to Rule 3-71 for an order directing further and better particulars respecting certain aspects of the various claims made against it. Specifically, Premier sought particulars related to proposed class members whose claims may be affected by workers’ compensation legislation and automobile accident insurance legislation.

41. The plaintiffs in *Wassermann* argued that the outstanding information being requested was outside their knowledge at the time or was irrelevant to preparing for certification. Justice Mitchell noted that the application for further and better was brought prior to certification and stated at para 24:

... The trend in the contemporary case law relating to a pre-certification application for particulars is that provided the plaintiff's statement of claim affords a proposed defendant sufficient information to enable counsel to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", further particulars are not necessary. See: *Kwicksutaineuk/Ab-Kwa-Mish First Nations v British Columbia (Agriculture and Lands)*, 2009 BCSC 1593 at para 45 quoting *Stone Paradise Inc. v Bayer Inc.*, [2005] OJ No 5657 (QL) (Ont Sup Ct J) at para 12. See also: *Canadian Society for the Advancement of Science in Public Policy v British Columbia*, 2021 BCSC 2168 at paras 17-22; *Stewart v General Motors Canada Ltd.*, [2007] OJ No 2319 (QL) (Ont Sup Ct) [*Stewart*]; and *Bellan v Curtis*, 2007 MBQB 221, 219 Man R (2d) 175 [*Bellan*].

42. Justice Mitchell noted at para 33 of *Wassermann* that Premier was seeking material facts relating to potential class members whose claims may be statutorily barred by workers compensation legislation. In essence, Premier was seeking identifying information and specifics about certain class members. Justice Mitchell disposed of the application for better and further particulars as follows:

[34] To begin, I note that material facts are distinct from particulars. Plaintiffs must plead material facts in order to formulate a complete cause of action. Particulars provide information which allows a party to understand the case they must meet. See, for example: *Sidhu v Hiebert*, 2018 BCSC 401 at paras 36-37 and *Stewart* at paras 12-13.

[35] The Respondents assert that they have pled the material facts related to these various proposed classes. In addition, they have served upon counsel for Premier and all other proposed defences an extensive Brief of Law for Certification. This documentation provides sufficient information to the proposed defendants to enable their counsel to file pleadings and respond to the certification application.

[36] Furthermore, the Respondents submit that they do not know, at this time, the identities of persons who may fall into the various proposed classes. The identities of these individuals likely will not be known until after certification, and perhaps not until after a trial. They contend it would place an undue burden on their counsel to require them at this time to seek out persons who potentially could be members of these classes following certification.

[37] I accept the Respondents' arguments. This is a proposed class proceeding flowing from a catastrophic mass transit accident. Accidents of this kind are

particularly amenable to class actions initiated on behalf of a potentially large and unknown number of unidentified plaintiffs who allegedly have suffered serious harm due to actions of the proposed defendants. It is not realistic to expect the Respondents to identify potential class members more precisely than they already have done.

[38] To reiterate, I conclude that Premier and the other proposed defendants know the case they need to meet and do not require further particulars from counsel for the Respondents in order to plead to the Amended Statement of Claim, and defend at the certification hearing.

43. Several applicable and key principles can be derived from the above reasoning of Justice Mitchell. First, with respect to preparing for certification, the pleadings are not the only materials that the Defendants will be provided with for the purposes of the certification hearing. Affidavit materials and legal arguments will be provided at that time that set out the facts and law necessary for the Plaintiffs to satisfy the Court that the action should be certified. It is premature for the Applicant Defendants to seek those facts now, especially when the Defendants are not required to plead until after certification.
44. Second, Justice Mitchell accepted the argument by the plaintiffs in *Wassermann* that they did not know, at that time, the identities of all persons who may fall into the various proposed classes. He accepted that it would place an undue burden on the plaintiffs' counsel at that stage to have to seek out each person who may fall into the classes. It was not realistic to expect the plaintiffs, in a proceeding of that nature and magnitude, to have identified potential class members more precisely than they had already done.
45. Justice Mitchell accepted that the material facts had been pled for Premier to know the case it had to meet in order to plead to the claim and to defend at the certification hearing.
46. In the present case, the Applicant Defendants argue that they need all manner of particulars now because they have to prepare for both certification and for pleading. The finding in *Wassermann* was that particulars identifying class members and their circumstances were not necessary for the defendants to plead or to prepare for certification.



47. A case that was cited and relied on in *Wassermann* was *Bellan*, a Manitoba case involving a proposed class action where particulars were sought by defendants prior to certification. The Plaintiffs submit that the facts and reasoning from that case are precisely on point.
48. In *Bellan*, the Court dismissed the bulk of the application for particulars. Justice Hanssen began his analysis by stating that the statement of claim contained a concise statement of material facts relied upon by the plaintiff such that "[a]nyone reading it will understand what the case is about".<sup>4</sup>
49. The circumstances here mirror that of *Bellan* in that anyone reading the Claim will understand what the case is about. Despite the representations made by several of the Defendants about the complexity of the Plaintiffs' claim, the Claim can be easily summarized. In fact, paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Brief of Law on behalf of Randy Donauer do just that. From these paragraphs, the Claim can be summarized as follows:
1. The Individually Named Defendants were employees, representatives or agents of the School and/or the Church, and were members of the Church.
  2. Each of the Individually Named Defendants observed corporal punishment.
  3. Each of the Individually Named Defendants carried out abuse in the nature of trespass to the person, assault, and battery.
  4. Each of the Individually Named Defendants used the threat of physical and non-physical abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on and intimidate and coerce students of the School and minor adherents of the Church.
  5. Each of the Individually Named Defendants are liable for breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, gross negligence, assault, battery, infliction of mental suffering and/or conspiracy.

---

<sup>4</sup> At para 18 of *Bellan*, as cited at para 25 of *Wassermann*.

6. In addition, anyone that was also a Principal Defendant was a director, officer, elder, principal, employee, representative or agent of the School and/or Church who developed and implemented the abusive policies and procedures of the School and/or Church.
  7. The Principal Defendants caused the Individually Named Defendants to carry out the abusive policies that they created.
  8. Members of the Plaintiff Classes suffered harms as a result of the conduct of the Defendants.
50. As in *Bellan*, the material facts and allegations are set out in the claim such that anyone reading it will know what it's about. The Defendants are well aware of the case they have to meet.
51. *Bellan* was a proposed class action against officers and directors of an investment fund as well as certain employees and agents of the fund and the Government of Manitoba. The statement of claim alleged, among other things, that the prospectuses for the fund did not contain proper disclosure and overstated the value of the fund's assets.
52. The defendants in *Bellan* sought "voluminous and detailed information regarding the claim" (para 17). Justice Hanssen's view was that the defendants were, in effect, demanding full discovery of the plaintiffs' case prior to the certification hearing and before filing their statements of defence.
53. Justice Hanssen dismissed the bulk of the requests for particulars on the following basis:

[18] I am dismissing the remainder of their requests. While there is no doubt room for improvement in the pleading, it does not fall as short of the mark as these defendants suggest. It contains a concise statement of the material facts upon which *Bellan* is relying. Anyone reading it will understand what the case is about.

[19] Much of the information these defendants are seeking with respect to specific paragraphs in the statement of claim is set out elsewhere in the statement of claim or documents referred to in the statement of claim.

[20] In many instances, the particulars being requested are with respect to details which Bellan probably does not have and couldn't be expected to have until the discovery process has been completed. In fact, at this time, these defendants likely have more knowledge of many of the details they are requesting than Bellan does. They were actively involved in the matters which are the subject of the action. As well, they have as much access as Bellan does to the large volume of information which is in the public domain.

[21] The balance of the information they are requesting is not necessary at this stage of the proceedings. There is a substantial difference between the particulars they require for the certification hearing or to file their statements of defence and the information they may later require for the purposes of trial.

[22] The level of detail they are requesting is not required for the certification process. Any additional information required for the certification motion can be provided by affidavits filed in support of the motion and any cross-examinations on them. If Bellan fails to provide sufficient information, the class action will simply not be certified.

[23] Although defendants in a class action proceeding often defer filing their statements of defence until the action is certified, once the particulars I have ordered have been provided, the defendants will have sufficient information to file their defences should they choose to do so.

[24] Under the circumstances, at this stage of the proceedings, it would not be in the interest of judicial economy to put Bellan through the extensive effort and expense of providing the voluminous particulars these defendants are requesting. Indeed, if the action is not certified the result would simply be a waste of time and money.

[25] If the class action is certified, the defendants will have ample opportunity to obtain any additional information they require for the purposes of trial through the discovery process.

54. The above reasoning from *Bellan* is precisely on point and can be relied on to dispose of the bulk of the applicant Defendants' requests for particulars.
55. The Applicant Defendants rely heavily on the ruling from the case of *Wildeman v Bell Mobility Inc.*, 2015 SKQB 125 [*Wildeman*], where Justice Elson ordered the plaintiffs in a proposed class action to provide further and better particulars. The particulars being sought in *Wildeman*, and the nature of that case, are nothing like what the Court is being asked to determine in the present case.
56. *Wildeman* was a proposed class action alleging that the defendants, all major providers of wireless and cellular services in Canada, improperly charged fees for

emergency 9-1-1 services charged as part of their cellular and wireless telecommunication services. Justice Elson summarized the particulars being sought as falling into the following categories:

- (a) particulars as to the portion of the 9-1-1 fee the plaintiff is seeking to recover;
- (b) particulars of the common law duty to charge only reasonable rates;
- (c) particulars as to how the defendants misled the class;
- (d) particulars as to the contract terms breached by the defendants with respect to the charging of 9-1-1 fees;
- (e) particulars of the statutory duties and obligations the defendants are alleged to have breached, and the specific provisions in question;
- (f) particulars of the time period and geographic locations that were not properly provided with 9-1-1 operator services;
- (g) particulars as to how the defendants participated in collusion and conspiracy and how they acted in concert with each other; and
- (h) particulars of the claim for special damages.

57. Justice Elson ordered further particulars on all but category (b) listed above.
58. Other than requests relating to conspiracy, the requests for particulars made by the defendants in *Wildeman* are nothing like the requests being made in the present case. The defendants were ordered to provide better particulars about alleged misrepresentations and special damages (which particulars are specifically required by the Rules of Court and case law), and to state how contracts and statutes had been breached. Obviously, stating how contracts and statutes had been breached were essential elements of the causes of action pled in *Wildeman*, which had not been addressed in the pleading. The defendants in *Wildeman* had also provided affidavit evidence stating that there were different components to the 9-1-1 fees charged and

- establishing that they needed to know which portions of those fees were in issue so they could plead intelligently. This makes logical sense in the context of that action and the evidence presented in support of that application. These issues are not applicable in the present case.
59. The issue of whether further particulars are required with respect to pleading conspiracy will be addressed below.
  60. As an aside, the only evidence presented by the Applicant Defendants in the present case are the Affidavit of Randy Donauer and the Affidavit of John Thuringer, which do nothing to establish that certain information is required to be able to plead intelligently. Donauer has simply sworn broadly that he has no knowledge of anything in the claim. It is not only incredible that Donauer apparently has no knowledge at all of anything pled, it is also difficult to understand how this broad statement is useful to the Court or the parties.
  61. Some of the Defendants have raised in their Briefs of Law that it is not sufficient for the Plaintiffs to state that the particulars are within the Defendant's knowledge. This was one of the primary issues in *Wildeman*, where the responses to requests for particulars in several instances simply stated the defendants had better knowledge of the particulars. The Applicant Defendants in the present case rely on this reasoning and argue that, if there is a matter in which the plaintiff has no particulars, they should so state.
  62. This argument by the Applicant Defendants is faulty for several reasons. First, this is but one of the grounds the Plaintiffs have relied upon to oppose the particulars requested. In none of the Replies is this the sole ground to oppose a request made. In all cases, it works complementary to the other grounds cited.
  63. Second, these are not matters in which the Plaintiffs can accurately state, or should be expected to state at this stage, that they have no particulars. As explained above, the nature of class proceedings in general, and of cases like this one in particular, is such that the Plaintiffs' knowledge of the conduct alleged in the Claim is constantly growing and evolving. As more class members come forward and bring their

evidence, more facts become known. It is not appropriate or just at this point in time to tie the Plaintiffs' hands and limit their case to the current information known. It appears that the Defendants are trying to catch the Plaintiffs in this trap.

64. As an aside, the examples of instances of abuse set out in the Claim were intended to provide context and to illustrate the nature of the violence and the types of violence that have been known by the representative Plaintiffs to have taken place at the School and Church. They were not intended to open the floodgates so that the Plaintiffs must plead every instance of abuse by every perpetrator suffered by each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, nor is it fair to interpret it as such. The representative Plaintiffs have made best efforts to plead in an informative way despite the scope of this proposed class action and the bulk of evidence that is still not, and cannot be, known at this stage in the proceedings. This is the natural course of class proceedings.
65. Finally, the case that this rule is derived from, *Koop v Saskatchewan Power Corp.* (1997) 159 Sask R. 290 (QB)<sup>5</sup>, was different from the present case. In *Koop*, Justice MacPherson raised the following concern with stating that particulars are in the knowledge of the Defendant:

[13] The reply to the demand for particulars becomes, in effect, a part of the statement of claim, and in preparing its statement of defence the defendant is entitled to know what particulars, if any, the plaintiff has to support the various clauses in the statement of claim; the defendant requires this information in order to plead intelligently. For example, in paragraph 3 of the demand for particulars the defendant seeks particulars of a promise that is alleged in paragraph 15(d) of the statement of claim. The plaintiff's reply does not say whether it has any such particular and if the defendant is required to plead to the allegation of the promise, presumably it is put in the position of having to perhaps scurry around to innumerable management people to find out if any of them made any such promise. If, on the other hand, the plaintiff's reply was to state that the plaintiff has no such particular, then the plaintiff is not put to such unnecessary, and perhaps expensive, effort. It is difficult to understand how the plaintiff can plead as a fact that a promise was made but when asked to give particulars as to who made the promise and when it was made, the plaintiff's response seems to be that it has no such particulars. This logically raises the question as to how the plaintiff can plead the existence of a certain fact but when asked to give particulars in respect to that fact, simply gives no particulars. If the

---

<sup>5</sup> Which was relied on by Justice Acton in *Franklin Land Development Ltd. v Clements*, 2010 SKQB 272.

plaintiff has no knowledge of the promise which he pleads, how can he comply with the Rule by stating only that the particulars of the promise are wholly within the knowledge of the defendant? Logically, one should look at the plaintiff's responses to paragraphs 2 to 5 of the demand for particulars as being an admission that the plaintiff has no particulars -- no knowledge - of those matters which he has pleaded, and if the plaintiff has no knowledge, on what basis can the pleading constitute a fact?

