



February 25, 2025

Sent by email

To:

Bruce Boudreau  
[REDACTED]

Copy To:

Michael J. Stangarone, Stephen Kirby

MacDonald & Partners LLP

[mstangarone@mpllp.com](mailto:mstangarone@mpllp.com); [skirby@mpllp.com](mailto:skirby@mpllp.com)

Jenna Beaton, Jessica Grys

McCarthy Hansen & Company LLP

[jenna@mccarthyco.ca](mailto:jenna@mccarthyco.ca); [jessica@mccarthyco.ca](mailto:jessica@mccarthyco.ca)

Randi Jakobsen  
[REDACTED]

Dear Bruce Boudreau:

**RE: C68278 - Boudreau v. Jakobsen**

I write in response to your November 29, 2024 letter seeking information about removing the above-noted decision from the Court's website.

Please note that court staff, including the Executive Legal Officer, cannot give legal advice. However, for your information, a judge's order is required to restrict public access to a court file or decision: *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, [2021 SCC 25](#). It is open to you to bring a motion before a single judge to request a discretionary order limiting court openness.

For further information about bringing a motion, please see r. 37 of the [Rules of Civil Procedure](#), R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194 and s. 7.1 of the [Practice Direction Concerning Civil Appeals at the Court of Appeal for Ontario](#).

Finally, you may wish to consider seeking legal advice. Here is some information on various legal resources:

1. The Law Society Referral Service:

The Law Society Referral Service is designed to provide callers with up to 30 minutes of consultation either by phone or in person at no charge. A Legal Information Officer will receive the

call and assess the needs of the client and then provide the name of a lawyer or paralegal who best fits the client's stated needs. The service is not designed to provide legal advice or second opinions, and any fees should be discussed with the lawyer or paralegal. The service can be reached by calling either 416-947-3330 within the GTA, or toll free 1-800-268-8326 outside the GTA. (TTY Phone: 416-644-4886). More information can be obtained from the following link: <https://lso.ca/public-resources/finding-a-lawyer-or-paralegal/law-society-referral-service?lang=en-ca>.

2. Justice Net

Justice Net is a program in which lawyers reduce their hourly fees on a portion of their practice to address the unmet legal needs of low and middle income members in their communities. Fees are adjusted dependent on family income and the number of dependents. More information can be obtained from the following link: <https://www.justicenet.ca/>.

3. Legal Aid Ontario


If you are unable to afford a lawyer, you may wish to attend at a free legal clinic in your area or apply for legal aid. If legal aid is granted, you may be able to retain the lawyer of your choice to represent you on the appeal or motion. You must meet certain financial and other criteria in order to qualify for legal aid. More information can be obtained from the following link: <http://www.legalaid.on.ca/en/getting/>.

4. Pro Bono Law Ontario

For civil appeals, Pro Bono Law Ontario operates a summary advice service that helps self-represented litigants understand the nature of an appeal, the proper court for an appeal, the timelines, and the documents for commencing an appeal. This service is not available for all stages of an appeal. It is designed to give individuals some basic guidance at the beginning of the process and to help them preserve their rights. You may apply online at [www.probonoontario.org/application](http://www.probonoontario.org/application) or by toll-free call to 1-855-255-7256.

The foregoing is provided for your information only. These organizations are not affiliated with the courts in any way. Court staff may not recommend that a litigant retain a particular counsel or seek the assistance of a program such as those provided by these organizations.

Yours truly,



Dayna Murczek  
Legal Counsel  
Office of the Executive Legal Officer

Nov. 29, 2024

Page 1 of 3.

Regarding: COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO  
CITATION: Boudreau v. Jakobsen, 2021 ONCA 511  
Date: 20210716  
DOCKET: C68278  
Brown, Roberts and Zamett JJ. A.

To Whom This May Concern, Court of Appeals of Ontario:

My name is Bruce Boudreau, I am the respondent to Appeal docket: C68278, Jakobsen Vs. Boudreau. Heard in writing on 2021, 07, 16. On appeal from the order of Justice Sharon Shore of the Superior Court of Justice dated February 5, 2020. The Appeal was dismissed.

I am contacting the Ontario Supreme Court today requesting that the public disclosure of the Appeal Decision be removed from the Ontario Court of Appeal Internet public access as it unfairly prejudices me, it has damaged important relationships, it continues to damage my mental health and effectively leaves me unemployable. This public exposure is preventing me from moving forward with my life in a meaningful way. The continued exposure of this public disclosure has damaged me and will continue to do so as long as it is left in the public realm. This public disclosure has damaged me personally, socially and professionally.

In April of 2018, under difficult abusive circumstances and unbelievable mental health stress, I left the common law relationship I shared with Randi Jakobsen and I chose to live out as a queer man. Being a queer man has been my crime. This has been the sole reason Randi Jakobsen has sought retribution through legal channels, the court system and socially. The contents of the Family Court trial decision dated February 5, 2020 and the public disclosure of the dismissed Appeal July 16, 2021 represents all of this. Homophobia is at the core of this issue as is coercive control. I would like to remind the court that regardless of the unfounded accusations and legal manipulation, I did effectively win all court proceedings. From the beginning of this ordeal, I have been unjustly and unfairly accused of unsubstantiated abuse and of unsubstantiated fraud and the legal system and courts have allowed for this. There is no evidence to support these accusations and no evidence has ever been presented to the courts. But that is how this public decision reads and is presented publicly.

This public disclosure presents an inaccurate narrative. It is public and because of that people believe it.