66. Evidently, Justice MacPherson's concern in *Koop* was that the plaintiff had simply stated that the information requested was wholly within the knowledge of the defendant without further reasoning and without further grounds for objection, when those particulars were otherwise necessary for the Defendant to be able to plead intelligently. Whether the information provided in the pleading enables the defendants to plead intelligently remains the underlying question.
67. Justice MacPherson posed the question: If the plaintiff has no knowledge of the matters on which he has pleaded, on what basis can the pleading constitute a fact? In *Koop*, the plaintiff pleaded that a promise had been made but when asked for the contents of that promise, had simply said it was in the knowledge of the defendants, without, apparently, providing any further reasoning.
68. In the present case, the Plaintiffs have used the knowledge presently known to them to form the basis of the Claim. They have stated all the material facts necessary to ground the elements of each cause of action alleged and have not said they do not have knowledge of the particulars requested. Rather, they have stated that, not only are the bulk of the particulars requested matters of evidence discoverable later in the proceedings, it is also the case that the Defendants have better knowledge of many of those particulars. To reiterate Justice Hanssen's poignant comment from *Bellan*: There is a substantial difference between the particulars required for the certification hearing or to file statements of defence and the information that may later be required for the purposes of trial (para 21).
69. In *Franklin Land Development Ltd. v Clements*, 2010 SKQB 272 [*Franklin*], it appears that Justice Acton relied solely on the *Koop* decision to establish that the responding party to a request for particulars may not state that the particulars are within the other party's knowledge.

70. In the more recent case of *Wildeman*, cited and distinguished above, Justice Elson stated at para 46:

[46] I agree with the admonition of McPherson C.J.Q.B. in *Koop* that, where the responding party does not have the requested particulars, it should simply say so in its answer. There is, of course, the risk that such a response will diminish, or even destroy, the cause of action or defence the responding party asserts. It may also affect the prospect of certification. There is also the prospect that the claim or defence will be unaffected by the answer. In either instance, an answer is required.

71. Again, the application of this reasoning is dangerous in the present case. If applied as a strict rule that where if the plaintiffs have no particulars at this time, they should so state, the Plaintiffs are being prematurely forced into a corner in a proceeding where identities of the members of the Plaintiff Classes are not yet known.

72. As quoted by the Court in *Wassermann*:

[23] ... Gerein C.J.'s (as he then was) caution issued in *Mallard v Killoran*, 2005 SKQB 203 respecting pleadings and particulars should be recalled. Referring to Rule 139(2) of the former *Queen's Bench Rules* (now Rule 13-8(2)) which stated that "[w]here necessary full particulars of any claim, or defence shall be stated in the pleading", he commented at para. 26: "One should be careful not to get carried away by reason of Rule 139(2)". The same caution is apposite in relation to Rule 3-71.

[Emphasis added]

73. The Plaintiffs suggest that such caution is warranted here. When the reasoning from *Koop* is applied so far as to require that the Plaintiffs must reply to every request for specifics made by the Applicant Defendants and to state which information is known at this point in the proceedings and which is unknown, there is both serious injustice and serious inefficiency that occurs.

74. First of all, it is well established that replies to requests for particulars form part of the pleadings. If the Plaintiffs are ordered to reply to each of these requests, the pleadings will easily be hundreds of pages long. This is contrary to the rules of pleadings, which suggest that pleadings should "contain only a statement in summary form of the



material facts on which the party pleading relies...” and “be as brief as the nature of the case will permit”.<sup>6</sup>

75. Second, as alluded to above, this ground of objection relating to the information being in the knowledge of the Defendants is intertwined with the Plaintiffs’ objection that most of what the Applicant Defendants are requesting as particulars relates to circumstances and evidence that are discoverable through Questioning. Even if the Court is not convinced that the objection relating to knowledge alone is valid, it is not the end of the enquiry. The substance of the Plaintiffs’ objections goes much further than simply who has the knowledge of the information requested.
76. In cases other than *Koop* and those that have relied on it, a response by a plaintiff that the particulars lie within the knowledge of the defendant has been accepted by the Court, especially in conjunction with the particulars being discoverable in the proceedings. In *Bellan* for example, Justice Hanssen said:

[20] In many instances, the particulars being requested are with respect to details which Bellan probably does not have and couldn't be expected to have until the discovery process has been completed. In fact, at this time, these defendants likely have more knowledge of many of the details they are requesting than Bellan does. They were actively involved in the matters which are the subject of the action. As well, they have as much access as Bellan does to the large volume of information which is in the public domain.

[Emphasis added]

77. In *Todd Acceptance Ltd. v Custom Communicating Systems Inc.*, [1984] 32 Sask R 104, the Court stated at para 8: “Particulars are not required to be given of the circumstances under which the act was done, but which the plaintiff would have a right as a matter of evidence to discover by means of examination on discovery.”
78. As illustrated by the case law, the ground of objection relating to who has the knowledge of the particulars requested ties in with the ground that objects on the basis that certain matters are evidence and are discoverable at Questioning. The Plaintiffs in the present case rely not only on the assertion that the particulars requested are within the knowledge of the Applicant Defendants, but more

---

<sup>6</sup> See Rule 13-8(1).

importantly, that there is distinction between particulars required at the pleadings stage and the information the Defendants may later require for trial. This was precisely Justice Hanssen's point in *Bellan*, as quoted above.

79. It is well established in Saskatchewan jurisprudence that the first application in a proposed class action is supposed to be the certification application. In the present case, we have already dealt with a pre-certification application by the Defendants to defer the filing of defences. Though the Plaintiffs agreed that the requests for particulars should be dealt with prior to certification, the reality of the requests for particulars that were received is beyond the scope of what could have been reasonably expected by the Plaintiffs, especially prior to certification. The Defendants have now flooded the Plaintiffs with an outrageous volume of inappropriate requests, which the Plaintiffs have responded to, and the Plaintiffs are now forced to prepare for and attend a multiple-day hearing in order to move forward with their application for certification. Each of these detours only serves to further delay certification.
80. Certain Defendants have already indicated through their conduct, and even explicitly, that they do not intend to participate in these proceedings in good faith and in accordance with the Court's Foundational Rules. Counsel for Mile Two went so far as to state in argument on July 7, 2023 (regarding timing of defences), that if required to file a defence pre-certification, Mile Two would file a bare defence which would not be of any assistance to the Court or the parties. These requests for particulars, where each Defendant has asked the Plaintiffs to provide in detail the particulars of each and every incident of abuse in a proposed class action that spans over a period of more than 40 years and consists of hundreds and perhaps thousands of individual members of the Plaintiff Classes, are but another example of this obstinate and vexatious conduct.
81. The only rational inference to be drawn is that the Defendants, individually and together, seek to increase the time and expense to the Plaintiffs, and to delay an orderly process to a certification hearing. This is plainly an abuse of process.

Application to the Requests for Particulars in Issue

82. As illustrated by the attached Schedule A, the particulars sought by the Defendants are voluminous. In order to deal with the requests in an orderly fashion for the purposes of argument, the Plaintiffs submit that it makes logical sense to group the requests into the following categories:

- (a) Requests for specifics about victims and each instance of abuse;
- (b) Requests for particulars about rules and principles of the School and/or Church;
- (c) Requests for particulars about the nature of alleged violence;
- (d) Requests for particulars about pain and suffering and harm to class members;
- (e) Requests for particulars about the conditions created by Mile Two;
- (f) Requests for particulars about the relationship of trust between GOS and the plaintiff classes.
- (g) Requests for particulars about misfeasance in public office, conspiracy, and intentional infliction of mental harm.
- (h) Requests for particulars about whether the action is suitable as a class action; and
- (i) Other miscellaneous factual requests.

83. The overwhelming majority of the requests for particulars fall into the category where Defendants are seeking particulars as to, with respect to each Defendant: the identities of the alleged victims, the dates and/or frequency of the abuse, the locations of the abuse, and specifics about each instance of abuse.

84. A column included on schedule A indicates the Plaintiffs' grouping of each request for particulars in issue for the purposes of argument. Each of these categories is addressed below.

**A) Requests for specifics about victims and instances of abuse.**

85. The bulk of the requests for further and better particulars made by the Applicant Defendants fall into this category.
86. The Applicant Defendants' requests for particulars are so broad that it would be akin to the Plaintiffs requesting from the Defendants (once the Defendants finally provide Statements of Defence) the following:
  1. Give full particulars of every single day that the defendant did not observe corporal punishment, including:
    - a. Dates that the defendant did not observe corporal punishment;
    - b. Locations that the defendant did not observe corporal punishment; and
    - c. Names of all students that the defendants did not observe receiving corporal punishment.
87. Such a request is, quite obviously, ridiculous.
88. Consider another analogy: asking the Plaintiffs in the present case to provide the particulars sought regarding each instance of abuse alleged is akin to, in a proposed class action against a pharmaceutical company responsible for marketing and selling opioids, asking the plaintiffs to identify, in their pleading, every instance of addiction and overdose being alleged, and the identities of the individuals who were addicted or who had overdosed. Such requests are completely out of touch with the realities and purposes of class action litigation.
89. The Defendants are suggesting that in order to properly defend the claim and to understand the claim so that they can respond to the certification application, they each need to know each and every date and instance that every one of them: abused a child; assaulted or battered a child; witnessed someone else abuse, assault or batter a child; threatened a child; etc.

90. This level of detail is wholly unnecessary and, as explained above, contrary to the Foundational Rules of this Court and the overarching purposes of class proceedings. The Defendants' conduct in demanding particulars as they have, and now applying for further and better particulars, is a transparent and blatant abuse of process.

91. As stated by the Court in *Bellan*:

[20] In many instances, the particulars being requested are with respect to details which Bellan probably does not have and couldn't be expected to have until the discovery process has been completed. In fact, at this time, these defendants likely have more knowledge of many of the details they are requesting than Bellan does. They were actively involved in the matters which are the subject of the action. As well, they have as much access as Bellan does to the large volume of information which is in the public domain.

[21] The balance of the information they are requesting is not necessary at this stage of the proceedings. There is a substantial difference between the particulars they require for the certification hearing or to file their statements of defence and the information they may later require for the purposes of trial.

92. If this class action is certified, the Defendants will have the opportunity to engage in discovery of the Plaintiffs' case. Requiring this level of specifics to be provided at the pleadings stage is not appropriate or warranted and would place undue burden on the Plaintiffs.

93. Contrary to the assertions of the Applicant Defendants, the Plaintiffs are not merely making bald allegations or casting a broad net. Rather, the Plaintiffs have made specific allegations, described in detail the nature of the violence perpetrated (with examples), named the people involved in perpetrating that violence, described the time period in issue, and described the Plaintiff Classes. To expect the Plaintiffs to know every allegation of violence committed against each class member is absurd.

94. The Claim does in fact specify which allegations relate to which Defendants. The inclusive term "Defendants" and the narrower "Individually Named Defendants" and "Principal Defendants" are defined in the Claim. There are also instances where specific Defendants are named throughout. If the Defendants need to know which of the allegations is directed at them, they need only look so far as the defined terms.

95. What the Applicant Defendants are asking for in terms of particularized allegations against each named Defendant is not practical or purposeful in a class action of this nature and scope.

***B) Requests for particulars about rules and principles of the school.***

96. If the Claim is read, and read as a whole, several of the requests for particulars made by the Defendants are in fact answered therein. Requests for particulars about rules and principles of the school are one such instance.

97. For example, the Claim states at paras 39-42:

39. The objectives and teachings of the Church and School rely heavily on the Principal Defendants' viewpoints and teachings, particularly those of its founder Keith Johnson. These objectives and teachings permeated the policies and procedures of the School and the Church. The Ministry knew, or ought to have known, these viewpoints, teachings and objectives.

40. Integral to the objectives, policies and procedures of the School and of the Church was the concept and practice of ensuring unquestioning obedience and compliance by the children attending the School or Church, through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse.

41. The principles promulgated by the Principal Defendants, and particularly Keith Johnson, and carried out by the Individually Named Defendants, promoted corporal discipline of children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct.

42. Such principles are expressed in publications by Keith Johnson and Mile Two Church Inc. (publications the Ministry knew of, or ought to have known of), and include, but are not limited to:

...

98. Further, the Plaintiffs did in fact reply to requests for particulars about the policies and procedures of the School and Church, as follows:

The policies and procedures referenced at paragraph 28 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim are those policies and procedures enacted and utilized in furtherance of the principles referred to throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraphs 41, which include but are not limited to:

1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;

2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;
4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;
6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;
7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;
8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;
10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;
11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and
12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.

The identities of the employees, representatives of agents of Mile Two or its predecessors that are alleged to have formulated the policies and procedures are the Principal Defendants.

99. Further particulars about the specific rules and principles, as well as particulars as to the effective dates of such policies and procedures, are matters of evidence that can be adduced through the discovery process and at trial.

***C) Requests for particulars about the nature of the alleged violence.***

100. Requests for particulars relating to the nature of the alleged violence that was perpetrated at the School and Church is another case where reading the Claim resolves the question. The Claim provides significant detail regarding the alleged violence, the nature of the violence, and examples of the violence.

101. Specifically, particulars as to the nature of the violence alleged are located at paragraphs 45-50 of the Claim. In this regard, the Claim speaks for itself.
102. Again, the reasoning from the *Bellan* case is directly on point, where the Court stated at para 19:

[19] Much of the information these defendants are seeking with respect to specific paragraphs in the statement of claim is set out elsewhere in the statement of claim or documents referred to in the statement of claim.

***D) Requests for particulars about pain and suffering and harm to class members.***

103. The Plaintiffs are not required to plead particulars about general damages claimed, such as pain and suffering. General damages arise by an inference of law and may be averred generally.
104. As stated by Justice Klebuc in *Driscoll v MacBain*, 2002 SKQB 244, with respect to the difference between pleading particulars of special damages and general damages:

[12] It is well established that a defendant is entitled to particulars of special damages claimed by the pleading party. See Bullen, Leake & Jacob's *Precedents of Pleadings*, 12th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1975) and *Mathews v. Cameron*, [1964] S.J. No. 50, supra, and the authorities cited therein. In Bullen, Leake & Jacob the learned authors at p. 60 set out the applicable principle:

... [W]henever the plaintiff has suffered any "special damage," this must be alleged in the statement of claim with all necessary particulars, and the plaintiff will not be allowed at the trial to give evidence of any special damage which is not claimed explicitly in his statement of claim or particulars. Special damage in the sense of a monetary loss which the plaintiff has sustained up to the date of trial must be pleaded and particularised, otherwise it cannot be recovered.

The distinction between general and special damage is this. General damage is such as the law will presume to be the natural or probable consequence of the defendant's act. It arises by inference of law, and need not, therefore, be proved by evidence and may be averred generally.

Special damage, on the other hand, is such a loss as the law will not presume to be the consequence of the defendant's act, but such as depends in part, at least, on the special circumstances of the particular case. It must therefore be always explicitly claimed on the pleading, as otherwise the defendant would have no notice that such items of damage would be claimed from him at the trial.



[emphasis added]

105. With respect to requests for particulars about harms to class members, this is another area where reading the claim as a whole is a complete answer. The harms alleged are described at length at paragraphs 54-56 of the Claim.

***E) Requests for particulars about the conditions created by Mile Two.***

106. This is yet another instance where reading the Claim as a whole provides the requesting Defendant (in this case, Mile Two) with sufficient information to answer the enquiry.
107. The Claim explains in detail the environment of fear and control experienced by students and minor congregants at the School and Church, and the principles, actions and threats that supported that environment. The allegation is that these conditions existed, where, to quote the Claim at para 56: “Members of the Plaintiff Classes... lived in fear and anxiety during their attendance at the School and Church, and for years after, as a consequence of the conduct of the Defendants...”.
108. As another example, paragraph 40 of the Claim states:

Integral to the objectives, policies and procedures of the School and of the Church was the concept and practice of ensuring unquestioning obedience and compliance by the children attending the School or Church, through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse.

109. Further details about this environment are matters of evidence that will be elucidated in discovery and for the purposes of trial.
110. Again, anyone reading this Claim understands what the claim is about. When read as a whole, it paints a clear picture of the conditions that the Plaintiffs allege were created by Mile Two. Those are the allegations. Like all other allegations, the Plaintiffs will have to prove these allegations at trial on a balance of probabilities.

***F) Requests for particulars about the relationship of trust between GOS and the plaintiff classes.***

111. Again, these particulars sought are provided elsewhere in the Claim. The answer to these requests is obvious based on a plain reading of the claim as a whole.

112. For example, paragraphs 71-73 of the Claim reads:

71. The Defendants, as principals, teachers, pastors and elders, School, and responsible Government employees, agents and representatives stood in a position of authority and total control over the members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, who were children in their care and supervision. The members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, were subject to the unilateral exercise of the Defendants' power or discretion.

72. The members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, were in a position of dependance (sic), trust and reliance on the ~~Plaintiffs~~-Defendants.

73. The Defendants therefore owed a fiduciary duty to the members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs.

113. GOS is part of the defined term "Defendants", indicating that these statements of material fact as set out in the Claim indeed apply to GOS. Any further particulars as to this relationship are matters of evidence for discovery and trial.

114. GOS also argues that there can be no relationship of dependency between GOS and the Plaintiff Class that is composed of minor congregants of the Church. This is not true. As stated at paragraph 38 of the Claim: "... The church is the school and the school is the church."

115. By allowing the School to operate in that way that it did, the GOS was an active participant in the harm that was done to both the children at the School and at the Church, which were in all practical respects the same entity. The Claim states that GOS knew or ought to have known about the harmful objectives and teachings that permeated the policies and procedures of the School and Church. The Defendants, including the Ministry, knew of and intended, or were reckless or wilfully blind to the fact that, the Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, and Intimidation Abuse would cause harm to the Plaintiff Classes, including the minor congregants of the Church (para 52 of the Claim).

116. As such, the Plaintiffs have alleged that GOS knew about and endorsed the conduct of the School and Church. It is absurd to argue that the duty of GOS extends only so far as to the children being abused at the School and not to the children being abused at the Church. GOS appears to be arguing that its role in the abuse of children was

permissible as long as those children attended only the Church and not both the School and the Church, when there was no true separation between those two entities.

117. Again, the allegations have been made and GOS knows the case to meet based on the Claim. If GOS wants to defend on the basis that it had no relationship of trust with one branch of the Plaintiff Classes, then it can defend on that basis. Further information from the Plaintiffs is not necessary in order for GOS to so plead.

***G) Requests for particulars about misfeasance in public office, conspiracy, and intentional infliction of mental harm***

118. The Claim alleges that GOS is liable in the tort of misfeasance in public office. GOS has requested: “With respect to paragraphs 31.h., 44.17, and 44.20 of the Claim, please identify which individuals are alleged to have committed the tort of misfeasance in public office, including when and how the misfeasance was committed.”

119. The British Columbia Court of Appeal decision in *Greengen Holdings Ltd. v British Columbia (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources Operations)*, 2023 BCCA 024, 479 DLR (4<sup>th</sup>) 424 [*Greengen*] confirmed that a claim for misfeasance in public office can be made against the public authority directly, rather than against the individual public official. For example, the Court in *Greengen* states:

5... While *Greengen* would be required to claim against the particular public officials as defendants if they sought a remedy against them, it is not a requirement that a plaintiff do so when the misfeasance claim is made directly against public authorities. In such a claim, the plaintiff must identify the relevant public officials, to the extent that their identity is known, in order to ensure that the defendant knows the case it has to meet, and to ensure that the public officials whose conduct is questioned can be defended by the public authority for which they worked.

[emphasis added]

120. The issue in this case is the extent to which the individuals who carried out the alleged misfeasance in public office are sufficiently identified in the pleading and the Replies.
121. Interestingly, the Court in *Greengen* also commented on the identification of the individual public officers. The Court in *Greengen* made the following comments:

45 In *Merchant Law Group v. Canada Revenue Agency and Attorney General of Canada*, 2010 FCA 184 ("Merchant"), the Federal Court of Appeal confirmed the striking out of a class action misfeasance claim against the CRA on jurisdictional grounds, but went on to consider the need for identification of the public officials whose conduct was at issue. The CRA argued that plaintiffs pleading the tort of misfeasance in public office "must always state the actual name of the individuals who committed the alleged misfeasance": at para. 37. Justice Stratas held that "such a requirement, if applied strictly in every case, would impose too onerous a burden upon plaintiffs in some cases. In addition, it would go beyond the level of particularity necessary to fulfil the purposes of pleadings in civil proceedings": at para. 37. He then stated that the individuals involved should be identified, if not by name, in some other way, as a material fact that must be pleaded, explaining that "it may be impossible for a plaintiff to identify by name the particular individual who was responsible", but identifying a particular group of individuals who were dealing with the matter, one or more of whom were allegedly responsible, by "job positions, an organizational branch, an office, or a building" would usually provide sufficient particularity to fulfill the purposes of pleadings: at para. 38.

122. The level of specificity required to plead misfeasance in public office in this matter has been met. The Claim makes it clear that the claim in misfeasance in public office is against GOS, not any particular individuals, and the Reply identifies the groups or types of individuals whose conduct is impugned.
123. The specific names of the individuals that worked for GOS is not within the knowledge of the Plaintiffs, as was stated in the Reply. Additionally, the following groups or types of individuals were identified as the individual perpetrators: "Ministers, Deputy Ministers, employees, staff members, agents and/or representatives of the Ministry of Education for Saskatchewan since 1982 until present."
124. This level of specificity regarding individual conduct is sufficient for pleading the tort of misfeasance in public office at this stage in the litigation, which, it must be remembered, is prior to document disclosure and questioning, and even prior to a certification application.
125. Another key aspect of this issue is that, as set out in the Affidavit of Caitlin Erickson, the Ministry has failed to discharge its obligations to reply to the Plaintiffs' access to information request in a timely or appropriate way. This applies to the claim against GOS in conspiracy as well. While the Ministry first indicated it had 113,000 pages of documents to disclose, only 9,000 pages were actually disclosed. Further, information

has been improperly redacted, which presents a serious barrier for the Plaintiffs in gathering relevant facts.

126. As stated by Justice Hanssen in *Bellan*:

[20] In many instances, the particulars being requested are with respect to details which *Bellan* probably does not have and couldn't be expected to have until the discovery process has been completed. In fact, at this time, these defendants likely have more knowledge of many of the details they are requesting than *Bellan* does. They were actively involved in the matters which are the subject of the action. As well, they have as much access as *Bellan* does to the large volume of information which is in the public domain.

127. In the present case, the government not only has as much access to the information as the Plaintiffs, they are the ones in control of the information and have actually stonewalled the Plaintiffs from accessing it. In further frustration of the process, GOS now seeks better particulars with respect to the very information they are controlling and withholding.

128. Sufficient particulars about the alleged conduct of GOS supporting the allegations of misfeasance in public office have also been pled.

129. Paragraphs 44.1 to 44.11 of the Claim, inclusive, set out the obligations of GOS to the plaintiff classes. Paragraphs 44.12 to 44.25 go on to state how GOS has failed to meet those obligations and how that leads to liability of GOS.

130. GOS has raised an objection to the Claim allegedly “bootstrapping” the misfeasance allegation to the negligence allegation. This is untrue.

131. It is acknowledged that misfeasance in public office and negligence are different torts. However, that does not mean that they do not overlap. The impugned conduct by GOS here can amount to both negligence by GOS and misfeasance in public office. These torts are not mutually exclusive.

132. In fact, the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *Pedigree Poultry Ltd. v Saskatchewan Broiler Hatching Egg Producers' Marketing Board*, 2022 SKCA 113, 4754 DLR (4<sup>th</sup>) 193 [*Slater*], commented on the mental element of the tort of misfeasance in public office as follows:

92 As can be seen from this discussion, by adopting the approach taken in *Three Rivers* and *Powder Mountain Resorts Ltd. v British Columbia*, 2001 BCCA 619, [2001] 11 WWR 488 [*Powder Mountain*], *Odhavji* expanded the ambit of the tort and clarified the point that subjective knowledge can include recklessness or wilful blindness on the part of the public officer. The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Foschia v Conseil des Écoles Catholique de Langue Française du Centre-Est*, 2009 ONCA 499, 266 OAC 17, synthesized the law on this point in this way: "In proving the third element [i.e., awareness], it is sufficient for the plaintiff to show that the public official acted with reckless indifference to both the unlawfulness of his or her act and the likelihood that it would injure the plaintiff" (at para 24): also see *Meekis v Ontario*, 2021 ONCA 534 at para 73, 461 DLR (4th) 307, and *Ontario Racing Commission v O'Dwyer*, 2008 ONCA 446, 293 DLR (4th) 559 [*O'Dwyer*].

93 The Supreme Court recently returned to the *Odhavji* principles in *Ontario (Attorney General) v Clark*, 2021 SCC 18, 456 DLR (4th) 361 [*Clark*]. While the decision in *Clark* did not engage in an in-depth discussion of the tort of misfeasance in public office, it did provide this summary of the tort's constituent elements:

[22] The elements and proper scope of the tort of misfeasance are not disputed in this appeal. A successful misfeasance claim requires the plaintiff to establish that the public official engaged in deliberate and unlawful conduct in his or her capacity as a public official, and that the official was aware that the conduct was unlawful and likely to harm the plaintiff (*Odhavji Estate v. Woodhouse*, [2003] 3 S.C.R. 263, at para. 23, per Iacobucci J.).

94 *Clark* is important in two fundamental respects. It affirmed (a) the broad scope or ambit of the tort, and (b) that subjective awareness can be established through subjective recklessness or a conscious disregard for the lawfulness of the conduct and its harmful consequences:

[23] The unlawful conduct anchoring a misfeasance claim typically falls into one of three categories, namely an act in excess of the public official's powers, an exercise of a power for an improper purpose, or a breach of a statutory duty (*Odhavji*, at para. 24). The minimum requirement of subjective awareness has been described as "subjective recklessness" or "conscious disregard" for the lawfulness of the conduct and the consequences to the plaintiff (*Odhavji*, at paras. 25 and 29; *Powder Mountain Resorts Ltd. v. British Columbia* (2001), 94 B.C.L.R. (3d) 14 (C.A.), at para. 7; *Three Rivers District Council v. Bank of England* (No. 3) (2000), [2003] 2 A.C. 1 (H.L.), at pp. 194-95, per Lord Steyn).

[Emphasis Added]

133. It is alleged at paragraph 44.17 of the Claim that the conduct of GOS was “willful misconduct and a marked departure from the standard by which responsible and competent agencies in charge of education habitually govern themselves... constituting misfeasance in a public office by the [GOS].”

134. It is also alleged at paragraph 44.18 of the Claim that the conduct of GOS was intended to cause harm to the Plaintiff Classes, or they were wilfully blind to whether the conduct would cause harm to the Plaintiff Classes.
135. Paragraph 44.19 of the Claim alleges that GOS showed recklessness and/or carelessness in its conduct, and the effect of that conduct, so as to rise to the level of bad faith.
136. Paragraph 44.20 clearly states that the actions of GOS were “reckless and constituted willful blindness on the part of the [GOS]”.
137. All of these allegations in the Claim, taken individually or together, are sufficient to satisfy the elements of the tort of misfeasance in public office. These allegations can and do cross over with a claim in negligence (and the conduct which constitutes negligence can also be reckless or wilful blindness or otherwise bad faith), but the allegations also support a standalone cause of action in the tort of misfeasance in public office.
138. The Claim alleges all of the necessary elements of the tort of misfeasance in public office and provides the Defendants with all of the information they need to respond. Any further particulars as to the tort of misfeasance in public office are matters of evidence for discovery and trial.
139. Several of the Applicant Defendants have also applied for further and better particulars with respect to the claim against the Defendants in conspiracy to injure. The Plaintiffs did in fact respond with further particulars about the conspiracy allegations in several of the Replies, as follows:

**Reply**

The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to:

1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;

2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
  3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;
  4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
  5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;
  6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;
  7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;
  8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
  9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;
  10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;
  11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and
  12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.
140. Further, the Claim itself provides the Defendants with the information they need to be able to plead intelligently.
141. An essential element of the tort of conspiracy is that an agreement between several persons must be pled. This was one of the issues canvassed by Justice Elson in *Wildeman*, where the case of *Frey v BCE Inc.*, 2006 SKQB 328 was cited as authority. Justice Elson commented:

[88] In *Frey 2*, Gerein J. concluded, correctly in my view, that, no matter whether the cause of action alleged was in conspiracy or collusion, an essential element of either cause of action was an agreement between the defendants. At this stage of the present case, it is not for me to decide whether the allegation of collusion discloses a cause of action. Having said that, given the remarks of Gerein J., the plaintiff's allegation of collusion must be taken to mean that the plaintiff alleges an agreement between the defendants. Accordingly, it necessarily follows that particulars of that agreement should be provided when sought.



142. In the present case, the Plaintiffs have stated in the Claim at para 60 that: “The Defendants conspired to inflict harm to the students of the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, by lawful and unlawful means of the Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, and Intimidation Abuse.”
143. The use of the phrase, “the Defendants conspired”, at para 60 of the Claim indicates that the Defendants had an agreement to harm the Plaintiffs. The words “conspire” and “agree” are synonyms. This was confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Cotroni v R.*, [1979] 2 SCR 256, at para 277, where Dickson J. wrote: “The word ‘conspire’ derives from two Latin words, ‘con’ and ‘spirare’, meaning ‘to breathe together.’ To conspire is to agree [Emphasis added].”
144. Further indication of the agreement that is alleged is provided in the Replies where the Plaintiffs state that the Defendants conspired by: “communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the [Claim].”
145. The Claim goes on to state at paragraph 62 that based on the allegations in the Claim, the Defendants are liable in the torts of conspiracy to harm by lawful and unlawful means.
146. The conduct of the Defendants that caused injury to the Plaintiff Classes, along with allegations as to the harm caused to the Plaintiff Classes, is outlined throughout the Claim and as already discussed in this Brief. Further conduct supporting the allegations of conspiracy are set out in the Replies. The cause of action in conspiracy has been sufficiently pled to enable the Defendants to know the case to meet and to plead intelligently. That is all that is required. Any further information about these allegations is a matter for discovery and trial.
147. With respect to the claim against the Defendants for intentional infliction of mental harm, this is, yet again, another instance where reading the whole of the Claim resolves the issue.
148. The Claim alleges at paragraph 76.1 that the Defendants, including GOS, are liable to the Plaintiff Classes for, “trespass to the person, assault, battery and intentional

infliction of mental suffering for the conduct described herein.” This indicates that the allegations are to be read from the Claim as a whole based on all of the conduct described. As explained above, the Claim goes into great detail about the alleged conduct giving rise to the Claim, including specific conduct of GOS.

149. Importantly, paragraph 58 of the Claim states:

58. The foreseeable and expected consequences of the wrongful acts of the Defendants amount to the Defendants having intentionally inflicted mental harm on the members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs.

150. This is the crux of the allegation. All of the conduct described in the Claim was so obviously going to cause harm that it amounted to an intention to inflict mental harm. This explicitly applies to all of the Defendants, including GOS. The Defendants know exactly what the Claim is about and have been told exactly what is being alleged with respect to intentional infliction of mental harm. The Defendants can respond on that basis. Any further details about the conduct giving rise to mental harm, and the mental harm suffered, are matters for discovery and trial.