The Appeal narrative unfairly maligns me, and it presents a false and inaccurate representation of my character, it unfairly prejudices me and effectively leaves me unemployable. I am being unjustly and unfairly presented as a fraudster and criminal with mental health issues. The difficulty with the appeal process is that the Appellant shapes and designs the narrative of the appeal. And this leaves the door open to unjustly malign with half-truths and disingenuous rhetoric that is not based in truth or fact. Further, because the Court of Appeal publically discloses the contents of appeals this provides for public humiliation. This is abusive use of the Ontario Court of Appeal and this is what has taken place. This is coercive control, I have been and I am being victimized and abused further by the Appellant and the Ontario Court of Appeals system has been used to produce this result. This continued abuse also continues to affect my mental health. Since the day I chose to leave my former spouse, my intention was to get on with my life and improve my mental health. This continues to be my intention and this unnecessary, unethical and unfair public flogging has been preventing me from doing so.

I am requesting that the Appeals Court provide advice on how to remove this document from the public realm. I have sought advice from various lawyers and there is no consensus on how to proceed forward in this regard. I am requesting that the courts provide a specific path and clear direction towards removing this document from the Internet.

Regarding: COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO  
CITATION: Boudreau v. Jakobsen, 2021 ONCA 511  
Date: 20210716  
DOCKET: C68278  
Brown, Roberts and Zamett JJ. A.

This is a formal request to the appeals court to remove this content from the Internet as it is damaging to me and prejudices me. If the court is unable to do this, I am formally requesting that the court identify and advise the legal steps I must take to remove this public disclosure from the Internet.

I am prepared to return to court as required. Please advise on the following:

1/ I am requesting that the court remove the appeals decision from the Internet as it has, and will continue to cause damage to me personally, socially and professionally. Is it possible for the Court of Appeal to remove this public disclosure from the Internet and the public realm?

2/ If the court is unable to or refuses to remove the public disclosure, then I am requesting the court outline the legal process I must follow to remove this from the Internet/ public realm. If this requires a return to court, please provide advice regarding a path forward.

3/ Finally I am requesting that the court instruct me on what is necessary to correct the public record so it both tells the entire story and provides context, If this means return to a higher or lower court to re-appeal or retry then please instruct me on what my legal options are.  
And, with respect, please do not tell me to consult a lawyer, I have already done so with a number of various opinions. It appears, there are conflicting options and today I am requesting clarity from the courts.

It is important that I know clearly what my options are, It is my intention to salvage what is left of my personal and professional reputation and regain control of my life if that is even possible at this point. The statistics for a 58-year-old queer man in my position are not good or hopeful. But I need to try.

Simply, I do not want this to ever happen to another human being. If this requires returning to the courts to ensure this, then I am willing to do so.

Please note, I started writing this letter in a therapist's office over a year ago. It has been a challenge to complete, that is a result of trauma and physical and emotional abuse. I have been living in survival mode after leaving the abusive common law relationship. Since that time I have entered into the wch trauma treatment program and I have been diagnosed with cptsd, complex post-traumatic stress disorder. I have only begun to understand the damage that has been done to me. And/ but I can certainly understand how the legal system and this appeal have been used to create more damage and abuse against me. That is coercive control and it is just one of the many forms of abuse that I endured during the common law relationship with my former spouse.

I understand that the Ontario court of appeal system is designed for everyone to be heard but it should never be allowed to be used as a form of retribution. That is allowing further abuse, and this appeal was used as a vehicle to seek vengeance. All of this abuse was demonstrated in the original trial and ignored by Justice Shore in her ruling. And because of this, Justice Shore made erroneous inferences regarding my inability or unwillingness to be productive. Justice shore misunderstood the level of abuse and at that time I was not able to express the depth of abuse. At that time I did not understand the depth of the damage caused.

Regarding: COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO  
CITATION: Boudreau v. Jakobsen, 2021 ONCA 511  
Date: 20210716  
DOCKET: C68278  
Brown, Roberts and Zamett JJ. A.

It is clear Justice Shore does not understand this kind of abuse. But Justice shore did understand the many homophobic dog whistles Randi Jakobsen sent her way during trial and it is clear that Justice Shore was influenced and showed a biased to Randi Jakobsen because of this. I have never agreed with all of Justice Shore's decision, I believe she made some drastic errors. This stated, I didn't insist on a cross appeal at the time because I was not emotionally equipped to deal with another trial written or otherwise and so I followed my lawyers instructions to defend over cross-appeal. I only now recognize the error of that decision. The result is this biased public disclosure that damages me as it was designed to do.

Regardless of the unfounded accusations and legal manipulations and miscarriage of justice, I did effectively win all legal and court proceedings. This unfortunately is not what the world sees or takes away from this public disclosure. Equally, the article written by Amanda Jerome for law360.ca, which quotes this public disclosure, also damages me and promotes this false narrative as designed by Randi Jakobsen and her representation.

The Overriding issue today is that the Court of Appeal Public Disclosure damages me and handicaps me professionally and socially. How does the Court expect me to be self-sufficient with this inaccurate damning information in the public realm preventing me from doing so. I am requesting that the court remove this public lashing from the Internet as it is needlessly prejudicial against me and is causing me harm. To be clear, the damage has been done. This appeal was designed not to seek justice but to inflict more harm and damage on me. It has and is successful as intended. The information has been distributed and that cannot be undone but removal of the online decision will be a start to toward rectifying the damaged caused

Thank you for your consideration of my request. I look forward to your response at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Bruce Boudreau