***H) Requests for particulars about whether the action is suitable as a class action.***

151. Each of the Defendants who filed applications for better and further particulars stated in their application that they are entitled to particulars pertaining to the suitability of the within action as a class action.

152. The certification criteria set out at section 6(1) of the Act can be summarized as follows:

- 2) Do the pleadings disclose a cause of action?
- 3) Is there an identifiable class?
- 4) Do the claims of the class members raise common issues?
- 5) Is a class action the preferable procedure?
- 6) Is there a willing and appropriate representative plaintiff?

153. In reality, however, the Defendants have not requested particulars that address these questions. In fact, very few of the requests for particulars have anything to do with the certification criteria.
154. Further, in *Bellan*, as cited above, the Court stated that: “Any additional information required for the certification motion can be provided by affidavits filed in support of the motion and any cross-examinations on them. If *Bellan* fails to provide sufficient information, the class action will simply not be certified” (Para 22).’
155. In the case of *Kwicksutaineuk/ Ah-Kwa-Mish First Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Agriculture and Lands)*, 2009 BCSC 1593, the Court was of the view that the only certification criteria relevant with respect to requests for better and further particulars is whether the pleadings disclose sufficient material fact to establish a cause of action (para 49). The Court quoted from *Stewart v General Motors Canada Ltd.*, 2007 CanLII 21611, at para 13, as follows:

... If the material facts have been pleaded in respect of the claims of the plaintiffs, the absence of particulars should not ordinarily bear on issues relating to certification. The factual basis for those relating to commonality, or the preferable procedure, should be dealt with in supporting affidavits and can be explored in cross-examination. Particulars will, therefore, not usually be required prior to certification and I see nothing in the circumstances of this case that would require it to be treated as exceptional.

[emphasis added]

156. The Defendants should not be permitted to use requests for particulars to gather evidence for the certification hearing. That is the purpose of the affidavit materials that will be filed prior to the certification hearing, which the Defendants will have an opportunity to respond to. Even the affidavits filed in support of certification need not include the level of specifics about each instance of abuse that the Applicant Defendants are seeking. Rather, those affidavits need only satisfy the Court that the certification criteria are met.
157. As stated by this Court in *Bemrose v Manz*, 2023 SKKB 261, at para 28: “Simply put, certification is not the time and place to prove the allegations of fact advanced; it is the time and place to answer only those questions set out in s. 6 of the Act.”

158. The Applicant Defendants cannot be permitted to force the Plaintiffs to respond to an overwhelming volume of requests for particulars under the guise of needing them to prepare for certification, when even the certification hearing will not require the level of factual details sought here. These requests by the Applicant Defendants expose either a fundamental misunderstanding of the realities of class proceedings (at best), or a bad faith attempt to delay and complicate these proceedings and drive up the costs for the Plaintiff Classes. Sadly, the latter is much more likely.
159. Further, it is the Plaintiffs that bear the risk at certification of inadequate materials, including an inadequate pleading, needed to satisfy the Court that that action should be certified. It is entirely speculative at this point to assert that the pleading is not sufficient for the purposes of certification. That is not the question presently before the Court.

## **VI. COSTS**

160. The Plaintiffs seek from each of the applicant Defendants the costs of each application for further and better particulars on an elevated basis, to be paid forthwith.

## **VII. RELIEF REQUESTED**

161. The Plaintiffs request that each of the within Applications be dismissed with costs.

**ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.**

DATED at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, this 29 day of April, 2024.

**SCHARFSTEIN LLP**

Per: 

Solicitors for the Plaintiffs,  
Caitlin Erickson, Jennifer Soucy  
(Beaudry), and Stefanie Hutchinson

**CONTACT INFORMATION AND ADDRESS FOR SERVICE**

Name of Firm: Scharfstein LLP  
Name of lawyer in charge of file: Grant J. Scharfstein, K.C. / Samuel W. Edmondson  
Address of Legal Firm: 200 Princeton Tower  
123 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South  
Saskatoon SK S7K 7E6  
Telephone Number: (306) 653-2838  
Fax Number: (306) 652-4747  
Email address: gscharfstein@scharfsteinlaw.com / sedmondson@scharfsteinlaw.com  
File number: 21,835.1

## VIII. AUTHORITIES

### Authorities Available on [www.canlii.org](http://www.canlii.org)

As Per Rule 13-38.1, the authorities in this List of Authorities are available on [www.canlii.org](http://www.canlii.org) and are not enclosed except where otherwise noted.

The Summary statements of legal principles relied upon from each authority are not intended to be exhaustive, and should be read in context with the body text of this Brief of Law.

	Name	Pinpoints	Legal Principle
<b>Case Law</b>			
1	<i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Association v Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i> , [1994] 9 WWR 293 (Sask QB).		Generally speaking, case law has established that particulars will be ordered:  a) For the purposes of pleading, i.e. to enable the opposite party to plead intelligently;  b) For the purpose of trial, i.e., to define the issues to be tried so as to save the expense of calling unnecessary witnesses and prevent the opposite party from being taken by surprise.
2	<i>Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v Dutton</i> , 2001 SCC 46.	Paras 27 and 29	The fundamental purposes of class proceedings are:  (a) To serve judicial economy;  (b) To improve access to justice;  (c) To serve efficiency and justice by ensuring that where wrongdoing is found, wrongdoers modify their behaviour.
3	<i>Wassermann v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i> , 2022 SKQB 17.		An application for further and better particulars from which several key principles can be derived, including:  - material facts are distinct from particulars;

			<p>- for the purposes of certification, additional materials will be filed to enable the defendants to respond to the certification application;</p> <p>- it would place an undue burden on the plaintiffs' counsel at this early stage to have to seek out each person who may fall into the classes. It was not realistic to expect the plaintiffs, in a proceeding of that nature and magnitude, to have identified potential class members more precisely than they had already done.</p>
4	<i>Driscoll v MacBain</i> , 2002 SKQB 244.	Para 6; Para 12	<p>It is well established that an order for further particulars is at the discretion of the Court and generally governed by the need to do justice in the specific circumstances before the Court.</p> <p>General damage is such as the law will presume to be the natural or probable consequence of the defendant's act. It arises by inference of law, and need not, therefore, be proved by evidence and may be averred generally</p>
5	<i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i> , [1984] S.J. No. 110.		<p>Grounds to refuse better and further particulars include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- where particulars requested are matters of evidence</li> <li>- where applicants have better knowledge of particulars demanded</li> </ul>
6	<i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i> , [1987] S.J. No. 703.		A case where applicants had better knowledge of particulars demanded.
7	<i>Bellan v Curtis</i> , 2007 MBQB 221.		A very similar case to the present case, where the Court dismissed the bulk of the application for better and further particulars. The defendants in <i>Bellan</i>

			sought “voluminous and detailed information regarding the claim”. Justice Hanssen’s view was that the defendants were, in effect, demanding full discovery of the plaintiffs’ case prior to the certification hearing and before filing their statements of defence.
<b>8</b>	<i>Wildeman v Bell Mobility Inc.</i> , 2015 SKQB 125.		A case where better and further particulars were ordered in the context of a class action.
<b>9</b>	<i>Koop v Saskatchewan Power Corp.</i> (1997) 159 Sask R. 290 (QB).	Para 13	It is not sufficient for the Plaintiffs to state that the particulars are within the Defendant’s knowledge.  Whether the information provided in the pleading enables the defendants to plead intelligently is the underlying question.
<b>10</b>	<i>Franklin Land Development Ltd. v Clements</i> , 2010 SKQB 272.		Justice Acton relied solely on the decision from <i>Koop</i> to opine that the responding party to a request for particulars may not state that the particulars are within the other party’s knowledge
<b>11</b>	<i>Todd Acceptance Ltd. v Custom Communicating Systems Inc.</i> , [1984] 32 Sask R 104.	Para 8	Particulars are not required to be given of the circumstances under which the act was done, but which the plaintiff would have a right as a matter of evidence to discover by means of examination on discovery.
<b>12</b>	<i>Kwicksutaineuk/ Ah-Kwa-Mish First Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Agriculture and Lands)</i> , 2009 BCSC 1593.	Para 13	If the material facts have been pleaded in respect of the claims of the plaintiffs, the absence of particulars should not ordinarily bear on issues relating to certification. The factual basis for those relating to commonality, or the preferable procedure, should be dealt with in supporting affidavits and can be explored in cross-examination.



13	<i>Bemrose v Manz</i> , 2023 SKKB 261.	Para 28	Certification is not the time and place to prove the allegations of fact advanced; it is the time and place to answer only those questions set out in s. 6 of the Act.
14	<i>Greengen Holdings Ltd. v British Columbia (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources Operations)</i> , 2023 BCCA 024.	Para 5; Para 45	<p>A claim for misfeasance in public office can be made against the public authority directly, rather than against the individual public official.</p> <p>Identifying individuals by name imposes too high a burden on plaintiffs. Identifying a particular group of individuals who were dealing with the matter, one or more of whom were allegedly responsible, by "job positions, an organizational branch, an office, or a building" will usually provide sufficient particularity to fulfill the purposes of pleadings</p>
15	<i>Pedigree Poultry Ltd. v Saskatchewan Broiler Hatching Egg Producers' Marketing Board</i> , 2022 SKCA 113.	Para 92-94	The mental element of the tort of misfeasance in public office is subjective knowledge that can include recklessness or wilful blindness on the part of the public officer.
16	<i>Frey v BCE Inc.</i> , 2006 SKQB 328		An essential element of a cause of action in conspiracy to injure is an agreement between the defendants.
17	<i>Cotroni v R.</i> , [1979] 2 SCR 256.	Para 277	The word 'conspire' derives from two Latin words, 'con' and 'spirare', meaning 'to breathe together.' To conspire is to agree.
Legislation			
18	<i>The Class Actions Act</i> , SS 2001 c C-12.01.	s. 6	Sets out the certification criteria.
Secondary sources			
19	<i>The King's Bench Rules</i>	Rule 1-3, 3-71 &	Rule 1-3: parties are to resolve claims in a just, timely and cost effective way.

		13-8(1)	<p>Rule 3-71: the authority for a party to request particulars of a pleading and to bring an application for further and better particulars</p> <p>Rule 13-8(1): pleadings should “contain only a statement in summary form of the material facts on which the party pleading relies...” and “be as brief as the nature of the case will permit.”</p>
--	--	---------	---

SCHEDULE "A" – Replies to Particulars in Issue in these Applications

Legend – Plaintiffs' Categorization of Requests

A	Requests for specifics about victims and instances of abuse.
B	Requests about rules and principles of the School and/or Church.
C	Requests about the nature of alleged violence.
D	Requests about pain and suffering and harm to class members.
E	Requests about the conditions created by Mile Two.
F	Requests about the relationship of trust between GOS and the plaintiff classes.
G	Requests about misfeasance in public office, conspiracy, and intentional infliction of mental harm.
H	Requests about whether the action is suitable as a class action.
I	Other miscellaneous factual requests.

Requesting Defendant	Request by Defendant and Response by Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs' categorization	(intentionally blank)
Mile Two	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 22 of the Claim, particulars of the identity or identities of the individual(s) or entities who allegedly promoted and advocated for Nathan Schultz as a babysitter.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state that Nathan Schultz was promoted and advocated for as a babysitter by the Defendants.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a</p>	<p><b>I.</b></p> <p>Other – factual request that has already been responded to.</p>	

	<p>2. Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>3. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>4. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>5. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 26(c) of the Claim, particulars of the physical, sexual, psychological, emotional, mental, or spiritual abuse allegedly perpetrated against the students attending the school operated by Mile Two, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the alleged victims of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Nature of the alleged abuse;</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state that paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself, in that the paragraph as a whole describes the “[Additional John Does and Jane Does” against whom allegations have been made in the Second Amended Statement of Claim, which include the categories of individuals who are defined as “Unidentified Corporate Officers”, “Unidentified Church Elders”, “Unidentified School Abusers”, “Unidentified Church Abusers”, “Unidentified School Abuse Planners”, and “Unidentified Church Abuse Planners”, all of whom together form the category of individuals defined as “Unidentified Parties”. The particulars of the conduct described in identifying the above noted categories of individuals are set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The identity or identities of the alleged victims of the alleged conduct is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The nature of the alleged abuse is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and span the period from 1982 to present.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraph 26(d) of the Claim particulars of the physical, sexual, psychological, emotional, mental, or spiritual abuse allegedly perpetrated against the students attending the school operated by Mile Two, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the alleged victims of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Nature of the alleged abuse;</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state that paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself, in that the paragraph as a whole describes the “[Additional John Does and Jane Does” against whom allegations have been made in the Second Amended Statement of Claim, which include the categories of individuals who are defined as “Unidentified Corporate Officers”, “Unidentified Church Elders”, “Unidentified School Abusers”, “Unidentified Church Abusers”, “Unidentified School Abuse Planners”, and “Unidentified Church Abuse Planners”, all of whom together form the category of individuals defined as “Unidentified Parties”. The particulars of the conduct described in identifying the above noted categories of individuals are set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The identity or identities of the alleged victims of the alleged conduct is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The nature of the alleged abuse is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim and span the period from 1982 to present.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince*

	<p><i>Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 26(e), the particulars of the policies and procedures allegedly formulated for the abuse of students attending the school operated by Mile Two or its predecessors, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identification of the policies and procedures referred to;</li> <li>b. The effective date(s) of such policies and procedures; and</li> <li>c. The identities of the employees, representatives, or agents of Mile Two or its predecessors that are alleged to have formulated the policies and procedures referred to.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p>	<p><b>B.</b></p> <p>Rules and principles of the School and/or Church</p>	



The Plaintiffs state that paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself, in that the paragraph as a whole describes the “[A]dditional John Does and Jane Does” against whom allegations have been made in the Second Amended Statement of Claim, which include the categories of individuals who are defined as “Unidentified Corporate Officers”, “Unidentified Church Elders”, “Unidentified School Abusers”, “Unidentified Church Abusers”, “Unidentified School Abuse Planners”, and “Unidentified Church Abuse Planners”, all of whom together form the category of individuals defined as “Unidentified Parties”. The particulars of the conduct described in identifying the above noted categories of individuals are set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The policies and procedures referenced at paragraph 26(e) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim are those policies and procedures enacted and utilized in furtherance of the principles referred to throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraphs 41, which include but are not limited to:

1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;
2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
3. Total control of students’ lives both inside and outside of the School and Church settings;
4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;

	<p>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</p> <p>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</p> <p>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</p> <p>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</p> <p>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</p> <p>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</p> <p>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>The identities of the employees, representatives of agents of Mile Two or its predecessors that are alleged to have formulated the policies and procedures are those individuals alleged to have formulated the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>policies and procedures as pled in the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraph 26(f) of the Claim, particulars of the policies and procedures allegedly formulated for the abuse of minor members of the church operated by Mile Two or its predecessors, including the:</p>	<p><b>B.</b></p> <p>Rules and principles of the School and/or Church</p>	

- a. Identification of the policies and procedures referred to;
- b. The effective date(s) of such policies and procedures; and
- c. The identities of the employees, representatives, or agents of Mile Two or its predecessors that are alleged to have formulated the policies and procedures referred to.

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state that paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself, in that the paragraph as a whole describes the “[A]dditional John Does and Jane Does” against whom allegations have been made in the Second Amended Statement of Claim, which include the categories of individuals who are defined as “Unidentified Corporate Officers”, “Unidentified Church Elders”, “Unidentified School Abusers”, “Unidentified Church Abusers”, “Unidentified School Abuse Planners”, and “Unidentified Church Abuse Planners”, all of whom together form the category of individuals defined as “Unidentified Parties”. The particulars of the conduct described in identifying the above noted categories of individuals are set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including but not limited to paragraph 42 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The policies and procedures referenced at paragraph 26(f) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim are those policies and procedures enacted and utilized in furtherance of the principles referred to throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which include but are not limited to:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church settings;</li> <li>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</li> <li>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTIQ+ community;</li> <li>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</li> <li>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</li> <li>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</li> <li>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</li> <li>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</li> </ol>	
--	---	--

	<p>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>The identities of the employees, representatives of agents of Mile Two or its predecessors that are alleged to have formulated the policies and procedures are the Principal Defendants.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan</i></li> </ol>	
--	--	--

	<p>(<i>Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>14. With respect to paragraph 46 of the Claim, particulars of the alleged witnessing of corporal punishment that was calculated to further shame, humiliate, and degrade the child being punished, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity of the individuals alleged to have calculated that the witnessing of corporal punishment would further shame, humiliate, and degrade the child being punished; and</li> <li>b. Nature of the alleged additional and severe psychological, mental, emotional, and spiritual harm.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The Plaintiffs state that Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that “Individually Named Defendants” and “Unidentified Parties” are possessive, and the allegation is against all such Individually Named Defendants and Unidentified Parties.</p> <p>b. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>D.</b></p> <p>Pain and suffering and harm to class members</p>

	<p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34)</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>15. With respect to paragraph 46.1 of the Claim, particulars of the rules of the school and church operated by Mile Two, and their effective dates.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The rules referenced at paragraph 46.1 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim include those rules furthering the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation paragraph 41, which include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students’ lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;</li> <li>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</li> <li>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</li> </ol>	<p><b>B.</b></p> <p>Rules and principles of the School and/or Church</p>	



	<p>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</p> <p>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</p> <p>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</p> <p>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</p> <p>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</p> <p>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>16. With respect to paragraph 46.1 of the Claim, particulars of the allegation that the school and church operated by Mile Two demanded and required compliance to its rules, including how such compliance was demanded and required.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state that the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself.</p> <p>In addition:</p>	<p>E. Conditions created by Mile Two</p>	

	<p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Mile Two</b></p>	<p><b>Request</b></p> <p>17. With respect to paragraph 46.1 of the Claim, particulars of the violence allegedly inflicted, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the alleged violence;</li> <li>b. Identities of the perpetrators of the alleged violence; and</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged violence occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The violence allegedly inflicted occurred during the period from 1982 to present. The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>22. With respect to paragraph 47(b)(i)(4) of the Claim, particulars of the alleged instances of paddling, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged paddling occurred;</li> <li>b. Frequency of the alleged paddling; and</li> <li>c. Identity or identities of the alleged perpetrator(s).</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The paddling occurred throughout the period that Coy Nolin attended the church and school operated by Mile Two (and its predecessor), being approximately 1997 through 2004.</p> <p>b. The paddling occurred with such frequency that Coy Nolin is unable to recall all incidents where he was paddled.</p> <p>c. Paddling was administered by the Individually Named Defendants and Unidentified Defendants.</p> <p>In any event, the Plaintiffs state:</p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
-----------------	---	---	--

		<p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</p>
	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	<p><b>Mile Two</b></p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>24. With respect to paragraph 47(b.1)(i) of the Claim, particulars of the alleged inappropriate personal and intimate relationship and sexual touching, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Frequency of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian</i></p>

	<p><i>Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>26. With respect to paragraph 47(b.2)(ii) of the Claim, particulars of the alleged instances of paddling, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>Paragraph 47(b.2)(ii) speaks for itself, sufficiently identifying the frequency and time of such battery for Mile Two to plead intelligently.</p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</p>	
Mile Two	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>28. With respect to paragraph 47(c) of the Claim, particulars of the alleged instances of physical striking by hand or wooden paddle, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>



	<p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p> <p>b. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself, identifying the perpetrators of the conduct described in paragraph 47(c) as “the Individually Named Defendants, Unidentified Church Abusers and Unidentified School Abusers”.</p> <p>c. The Plaintiffs state that the conduct described at paragraph 47(c) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim occurred repeatedly and consistently throughout the period from 1982 to present.</p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110). Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><i>Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>29. With respect to paragraph 47(d), (e), (g), (1.1), and (o) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>30. With respect to paragraph 47(f) of the Claim, particulars of the allegation set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity of the victim of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110). Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian</i></p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>32. With respect to paragraph 47(i) and (j) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged sexual conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged sexual conduct;</li> <li>c. Nature of the alleged sexual conduct in relation to each alleged victim; and</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The abusers include, but are not limited to, Aaron</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>Benneweis, Darcy Schuster, Nathan Schultz, and Ken Schultz.</p> <p>b. The victims are members of the Abused Student Class and Church Minors Class.</p> <p>c. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p> <p>d. The abuse described at paragraphs 47(i) and 47(j) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim occurred during the period from 1982 to present.</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>33. With respect to paragraph 47(k) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and</p>

	instances of abuse.	<p>a. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</p> <p>b. Frequency of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim; and</p> <p>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>
--	---------------------	---

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>34. With respect to paragraph 47(k.1) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
-----------------	--	--	--

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p>particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>35. With respect to paragraph 47(1) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Nature of the alleged physical and/or learning disability or disabilities for each alleged victim; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



	<p><i>Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>36. With respect to paragraph 47(m) of the Claim, particulars of the allegation set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity of the victim of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Date or approximate date on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>37. With respect to paragraph 47(n) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>38. With respect to paragraph 48(a)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>39. With respect to paragraph 48(c) of the Claim, particulars of the allegation set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Identity of the victim of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>c. Date or approximate date on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34)</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>40. With respect to paragraph 48(d) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>d. Identification of the principles, teachings, and purported obligations referred to; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
Mile Two	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>41. With respect to paragraph 48(e) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</p> <p>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</p> <p>d. Nature of the alleged conduct in relation to each alleged victim;</p> <p>c. Nature of the alleged physical and/or learning disability or disabilities in relation to each alleged victim;</p> <p>d. Identification of the performance standards referred to; and</p> <p>e. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol>	

	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>42. With respect to paragraph 48(f) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Nature of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>43. With respect to paragraph 48(g)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>d. Nature of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>44. With respect to paragraph 48(h), (i), (j), (1), (m), (m.1), (m.2), (m.3), (m.4), (m.5), (m.8), and (m.9) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
Mile Two	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>45. With respect to paragraph 48(k) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p>	A.	Specifics about victims and

	<p>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</p> <p>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</p> <p>c. Nature of the alleged learning disabilities for each alleged victim; and</p> <p>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan</i></li> </ol>	instances of abuse.
--	--	---------------------

	<p>(<i>Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p><b>Mile Two</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>46. With respect to paragraph 48(m.6) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>c. Nature of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim; and</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p><i>Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>47. With respect to paragraph 48(m.7) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>b. Identity of the victim of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>c. Location(s) in which the alleged conduct occurred; and</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>,</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>[1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>48. With respect to paragraph 48(m.10) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Plaintiffs State that the conduct of Donauer as pled at paragraph 48(m.10) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim occurred on or about February 11, 2001 in the presence of a number of minors, including Stefanie Hutchinson, the identities</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>of which are not presently known to the Plaintiffs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>3. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>4. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>5. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>49. With respect to paragraph 49(a)(i) and (iii) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



**Reply:**

a. With respect to paragraph 49(a)(i) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim:

The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).

The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

b. With respect to paragraph 49(a)(iii) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, the Plaintiffs state that the paddles were sold and kept in plain view throughout the period that Caitlin Erickson attended at Mile Two, either as a student or as a minor congregant or adherent of the Church, from 1992 to 2005. More generally, the Plaintiffs state that paddles were sold and kept in plain view throughout the period from 1982 to present.

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>50. With respect to paragraph 49(a)(ii) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>b. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. With respect to paragraph 49(a)(i) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim:</p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110). Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
-----------------	---	--	--

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p>b. The conduct occurred throughout the period that Caitlin Erickson attended at Mile Two, either as a student or as a minor congregant or adherent of the Church, from 1992 to 2005.</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p><b>51.</b> With respect to paragraph 49(a.1) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the individuals who discouraged Jennifer Soucy (Beaudry) from reporting the alleged abuse to police, discouraged her from pursuing criminal charges, and coerced her into lying to police;</li> <li>b. Nature of the coercion alleged against each alleged perpetrator; and</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred by each alleged perpetrator.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself.</li> <li>b. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ul> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p>c. The conduct occurred during and after the period in which Aaron Benneweis engaged in an inappropriate personal relationship and sexual touching of Jennifer Soucy (Beaudry).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>52. With respect to paragraph 49(a.2) of the Claim, particulars of the dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>53. With respect to paragraph 49(b), (c), (e), (f), (h), (i), U), (l), (n), (o), (p), and (q) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The perpetrators of the alleged conduct are the Individually Named Defendants, Unidentified School Abusers, and Unidentified Church Abusers.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>b. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p>c. The alleged conduct occurred throughout the period from 1982 to present.</p>		
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>54. With respect to paragraph 49(d), (g), and (m) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>c. Identification of the principles, teachings, and purported obligations referred to for each alleged victim; and</p> <p>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The perpetrators of the alleged conduct are the Individually Named Defendants, Unidentified School Abusers, and Unidentified Church Abusers.</p> <p>b. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo34).</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>c. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703)</p>	
<p><b>Mile Two</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>55. With respect to paragraph 49(k) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identity or identities of the perpetrator(s) of the alleged conduct for each alleged victim;</li> <li>b. Identity or identities of the victim(s) of the alleged conduct;</li> <li>c. Nature of the information alleged to have been deemed secret for each alleged victim; and</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred for each alleged victim.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The perpetrators of the alleged conduct are the Individually Named Defendants, Unidentified School Abusers, and Unidentified Church Abusers</li> <li>b. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>



	<p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo34).</p> <p>c. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo34).</p> <p>d. The alleged conduct occurred against numerous victims from 1982 to present.</p>		
<p><b>Mile Two</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p><b>56.</b> With respect to paragraph 54(a) and (b) of the Claim, particulars of the nature of the pain and suffering alleged to have been sustained.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state that the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol>	<p><b>D.</b></p> <p>Pain and suffering and harm to class members</p>	

		<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>
	<p><b>D.</b> Pain and suffering and harm to class members</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>57. With respect to paragraph 54(t) of the Claim, particulars of the allegations set out therein, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the psychological, psychiatric, medical, and spiritual treatment alleged to have been required in relation to each alleged victim; and</li> <li>b. Nature of the illnesses and other disorders alleged to have been sustained in relation to each alleged victim.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110). Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v.</i></p>

	<p><i>Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>58. With respect to paragraph 60 of the Claim, particulars of conspiracy alleged to have been participated in by the Defendants, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the conspiracy alleged;</li> <li>b. The identities of all parties to the alleged conspiracy; and</li> <li>c. Nature of the lawful and unlawful means alleged to have been employed to advance the alleged conspiracy.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> </ol>	<p>G.</p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy, and IIMS</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;</li> <li>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</li> <li>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</li> <li>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</li> <li>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</li> <li>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</li> <li>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</li> <li>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</li> <li>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may</li> </ol>	
--	--	--

	<p>be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>	
<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>60. With respect to paragraph 63 of the Claim, particulars of the conditions referred to therein,</p>	<p>E.</p>

<p>including the nature of the conditions that are alleged to have been created, and when they were created.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that the conduct of Mile Two, and its directors and officers, as pled herein created the said conditions throughout the period of 1982 to present. With respect to the applicable date that such conditions were created:</li> <li>2. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>3. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>4. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>5. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</li> </ol>	<p>Conditions created by Mile Two</p>
---	---------------------------------------

<p>Mile Two</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>63. With respect to paragraph 76.2 of the Second Amended Claim, particulars concerning the conspiracy allegedly participated in by the Defendants, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the conspiracy alleged;</li> <li>b. The identities of all parties to the alleged conspiracy; and</li> <li>d. Nature of the means alleged to have been employed to advance the alleged conspiracy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church settings;</li> </ol>	<p>G.</p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	
-----------------	---	---	--



4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;
6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;
7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;
8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;
10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;
11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and
12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.

<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>In addition:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mile Two has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mile Two in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mile Two sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to paragraph 28 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars as to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the policies and procedures the Plaintiffs allege Donauer was instrumental in developing and implementing; and</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p><b>B.</b> Rules and Principles of the School and/or Church</p>	

(b) the role the Plaintiffs allege Donauer played in the development and implementation of the policies and procedures.

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state that the principles which were promulgated by the Principal Defendants are outlined in the Statement of Claim. These principles include, but are not limited to:

1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;
2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;
4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;
6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;
7. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
8. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority

	<p>outside of that offered by the Church and/or School</p> <p>9. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 such as sexual abuse;</li> <li>2 Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</li> <li>3 That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</li> </ol> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in</li> </ol>	
--	--	--

<p>a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	<p><b>B.</b> Rules and Principles of the School and/or Church</p>	
<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 43 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars as to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the abusive policies that the Plaintiffs allege Donauer carried out;</li> <li>b. the abusive policies that the Plaintiffs allege Donauer developed;</li> <li>c. the manner in which the Plaintiffs allege Donauer developed these abusive policies; and</li> <li>d. the manner in which the Plaintiffs allege that Donauer caused other employees, agents, and representatives of Mile Two Church Inc. including all of the Individually Named Defendants, to carry out said abusive policies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state that the abusive policies which were promulgated by the Principal Defendants, including Donauer, are all policies in furtherance of the principles described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation paragraph 41, outlined in the Statement of Claim. These principles include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> </ul>	

2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;
4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;
6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;
7. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
8. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School
9. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;

	<p>10. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>11. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p>	
	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>	

<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the corporal punishment allegedly observed by Donauer, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. specific conduct that was allegedly observed by Donauer;</li> <li>b. dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct was observed;</li> <li>c. location of the conduct that was allegedly observed by Donauer; and</li> <li>d. the names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant cause of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.</li> <li>2. In addition:</li> <li>3. The particulars requested are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>4. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see <i>Prince Albert</i></li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
----------------------	---	--	--



	<p><i>Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>5. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently: (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>6. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand 'at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about', as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars: (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructures)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraphs 46.2 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse allegedly suffered and the hands of Donauer, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. specific conduct that was allegedly suffered at the hands of Donauer;</li> <li>b. dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred;</li> <li>c. location of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>d. the names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant cause of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd.</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently: (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand ‘at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about’, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars: (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructures)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraph 47 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of Donauer's alleged abuse in the nature of trespass to the person, physical assault and/or battery of students at the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. specific conduct that was allegedly carried out by Donauer;</li> <li>b. dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred;</li> <li>c. location of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>d. the names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant cause of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J.</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
----------------------	---	--

	<p>No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently: (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand ‘at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about’, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars: (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructures)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 48 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the intentional infliction of mental injury and conduct in the nature of trespass to the person, including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm to the students at the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church allegedly engaged in by Donauer, including the</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. specific conduct that was allegedly engaged in by Donauer;</li> <li>b. dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred;</li> <li>c. location of the alleged conduct; and</li> <li>d. the names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b> Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>D.</b> Pain and suffering and harm to class members</p>	

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant cause of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently: (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand 'at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about', as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars: (see: *Wassermann v Infrastructures*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Randy Donauer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of alleged incidences of Donauer using the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. specific threats that were allegedly made by Donauer;</li> <li>b. dates or approximate dates on which such alleged threats were made;</li> <li>c. location where the alleged threats were made; and</li> <li>d. the names of the recipients of the alleged threats.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant cause of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
----------------------	---	--

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd.</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently: (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand ‘at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about’, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars: (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructures)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have been owed a fiduciary duty by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged breaches of fiduciary duty;</li> <li>c. The locations where the fiduciary duty was breached by Ken Schultz; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the breaches of fiduciary duty of Ken Schultz.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

**Reply:**

a. Ken Schultz owed a fiduciary duty to each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes.

d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the fiduciary duty, and breaches thereof.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).



Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged negligence and/or gross negligence;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence was committed by Ken Schultz; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Ken Schultz.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence of Ken Schultz.</li> <li>d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of Ken Schultz alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.</li> </ol> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
-------------	--	--	--

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the assault and/or battery by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged assaults and/or battery;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged assaults and/or battery was committed by Ken Schultz; and</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the alleged assault and/or battery by Ken Schultz.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the assaults and/or battery committed by Ken Schultz.</p> <p>d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of Ken Schultz alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in</li> </ol>	
--	--	--

<p>Ken Schultz</p>	<p>a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging mental suffering as a result of the actions or conduct of Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental suffering by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental suffering took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the infliction of mental suffering by Ken Schultz.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the conduct alleged to have inflicted mental suffering on members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Ken Schultz</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have suffered damages or a loss as a result of the claim of alleged conspiracy against Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged conspiracy by Ken Schultz; and</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	

c. The particulars of the actions or conduct of Ken Schultz allegedly giving rise to a claim against Ken Schultz in conspiracy.

**Reply:**

a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, suffered damages and/or loss as a result of the conspiracy as pled.

c. The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to:

1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;
2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;
3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;
4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;
5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;

	<p>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</p> <p>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</p> <p>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</p> <p>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</p> <p>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</p> <p>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Ken Schultz</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraph 31(d) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to be entitled to punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages from Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any conduct allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Ken Schultz; and</li> <li>c. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Ken Schultz allegedly giving rise to a claim of</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



	<p>punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Ken Schultz.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, is entitled to punitive, exemplary and aggravated damages from Ken Schultz.</p> <p>c. The conduct giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Ken Schultz is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in</li> </ol>	
--	--	--

Ken Schultz	<p>a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 31(e) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly corporally punished by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged corporal punishment by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged corporal punishment took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Ken Schultz giving rise to a claim against Ken Schultz relating to corporal punishment.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>		

Ken Schultz	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice), [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have a claim pursuant to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c);</li> <li>b. The dates or timeframes of any alleged conduct giving rise to a claim against Ken Schultz in relation to the matters pleaded in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c);</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged conduct took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of alleged conduct of Ken Schultz giving rise to a claim against Ken Schultz relating to the claims set out in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>H.</b></p> <p>Whether the action is suitable as a class action</p>	

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that the conduct giving rise to the descriptions of the Plaintiff Classes in paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and particularly paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

**In addition:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p><b>Ken Schultz</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>9. With respect to paragraphs 46 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly physically, psychologically, emotionally and religiously abused by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Ken Schultz giving rise to a claim against Ken Schultz relating to physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 46 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Ken Schultz.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
---------------------------	---	---	--

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice), [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Ken Schultz</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>10. With respect to paragraphs 47 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging physical or sexual assault and/or battery as a result of the actions or conduct of Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery took place; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Ken Schultz.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 47 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Ken Schultz.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan</i></li> </ol>	
--	---	--

<p>Ken Schultz</p>	<p><i>(Minister of Highways and Infrastructure),</i> 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>11. With respect to paragraphs 48 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm as a result of the actions or conduct of Ken Schultz;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Ken Schultz;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Ken Schultz.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 48 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Ken Schultz.</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
--------------------	--	---	--



	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan Minister of Justice</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Ken Schultz, including but not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

and/or intimidate students as a result of the actions or conduct of Ken Schultz;

- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by Ken Schultz;
- c. The location where the alleged threatened physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students took place; and
- d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by Ken Schultz.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 49 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Ken Schultz.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
- 2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Ken Schultz</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>13. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or intentional infliction of mental injury allegedly observed by Ken Schultz not provided in reply to the requests as set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>14. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury allegedly condoned or conspired to by Ken Schultz not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Ken Schultz</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>15. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged threats by Ken Schultz of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury, and any particulars of any alleged coercion or intimidation not provided in the reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
Ken Schultz	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>16. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidents and alleged acts complained of and carried out by others that Ken Schultz, either allegedly had knowledge of, directed or approved not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</li> </ol>	A.	Specifics about victims and

	<p>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have been owed a fiduciary duty by James Randall;</p> <p>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged breaches of fiduciary duty;</p> <p>c. The locations where the fiduciary duty was breached by James Randall; and</p> <p>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the breaches of fiduciary duty of James Randall.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. James Randall owed a fiduciary duty to each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes.</p> <p>d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the fiduciary duty, and breaches thereof.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	instances of abuse.	
--	---	---------------------	--



	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice), [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p><b>James Randall</b></p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged negligence and/or gross negligence;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence was committed by James Randall; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by James Randall.</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

**Reply:**

a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence of James Randall.

d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of James Randall alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice), [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).

4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the assault and/or battery by James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged assaults and/or battery;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged assaults and/or battery was committed by James Randall; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the alleged assault and/or battery by James Randall.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the assaults and/or battery committed by James Randall.</li> <li>d. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of James Randall alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.</li> </ul> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
----------------------	--	--	--

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice), [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging mental suffering as a result of the actions or conduct of James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental suffering by James Randall;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental suffering took place; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the infliction of mental suffering by James Randall.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the conduct alleged to have inflicted mental suffering on members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have suffered damages or a loss as a result of the claim of alleged conspiracy against James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged conspiracy by James Randall; and</li> <li>c. The particulars of the actions or conduct of James Randall allegedly giving rise to a claim against James Randall in conspiracy.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, suffered damages and/or loss as a result of the conspiracy as pled.</li> <li>c. The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>G.</p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	
---------------	--	---	--

	<p>intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church settings;</li> <li>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</li> <li>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</li> <li>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</li> <li>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</li> <li>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</li> <li>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</li> <li>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</li> <li>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. With respect to paragraph 31(d) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and</p>	



	<p>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to be entitled to punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages from James Randall;</p> <p>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any conduct allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against James Randall; and</p> <p>c. The particulars of the alleged conduct of James Randall allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against James Randall.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>b. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, is entitled to punitive, exemplary and aggravated damages from James Randall.</p> <p>d. The conduct giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against James Randall is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian</i></li> </ol>	instances of abuse.	
--	---	---------------------	--

	<p><i>Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 31(e) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <p>The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly corporally punished by James Randall;</p> <p>The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged corporal punishment by James Randall;</p> <p>The location that any alleged corporal punishment took place; and</p> <p>The particulars of the alleged conduct of James Randall giving rise to a claim against James Randall relating to corporal punishment.</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. With respect to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p>	

	<p>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have a claim pursuant to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c);</p> <p>b. The dates or timeframes of any alleged conduct giving rise to a claim against James Randall in relation to the matters pleaded in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c);</p> <p>c. The location that any alleged conduct took place; and</p> <p>d. The particulars of alleged conduct of James Randall giving rise to a claim against James Randall relating to the claims set out in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c).</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that the conduct giving rise to the descriptions of the Plaintiff Classes in paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and particularly paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p><b>H.</b></p> <p>Whether the action is suitable as a class action</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>9. With respect to paragraphs 46 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly physically, psychologically, emotionally and religiously abused by James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse by James Randall;</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of James Randall giving</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

rise to a claim against James Randall relating to physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 46 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes James Randall.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v*

<p>James Randall</p>	<p><i>Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</i></p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>10. With respect to paragraphs 47 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging physical or sexual assault and/or battery as a result of the actions or conduct of James Randall;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery by James Randall;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the physical or sexual assault and/or battery by James Randall.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 47 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes James Randall.</p>		

	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. With respect to paragraphs 48 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including without limitation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging infliction of mental</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm as a result of the actions or conduct of James Randall;

- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by James Randall;
- c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm took place; and
- d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by James Randall.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 48 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes James Randall.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this

	<p>matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>12. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to James Randall, including but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students as a result of the</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

actions or conduct of James Randall;

- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by James Randall;
- c. The location where the alleged threatened physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students took place; and
- d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by James Randall.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 49 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes James Randall.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
James Randall	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>13. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or intentional infliction of mental injury allegedly observed by James Randall not provided in reply to the requests as set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>14. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury allegedly condoned or conspired to by James Randall not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
----------------------	--	--	--

	<p>strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>15. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged threats by James Randall of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury, and any particulars of any alleged coercion or intimidation not provided in the reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>James Randall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>16. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidents and alleged acts complained of and carried out by others that James Randall, either allegedly had knowledge of, directed or approved not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J.No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Duff Friesen	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have been owed a fiduciary duty by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged breaches of fiduciary duty;</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

c. The locations where the fiduciary duty was breached by Duff Friesen; and

d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the breaches of fiduciary duty of Duff Friesen.

**Reply:**

b. Duff Friesen owed a fiduciary duty to each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes.

e. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the fiduciary duty, and breaches thereof.

**In addition:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges*

	<p><i>Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged negligence and/or gross negligence;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence was committed by Duff Friesen; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence by Duff Friesen.</li> </ol>		<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

**Reply:**

- b. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the alleged negligence and/or gross negligence of Duff Friesen.
- e. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of Duff Friesen alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.

**In addition:**

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
- 2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
- 4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-

Duff Friesen	<p>certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the assault and/or battery by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged assaults and/or battery;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged assaults and/or battery was committed by Duff Friesen; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the alleged assault and/or battery by Duff Friesen.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes suffered from the assaults and/or battery committed by Duff Friesen.</li> <li>e. The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the actions and conduct of Duff Friesen alleged to amount to negligence and/or gross negligence.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>		

	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
Duff Friesen	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and</p>	

instances of abuse.

- a. The identity of all individuals alleging mental suffering as a result of the actions or conduct of Duff Friesen;
- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental suffering by Duff Friesen;
- c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental suffering took place; and
- d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the infliction of mental suffering by Duff Friesen.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself with respect to the conduct alleged to have inflicted mental suffering on members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have suffered damages or a loss as a result of the claim of alleged conspiracy against Duff Friesen</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged conspiracy by Duff Friesen; and</li> <li>c. The particulars of the actions or conduct of Duff Friesen allegedly giving rise to a claim against Duff Friesen in conspiracy.</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy, and IIMS</p>	



	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>b. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, suffered damages and/or loss as a result of the conspiracy as pled.</p> <p>d. The Defendants conspired, by lawful and unlawful means described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, to injure members of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, by communicating or receiving communication furthering, directed and aimed at carrying out the principles referenced throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation at paragraph 41, which principles include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students' lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;</li> <li>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</li> <li>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</li> <li>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not</li> </ol>	
--	---	--

considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;

7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;
8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;
9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;
10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;
11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be discovered during the course of this litigation; and
12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraph 31(d) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <p>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to be entitled to punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages from Duff Friesen;</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

- b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any conduct allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Duff Friesen; and
- c. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Duff Friesen allegedly giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Duff Friesen.

**Reply:**

- c. Each and every member of the Plaintiff Classes, including the Plaintiffs, is entitled to punitive, exemplary and aggravated damages from Duff Friesen.
- e. The conduct giving rise to a claim of punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages against Duff Friesen is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

**In addition:**

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
- 2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 31(e) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly corporally punished by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged corporal punishment by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged corporal punishment took place; and</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Duff Friesen giving rise to a claim against Duff Friesen relating to corporal punishment.

**Reply:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have a claim pursuant to paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c);</li> <li>b. The dates or timeframes of any alleged conduct giving rise to a claim against Duff Friesen in relation to the matters pleaded in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c);</li> <li>c. The location that any alleged conduct took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of alleged conduct of Duff Friesen giving rise to a claim against Duff Friesen relating to the claims set out in paragraphs 32(b) and/or 32(c).</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that the conduct giving rise to the descriptions of the Plaintiff Classes in paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and particularly paragraphs 32(b) and 32(c) is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>H.</b></p> <p>Whether the action is suitable as a class action</p>	
---------------------	---	---	--

	<p>in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Duff Friesen	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>9. With respect to paragraphs 46 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <p>a. The identity of all individuals alleging to have been allegedly physically, psychologically, emotionally and religiously abused by Duff Friesen;</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse by Duff Friesen;

c. The location that any alleged physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse took place; and

d. The particulars of the alleged conduct of Duff Friesen giving rise to a claim against Duff Friesen relating to physical, psychological, emotional and religious abuse.

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 46 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Duff Friesen.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>10. With respect to paragraphs 47 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging physical or sexual assault and/or battery as a result of the actions or conduct of Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged physical or sexual assault and/or battery took place; and</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Duff Friesen.</p>	
<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 47 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Duff Friesen.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-</li> </ol>	<p>The particulars of the actions or conduct to the physical or sexual assault and/or battery by Duff Friesen.</p>	

Duff Friesen	<p>certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>11. With respect to paragraphs 48 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm as a result of the actions or conduct of Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged infliction of mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the mental injury including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm by Duff Friesen.</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>		

**Reply:**

The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 48 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Duff Friesen.

**In addition:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p>	<p>12. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Duff Friesen, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleging the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students as a result of the actions or conduct of Duff Friesen;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of any alleged threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by Duff Friesen;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged threatened physical abuse and non-physical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students took place; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct to the threat of physical abuse and nonphysical abuse to emotionally inflict mental injury on and/or intimidate students by Duff Friesen.</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
---------------------	------------------------	--	--

	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself in that paragraph 49 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim alleges specific acts against the Defendants, which includes Duff Friesen.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways</i></li> </ol>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><i>and Infrastructure</i>), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	<p>A. Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>13. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or intentional infliction of mental injury allegedly observed by Duff Friesen not provided in reply to the requests as set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol>		



	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>14. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidence of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury allegedly condoned or conspired to by Duff Friesen not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J.No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Duff Friesen</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>15. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged threats by Duff Friesen of corporal punishment, physical and/or sexual assault, trespass to the person, battery, and/or infliction of mental injury, and any particulars of any alleged coercion or intimidation not provided in the reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Duff Friesen	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>16. With respect to the Statement of Claim in general, particulars of any alleged incidents and alleged acts complained of and carried out by others that Duff Friesen, either allegedly had knowledge of, directed or approved not provided in reply to the requests set out in paragraphs 1-12 above.</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifies about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself as to the particulars requested.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserma v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Aaron Benneweis</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraphs 41, 43, and 45-46 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the alleged corporal punishment that relate to Aaron Benneweis, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The relevant cause of action alleged against Aaron Benneweis with respect to the allegations;</li> <li>b. The identity of all individuals who were abused or corporally punished;</li> <li>c. The relevant dates and timeframe of all alleged abused or corporal punishments carried out by Aaron Benneweis;</li> <li>d. The location where Aaron Benneweis carried out the alleged abused or corporal punishments; and</li> <li>e. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged abused or corporal punishments that constitute a cause of action known to law.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant causes of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
------------------------	--	--	--

In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. Aaron Benneweis has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Aaron Benneweis in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords Aaron Benneweis sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Aaron Benneweis</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. Full particulars of the allegations of Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, Intimidation Abuse, and Harms (as defined in the Statement of Claim) as they relate to Aaron Benneweis, including without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The relevant cause of action alleged against Aaron Benneweis with respect to the allegations;</li> <li>b. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, Intimidation Abuse, and Harms by Aaron Benneweis;</li> <li>c. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, Intimidation Abuse, and Harms;</li> <li>d. The location where the alleged Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, Intimidation Abuse, and Harms were committed by Aaron Benneweis; and</li> <li>e. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse, Intimidation Abuse, and Harms by Aaron Benneweis.</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
------------------------	---	--	--

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant causes of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. Aaron Benneweis has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Aaron Benneweis in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords Aaron Benneweis sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan*



<p>Aaron Benneweis</p>	<p>(<i>Minister of Highways and Infrastructure</i>), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 31 and paragraphs 60 to 62 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the alleged conspiracy to harm by lawful and unlawful means that relate to Aaron Benneweis, including without limitation, the identity of all parties to the conspiracy.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. The names of every individual</li> <li>2. that participated in the alleged conspiracy are not currently known to the Plaintiffs due, in part, to the failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to discharge its statutory obligations pursuant to <i>The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>. Having said that, the individuals that participated in the alleged conspiracy include Ministers, Deputy Ministers, employees, staff members, agents and/or representatives of the Ministry of Education for Saskatchewan as well as employees, staff members, agents and/or representatives of Mile Two Church Inc. since 1982 until present.</li> <li>3. The identity or identities of the alleged victims of the alleged conduct is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</li> </ol>	<p>G.</p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	
------------------------	---	---	--

	<p>4. The nature of the alleged abuse is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>5. The dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct occurred is set out throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, and span the</p> <p>6. period from 1982 to present.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Aaron Benneweis has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Aaron Benneweis in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords Aaron Benneweis sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</li> </ol>	
--	--	--

<p>Aaron Benneweis</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 70 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Aaron Benneweis, including without limitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have suffered from the alleged negligence by Aaron Benneweis;</li> <li>b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged negligence;</li> <li>c. The location where the alleged negligence was committed by Aaron Benneweis; and</li> <li>d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the alleged negligence by Aaron Benneweis.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant causes of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
------------------------	---	--

	<p>this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. Aaron Benneweis has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Aaron Benneweis in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Aaron Benneweis sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Aaron Benneweis</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraphs 73 to 74 of the Statement of Claim, full particulars of the allegations that relate to Aaron Benneweis, including without limitation:</p> <p>a. The identity of all individuals alleged to have been owed a fiduciary duty by Aaron Benneweis;</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

b. The relevant dates or timeframe of all alleged breaches of fiduciary duty;

c. The locations where the fiduciary duty was breached by Aaron Benneweis; and

d. The particulars of the actions or conduct related to the breaches of fiduciary duty by Aaron Benneweis.

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs state the Second Amended Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. All relevant causes of action are outlined in the Second Amended Statement of Claim. In addition, the definition of the Plaintiff Classes at paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim defines the individuals that have suffered damages in the action.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. Aaron Benneweis has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

		<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Aaron Benneweis in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Aaron Benneweis sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><b>A.</b> Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraphs 31(a) and 70 of the Amended Claim, particulars of any incident of alleged negligence, alleged gross negligence, alleged breach of any duty of care, and any alleged harm committed by Kevin, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>b. Location of the incident(s); and</li> <li>c. Time frames and dates on which the alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The alleged victims of Kevin are the members of the Plaintiff Classes;</p> <p>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</p>	

c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.

The prayer for relief pled in paragraph 31(a) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is relief for the conduct described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The negligence pled in paragraph 70 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including but not limited to paragraph 66, 68 and 69.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).

	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraphs 31(a) and 73-74 of the Amended Claim, particulars of any incident of alleged breach of fiduciary duty committed by Kevin, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>b. Location of the incident(s); and</li> <li>c. Time frames and dates on which the alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The alleged victims of Kevin are the members of the Plaintiff Classes;</li> <li>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</li> <li>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



The prayer for relief pled in paragraph 31(a) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is relief for the conduct described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim.

The negligence pled in paragraphs 73-74 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including but not limited to paragraph 71 and 72.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v*

Kevin MacMillan	<p><i>Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34.</i></p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Amended Claim, particulars of any incident of alleged assault and/or battery committed by Kevin, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>b. Location of the incident(s); and</li> <li>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The assault and battery pled in the Second Amended Statement of Claim is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation paragraphs 47 and 50 thereof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The alleged victims of Kevin are the members of the Plaintiff Classes, and particularly the Abused Student Class and the Church Minors Class. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who she had assaulted and/or battered than the Plaintiffs;</li> <li>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</li> <li>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee.</li> </ul>	A. Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.	
-----------------	---	--	--

	<p>representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.</p>	
	<p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of</i></li> </ol>	

<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><i>Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	<p>A. Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Amended Claim, particulars of any incident of alleged infliction of mental suffering committed by Kevin, including:</p> <p>a. Names of the alleged victims;</p> <p>b. Location of the incident(s); and</p> <p>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The infliction of mental suffering is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation paragraphs 48, 49 and 58 thereof.</p> <p>a. The alleged victims of Kevin are the members of the Plaintiff Classes, and particularly the Abused Student Class and the Church Minors Class. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who she had inflicted mental injury than the Plaintiffs;</p> <p>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</p> <p>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the</p>		

School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserma v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 31(a) of the Amended Claim, particulars of any incident of alleged conspiracy to injure students involving Kevin, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>b. Location of the incident(s);</li> <li>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred; and</li> <li>d. Names of alleged co-conspirators.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The conspiracy to injury is described throughout the Second Amended Statement of Claim, including without limitation paragraphs 45 through 62 thereof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The alleged victims of Kevin are the members of the Plaintiff Classes, and particularly the Abused Student Class and the Church Minors Class. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who she had conspired to injure than the Plaintiffs;</li> <li>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</li> <li>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	
------------------------	--	---	--

School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of*

Kevin MacMillan	<p><i>Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Amended Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of corporal punishment allegedly observed by Kevin, including the:</p> <p>a. Names of the alleged victims;</p> <p>b. Location of the incident(s); and</p> <p>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The alleged victims who Kevin observed being corporally punished are the members of the Plaintiff Classes, and particularly the Abused Student Class and the Church Minors Class. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who she had conspired to injure than the Plaintiffs;</p> <p>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</p> <p>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.</p>	A. Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.	
-----------------	---	---	--



In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraphs 47 and 48 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Kevin's alleged abuse in regard to trespass to the person, intentional infliction of mental injury, physical or sexual assault and/or battery of students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <p>a. Names of the alleged victims;</p> <p>b. Location of the incident(s); and</p> <p>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The alleged abuse in regard to trespass to the person, intentional infliction of mental injury, physical or sexual assault and/or batter of students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church Plaintiff Classes. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who he committed the said torts against than the Plaintiffs;</p> <p>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan; and</p> <p>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member of the Church during the period from 1982 to present.</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
------------------------	---	--	--

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Kevin MacMillan</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraphs 49 and 60-62 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Kevin's alleged conspiracy and/or use of the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical Abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <p>a. Names of the alleged victims;</p> <p>b. Location of the incident(s);</p> <p>c. Time frames and dates on which such alleged conduct occurred; and</p> <p>d. The identity of any alleged co-conspirators.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The alleged abuse in regard to trespass to the person, intentional infliction of mental injury, physical or sexual assault and/or batter of students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church Plaintiff Classes. In any event Kevin has better knowledge of who he committed the said torts against than the Plaintiffs;</p> <p>b. The incident(s) alleged occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan;</p> <p>c. The time frame and dates when the alleged conduct occurred is all times at which Kevin was an employee, representative or agent of Mile Two Church Inc. or its predecessors, the School and/or Church, and/or a member</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	
------------------------	--	---	--

of the Church during the period from 1982 to present; and

d. The co-conspirators are the Defendants.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of*

Lou Brunelle	<p><i>Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraph 45 &amp; 46 of the Amended Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of corporal punishment allegedly observed by Lou, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ul>	A.	
		Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.	

		<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 47 &amp; 48 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Lou’s alleged abuse in regard to trespass to the person, intentional infliction of mental injury, physical or sexual assault and/or battery of students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p>	

The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of*



<p>Lou Brunelle</p>	<p><i>Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Lou's alleged use of the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical Abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of</i></li> </ol>	

	<p><i>Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Lou Brunelle</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p>	<p>4. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Lou’s alleged direction of Church Inc. to carry out Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse and Intimidation Abuse, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>Lou Brunelle</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 63 of the Amended Claim, particulars of instances in which Lou failed to supervise the employees, agents and representatives to ensure the safety of the students of the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
---------------------	---	--	--

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Nathan Rysavy</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraph 45 and 46 of the Amended Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of corporal punishment allegedly observed by Nathan, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Frequency;</li> <li>(b) Location;</li> <li>(c) Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>(d) The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>5. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see:</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>		

	<p><i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>6. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>7. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>8. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Nathan Rysavy</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraphs 47 and 48 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Nathan’s alleged abuse in regard to trespass to the person, intentional infliction of mental injury, physical or sexual assault and/or battery of students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>(a) Frequency;</p> <p>(b) Location;</p> <p>(c) Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</p> <p>(d) The names of the alleged victims.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for</li> </ol>	

		<p>further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Nathan Rysavy</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Nathan’s alleged use of the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical Abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>*No reply was given*</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
<p>Nathan Rysavy</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Amended Claim, particulars of Nathan’s alleged direction of employees, agents and representatives of Mile Two Church Inc. to carry out Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse and Intimidation Abuse, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> </ul>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	



	<p>c. Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</p> <p>d. The names of the alleged victims.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of</i></li> </ol>	
--	---	--

Nathan Rysavy	<p><i>Highways and Infrastructure</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 63, particulars of instances in which Nathan failed to supervise the employees, agents and representatives to ensure the safety of the students of the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Frequency;</li> <li>(b) Location;</li> <li>(c) Dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>(d) The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v.</i></li> </ol>	A.	Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.
---------------	--	----	---

	<p><i>Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 41 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, details of the principles referred to therein and of the manner in which Joel is alleged to have carried them out, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The manner in which these principles were allegedly communicated to Joel;</li> <li>b. Joel’s alleged agreement with these principles, whether express or implied;</li> <li>c. The manner in which Joel allegedly carried out these principles;</li> <li>d. Dates or approximate dates which Joel allegedly carried out these principles;</li> <li>e. The location of each alleged incident of Joel carrying out these principles;</li> <li>f. The names of the individuals who Joel allegedly carried out these principles upon; and</li> </ul>	<p><b>B.</b></p> <p>Rules and principles of the School and/or Church</p>

	<p>g. The names of the individuals who allegedly witnessed Joel carrying out these principles.</p> <p>Reply:</p> <p>5. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>6. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>7. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>8. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Joel Hall	3. With respect to paragraphs 45 & 46 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the	A.	

	<p>corporal punishment allegedly observed by Joel, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>e. The capacity in which Joel was present at the alleged incidents; and</li> <li>f. The names of the individuals who witnessed Joel present at the alleged incidents.</li> </ol> <p>Reply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead</li> </ol>	<p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p>5. With respect to paragraphs 47(b)(i)(4) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of Joel striking Coy Nolin with a paddle including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</li> <li>d. Details of Joel’s alleged presence at the incidents; and</li> <li>e. Details of Joel’s alleged role in the incidents.</li> </ul> <p>Reply:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see:</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p><i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
Joel Hall	<p>6. With respect to paragraphs 47(c) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of Joel physically striking students and minor adherents and congregants of the Church as a disciplinary response to the behaviour noted therein, including:</p> <p>a. Frequency;</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>b. Location;</p> <p>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</p> <p>d. Details of Joel's alleged presence at the incidents; and</p> <p>e. Details of Joel's alleged role in the incidents.</p>	
	<p>Reply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a</li> </ol>	



	<p>pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>	
<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraphs 47(f) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, details of Joel allegedly taking the student to be paddled, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</li> <li>b. The name of the alleged victim;</li> <li>c. The name of the individual who allegedly paddled the student; and</li> <li>d. The nature of Joel’s involvement with the alleged paddling.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs reply as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The conduct took place in or about 2002 or 2003.</li> <li>c. The paddling was carried out by John Olubobokun.</li> </ol> <p>The Plaintiffs state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see:</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p><i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraphs 47(i) and 47(l.1) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, details of the conduct Joel is alleged to have engaged in, including:</p> <p>a. Frequency;</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifies about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>b. Location;</p> <p>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</p> <p>d. The names of the alleged victims;</p> <p>e. The nature of the alleged physical tasks;</p> <p>f. The nature of the alleged disabilities;</p> <p>g. The relationship between the alleged physical tasks and the performance standards mentioned;</p> <p>h. The relationship between the alleged "wall sit" mentioned in 47(1.1) and the allegation against Joel in 47(1);</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>9. With respect to paragraph 48 of the Second Amended Statement of Claim, particulars of Joel’s alleged abuse in the nature of intentional infliction of mental injury, the nature of trespass to the person, and the intentional infliction of mental, psychological, emotional, and spiritual harm to the students at the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

e. The actions which Joel is alleged to have taken which amount to alleged abuse in the natures noted above.

Reply:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of*

<p>Joel Hall</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>22. With respect to paragraph 49, particulars of the alleged incidents of Joel using the threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, intimidate or coerce students and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates or approximate dates on which such alleged conduct took place;</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims;</li> <li>e. Details of what Joel is alleged to have said amounting to a threat of physical abuse and non-physical abuse;</li> <li>f. Details of the manner in which Joel is alleged to have used such a threat to inflict mental injury, intimidate or coerce students and minor adherents and congregants of the Church.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>

	<p>2. The Defendant has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Defendant in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Defendant sufficient information to enable it to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
GOS	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraphs 44.23 and 44.25 of the Claim, please state how the Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Classes were in a relationship of financial, emotional, physical and/or other dependency with the Ministry, and in a relationship “akin to that of a guardian-ward and/or parent and child.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p>	<p><b>F.</b></p> <p>Relationship of trust between GOS and plaintiff classes</p>	

	<p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Government of Saskatchewan in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol> <p>The Statement of Claim affords the Government of Saskatchewan sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p>		
GOS	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. With respect to paragraphs 31.h., 44.17, and 44.20 of the Claim, please identify which individuals are alleged to have committed the tort of misfeasance in public office, including when and how the misfeasance was committed.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein. It is alleged that the Government of Saskatchewan committed the tort of misfeasance in public office. No claim has been advanced against any</p>	<p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	



individual for misfeasance in public office.

The names of every individual responsible for the misfeasance in public office by the Government of Saskatchewan are not currently known to the Plaintiffs due, in part, to the failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to discharge its statutory obligations pursuant to *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. Having said that, the individuals responsible for the misfeasance in public office by the Government of Saskatchewan include Ministers, Deputy Ministers, employees, staff members, agents and/or representatives of the Ministry of Education for Saskatchewan since 1982 until present.

In addition:

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J.No. 110).
2. The Government of Saskatchewan has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Government of Saskatchewan in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).

	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Government of Saskatchewan sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, (2022] SJNo 34).</p>		
<p>GOS</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraphs 58 and 59 of the Claim, please advise if the torts of intentional infliction of mental harm or trespass to the person are alleged against the Ministry, and if so, please provide particulars of same.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Statement of Claim speaks for itself. It is alleged that the Government of Saskatchewan intentionally inflicted mental harm and committed trespass to the person to the Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Classes.</p> <p>Particulars of the intentional infliction of mental harm include, but are not limited to, the allegations contained in paragraphs 44.12-44.25 of the Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>Particulars of the trespass to the person include, but are not limited to, the allegations contained in paragraphs 44.12-44.25 of the Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a</li> </ol>	<p><b>G.</b></p> <p>Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS</p>	

	<p>Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J.No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Government of Saskatchewan has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J.No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, (1987] S.J.No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Government of Saskatchewan in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i> , [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Government of Saskatchewan sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff's case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p>		
GOS	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraphs 60-62 of the Claim, please particularize the conspiracy the Ministry is alleged to have been involved in, including:</p> <p>a. Who is alleged to have been involved from the Ministry?</p>	G. Misfeasance, conspiracy and IIMS	

- b. Who else is alleged to have been involved?
- c. What was done in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, by whom and when?

**Reply:**

The Plaintiffs reply as follows:

- a. The names of every individual that participated in the alleged conspiracy by the Government of Saskatchewan are not currently known to the Plaintiffs due, in part, to the failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to discharge its statutory obligations pursuant to *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. Having said that, the individuals that participated in the alleged conspiracy by the Government of Saskatchewan include Ministers, Deputy Ministers, employees, staff members, agents and/or representatives of the Ministry of Education for Saskatchewan since 1982 until present.

- b. Paragraph 60 of the Statement of Claim speaks for itself. The Defendants are alleged to have participated in the conspiracy.
- c. The Statement of Claim speaks for itself and outlines the particulars requested herein.

In addition:

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of

	<p>evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. The Government of Saskatchewan has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by it (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, (1987) S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by the Government of Saskatchewan in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords the Government of Saskatchewan sufficient information to enable it to understand "at least in broad strokes what the plaintiffs case is about", as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJNo 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 47(a)(i)(2), particulars of the allegation that the Defendant John Olubobokun was kicked out of Coy Nolin's hospital room and that the Plaintiff Caitlin Erickson was subsequently spanked or paddled, including:</p> <p>a. Why is it that Coy Nolin was allegedly hospitalized?</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>I.</b></p>	

	<p>b. Why was the Defendant John Olubobokun kicked out of Coy Nolin's hospital room, and by whom?</p> <p>c. When is it alleged that John Olubobokun demanded the identity of the nurse in question?</p> <p>d. How many times were each of the plaintiffs struck, and by whom?</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> <li>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient</li> </ol>	Other miscellaneous factual requests	
--	---	--------------------------------------	--

	<p>information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 47(a)(i)(3), further particulars including:</p> <p>a. Who allegedly directed punishment for “not trying hard enough” or “having an attitude”, and who administered the punishment and on how many occasions? ...</p> <p>c. Specifically regarding the occasions when the Plaintiff Caitlin Erickson was struck on the leg, causing her to limp:</p> <p>i. Who allegedly inflicted the punishment on that occasion? ii. When, and why, was that particular punishment allegedly inflicted upon Caitlin Erickson?</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. John Olubobokun carried out the assault and battery on Caitlin Erickson. It is entirely within his knowledge as to how many times he battered Caitlin Erickson while she</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

was a minor in his care on the occasion referenced in this paragraph.

...

c.

i. For the incident in question, it was John Olubobokun who assaulted and battered Caitlin Erickson, striking her on the leg and causing her to limp.

ii. The incident in question occurred during Caitlin Erickson's Grade 12 year, which was the 2004-2005 school year. It is entirely within the knowledge of John Olubobokun, and unknown to the Plaintiffs, what justification he purports to have for having assaulted and battered Caitlin Erickson while she was a minor in his care on the occasion referenced in this paragraph. In any event, there is no materiality or relevance to why John Olubobokun assaulted and battered Caitlin Erickson while she was a minor in his care on the occasion referenced in this paragraph.

In addition:



	<p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p> <p>2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
John Olubobokun	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>5. With respect to paragraph 47(b)(i)(3), further particulars including:</p>	A.	

	<p>a. In what month and year did this alleged incident of corporal punishment take place?</p> <p>b. How did the “revelation” of Coy Nolin’s homosexuality come about, and is that revelation merely coincidental to the timing of the alleged corporal punishment, or is there allegedly a causal connection between the revelation and the punishment?</p> <p>c. Why, and upon whose invitation, were John and Simbo Olubobokun at Coy Nolin’s home?</p> <p>d. What, if anything, gave rise to the alleged punishment at Coy Nolin’s home?</p> <p>e. What did the defendant John Olubobokun allegedly use to inflict the paddling upon Coy Nolin?</p> <p>f. How many times does the Plaintiff Coy Nolin claim to have been paddled on that occasion?</p>	<p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>I.</p> <p>Other miscellaneous factual requests</p>	
--	---	---	--

g. If a "paddle" was used, is it alleged that the defendant John Olubobokun, or some other defendant, brought the paddle to Coy Nolin's home, or was the paddle already at the home?

**Reply:**

a. The incident occurred during the period that John Olubobokun was a director at the School and while Coy Nolin was a student at the School. In any event, it is entirely within the knowledge of John Olubobokun as to when he assaulted and battered Coy Nolin, a minor who was in his care.

**In addition:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead

	<p>intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p> <p>5. The entirety of the requested particulars is improper, serving absolutely no legitimate benefit to the pleadings in this action.</p> <p>6. The entirety of the requested particulars is frivolous, scandalous and an abuse of Court process, worthy of condemnation by the Court, and costs on an elevated basis.</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>6. With respect to paragraph 47(b)(i)(4), further particulars including:</p> <p>e. The number, instances, and reasons why Coy Nolin was “struck in the area of the buttocks with a paddle”, and by whom, and on what dates?</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifies about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

**Reply:**

The incidents referenced in paragraph 47(b)(i)(4) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim occurred during the period spanning 1997 through 2004.

**In addition:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan*

	<p>(Minister of Highways and Infrastructure), 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>7. With respect to paragraph 47(b)(ii), further particulars including:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b. Did Coy Nolin and/or a parent or guardian on his behalf, consent to the alleged exorcism, cooperate with or facilitate the alleged exorcism in any way?</p> <p>c. What is the “physical contact” to which Coy Nolin alleges he was subject to during the course of the alleged exorcism.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>a. The purported exorcism referenced at paragraph 47(b)(ii) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim is the same event referenced at paragraph 48(b)(i) of the Second Amended Statement of Claim.</p> <p>b. The requested particulars are wholly immaterial and irrelevant to the assault and battery carried out by John Olubobokun, Simbo Olubobokun, Garret Johnson (now Garret Davis) and Avril Johnson, and serves no legitimate purpose to the pleadings in this action.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</p>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifies about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p><b>I.</b></p> <p>Other miscellaneous factual requests</p>	

<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p>2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>8. With respect to paragraph 47(c) through 47(l.1), further particulars including:</p> <p>a. Do any of these general allegations apply to the Defendant John Olubobokun and, if so,</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifies about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

i. In respect to which of these incidents is it alleged that the Defendant, John Olubobokun, is responsible in any way and if so:

1. The dates and particulars of each incident and each plaintiff;

**Reply:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).

2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).

4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient



	<p>information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>11. With respect to paragraph 48(b)(i), further particulars including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In what manner does the plaintiff Coy Nolin claim to have been “intimidated and coerced”?</li> <li>b. Was the alleged intimidation and coercion successful in that the plaintiff felt obliged to reveal the identity of “the other student”?</li> <li>c. If such alleged intimidation and coercion was unsuccessful, then what consequences, if any, resulted from the plaintiff’s effective resistance?</li> <li>d. Was Coy Nolin in fact expelled from the school? If so, was the expulsion in writing, and who authorized his expulsion?</li> <li>e. Did Coy Nolin contact any other student in respect to the alleged inquiries, and, if so, does he have any knowledge as to whether or not</li> </ol>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>I.</p> <p>Other miscellaneous factual requests</p>	

the plaintiff, John Olubobokun, contacted the police?

f. Is the description of John Olubobokun's attendance at Coy's home merely an elaboration of the allegations pertaining to an exorcism earlier referenced in paragraph 47(b)(i)(3) and 47(b)(ii), or is it alleged or implied that there may have been a second such incident?

g. Does Coy Nolin know what "special church" he was to be moved to in Edmonton and, if so, did he in fact attend the "special church"?

h. Do any of the other allegations set out in paragraph 48 pertain to the Defendant, John Olubobokun, or are the specific allegations naming the Defendant John Olubobokun a comprehensive enumeration of the allegations against him?

i. If the general allegations in paragraph 48 do pertain to the Defendant, John Olubobokun, in addition to the specific allegations in respect to which John Olubobokun is specifically named, then further particulars including:  
i. Where, when, against whom, and in what manner is it alleged that the Defendant, John

Olubobokun  
“...engaged in the intentional infliction of mental injury and conduct in the nature of trespass to the person, including psychological, mental, emotional and spiritual harm?”

**Reply:**

- d. Coy Nolin was, in fact, expelled from the School.
- f. The exorcism referenced at paragraph 48(b)(i) is one and the same exorcism as referenced at paragraph 47(b)(ii).

**In addition:**

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
- 2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).

	<p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>12. With respect to paragraph 49, further particulars including:</p> <p>a. Where and when and why the incident alleged in subparagraph 49(a)(i) took place;</p> <p>b. Do the general allegations otherwise enumerated in paragraph 49 pertain to the Defendant, John Olubobokun, in addition to the specific allegation in paragraph 49(a)(i) and, if so, where, when, against whom and under what circumstances is it alleged that the Defendant, John Olubobokun, “...used the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical Abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students of the School and minor</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

adherents and congregants of the Church...”?

**Reply:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).
4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).

<p>John Olubobokun</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>13. With respect to paragraphs 50 through 77 of the Statement of Claim, further particulars, including:</p> <p>a. Any other word or deed, including alleged conspiracies, or simple neglect, attributable to the Defendant John Olubobokun, including particulars of when, where and against whom such actions or neglect pertained, along with the associated harms, whether physical, emotional, psychological or spiritual, suffered by each and every plaintiff.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. John Olubobokun has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by John Olubobokun in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 293).</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	
------------------------	--	---	--

	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords John Olubobokun sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, 2022 SKQB 17, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Thuringer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>1. With respect to paragraph 41 &amp; 42 of the Statement of Claim, details of the promulgated principles referred to therein.</p> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <p>The Plaintiffs state that the principles which were promulgated by the Principal Defendants are outlined in the Statement of Claim. These principles include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The systematic oppression, intimidation, and abuse of children;</li> <li>2. The requirement of unquestioning obedience and compliance by children through intimidation, coercion, isolation, fear, and threat of physical abuse;</li> <li>3. Total control of students’ lives both inside and outside of the School and Church setting;</li> </ol>	<p><b>B.</b></p> <p>Rules and Principles of the School and/or Church</p>	

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4. The use of corporal punishment on children for all manner of conduct, including trifling and trivial conduct;</p>  |  |  |
| <p>5. The vilification and detestation of the LGBTQ+ community;</p>  |  |  |
| <p>6. Complete isolationism and condemnation of anything not considered a part of or approved by the Church and its leadership;</p>  |  |  |
| <p>7. The vilification and detestation of anyone that is not a member of the Church and/or School;</p>   |  |  |
| <p>8. The breaking up of families where a member of the family was not wholly subservient to the Church;</p>   |  |  |
| <p>9. Promotion of a distrust and opposition to post-secondary education and authority outside of that offered by the Church and/or School;</p>  |  |  |
| <p>10. The promotion of isolationist ideology and practice, including the cover-up of alleged tortious, illegal and other wrongful acts by members of the Church and/or School such as sexual abuse;</p> |  |  |
| <p>11. Such further and other promulgated principles as are currently unknown, but may be</p>  |  |  |



John Thuringer	<p>discovered during the course of this litigation; and</p> <p>12. That the above promulgated principles are God's will.</p>		
<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>2. With respect to paragraph 45 &amp; 46 of the Statement of Claim, particulars of the corporal punishment allegedly observed by John, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates and approximate dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mr. Thuringer has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</li> <li>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mr. Thuringer in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v.</i></li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>		

	<p><i>Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] S.J. No. 431).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mr. Thuringer sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Thuringer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>3. With respect to paragraph 47 &amp; 48 of the Statement of Claim, particulars of John’s alleged abuse in the nature of trespass to the person, the intentional infliction of mental injury, physical assault and/or battery of students at the School and minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates and approximate dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> <li>d. The names of the alleged victims.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reply:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110).</li> <li>2. Mr. Thuringer has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him</li> </ol>	<p><b>A.</b></p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

	<p>(see: <i>Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons</i>, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and <i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd</i>, [1987] S.J. No. 703).</p> <p>3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mr. Thuringer in order to plead intelligently (see: <i>Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)</i>, [1994] S.J. No. 431).</p> <p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mr. Thuringer sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
<p>John Thuringer</p>	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <p>4. With respect to paragraph 49 of the Statement of Claim, particulars of the alleged incidents of John using the threat of Physical Abuse and Non-Physical abuse to intentionally inflict mental injury on, and intimidate and coerce students, minor adherents and congregants of the Church, including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Frequency;</li> <li>b. Location;</li> <li>c. Dates and approximate dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and</li> </ul>	<p>A.</p> <p>Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.</p>	

d. The names of the persons allegedly so threatened.

**Reply:**

1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
2. Mr. Thuringer has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mr. Thuringer in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] S.J. No. 431).
4. The Statement of Claim affords Mr. Thuringer sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: *Wasserman v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)*, [2022] SJ No 34).

John  
Thuringer

**Request:**

5. With respect to paragraph 64 of the Statement of Claim, particulars of the alleged Physical Abuse, Non-Physical Abuse and Intimidation Abuse, that was allegedly carried out by employees, agents, and representatives of Mile Two Church Inc. on the direction, knowledge and approval of John, including the:

- f. Frequency;
- g. Location;
- h. Dates and approximate dates on which such alleged conduct was observed; and
- i. The names of the victims allegedly abused.

**Reply:**

- 1. The particulars requested herein are matters of evidence not pleading and are discoverable through a Questioning in this matter (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110).
- 2. Mr. Thuringer has better knowledge of the particulars demanded by him (see: *Prince Albert Co-Operative Assn. Ltd. v. Lyons*, [1984] S.J. No. 110 and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Todd*, [1987] S.J. No. 703).
- 3. The particulars demanded are not reasonably required by Mr. Thuringer in order to plead intelligently (see: *Saskatchewan Provincial Court Judges Assn. v. Saskatchewan (Minister of Justice)*, [1994] S.J. No. 431).

**A.**

Specifics about victims and instances of abuse.

	<p>4. The Statement of Claim affords Mr. Thuringer sufficient information to enable him to understand “at least in broad strokes what the plaintiff’s case is about”, as is required in a pre-certification application for further particulars (see: <i>Wasserman v Saskatchewan (Minister of Highways and Infrastructure)</i>, [2022] SJ No 34).</p>		
--	--	--	--