Draft thought from a quick review of the decision. Take from it what you will.
Responses hailing the Ingram v Alberta as a win are misguided celebrations at best and willfully deceptive or possibly worse.
https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/2023-07-31-DECISION-Ingram-v-Alberta-Chief-Medical-Officer-of-Health-FILED-July-31-20238.pdf

It is like the people who celebrated the 'Mature Minor' decisions as a win but ignored the reality of what that judgment would be applied to i.e. transgender therapy or vaccine insistence (through background coercion). Most adults don't have the wherewithal to make these decisions and now instead of Informed Consent, we have children able to overall their parents when making life altering decisions. This is the ultimate double-edged sword that is being ignored as it is in the Ingram v Alberta decision.

Frankly, lawyers supporting this need to go back to law school, as do many others, it appears. Especially those who are reading only the decision without all the context.

Doing an analysis without understanding or referencing the context of the outcome for the future and the actual filings and cross examination doesn't help anyone. I have read the application, watched the cross examinations and know what the plaintiffs' lawyers have buried to keep this insanity going. If people knew what these lawyers were really up to, they would be calling for their heads.

Read the initial application that makes the completely opposite Ultra Vires argument to the final decision. If not for CM v Alberta (decided in 2022) they would probably have lost everything. And CM v Alberta was not a good decision for those wanting an end of restrictions.

Also, the 'Impugned Orders' were initially those up to January 2021 (and a specific subset of those were named and the ones impugned). This was potentially expanded to July 2021 and prior. So saying ALL Orders were Ultra Vires is not true. And Ultra Vires is not strictly 'Illegal', it is 'outside of the lawful authority'. This is not exactly the same (there are some nuances, especially in this case). The lawyers commenting should know the difference and be clear about that.

https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/2020-12-07-Originating-Application_Redacted.pdf

Also see:

https://www.albertacourts.ca/docs/default-source/qb/judgments/ingram-v-alberta-(chief-medical-officer-of-health)-2022-abqb-595---reasons-for-decision.pdf?sfvrsn=46de6982_5

Even the opening statement of the Romaine decision is clear about it not being 'ALL ORDERS'. *"[1] This application involves challenges to certain orders enacted by the Chief Medical Officer of Health for Alberta (CMOH)"* (clarified later at [6], [7]).

In CM v Alberta, the argument was that Cabinet (in effect the Minister for Education) 'forced' the CMOH to drop an Order regarding the masking of children where the CMOH wanted to keep masks.

There are issues with the CM v Alberta decision as Justice Dunlop appears to have missed the powers that Bill 10 (and then Bill 66) provided Ministers, such as the Minister of Education when making the statement *"[7] I also find that, while Minister LaGrange's Statement on its face appears to prohibit school boards from imposing mask mandates, it does not do so, because the Minister can only do that through a* ***regulation****, and the statement was not a regulation.".* The Health Minister could have made a Ministerial Order (which would then have become Law) also. However, a statement is neither a regulation nor a Ministerial Order.
https://albertacourts.ca/docs/default-source/qb/judgments/cm-v-alberta-2022-abkb-716---decision.pdf

Note that what is missing in all these decisions is the fact that there was no provable emergency (based on the government's own published data), Orders were made OUTSIDE of the State of Emergency and the State of Emergency declaration and Bill 10 used *"Pandemic Influenza"* and the *"significant likelihood of pandemic influenza"* to trigger the

State of Emergency. COVID (SARS-CoV-2) is **NOT** influenza. This is a critical fact that appears to be being actively ignored by others, other than myself.
See Bill 10, Bill 66, M.O. 608/2020, OC 080/2020, OC 354/2020, OC 255/2021, M.O. 627/2020, M.O. 612/2020 (etc.)
https://dksdata.com/Court/Ingram

The issue with using the same argument as regards persons other than the CMOH making Orders from CM v Alberta in Ingram v Alberta is that this position hasn't been clarified for EVERY Order, just some. It will be easy to show the Orders Deena supported, wrote and published, regardless of Cabinet's input which is probably why the Judge wrote 'if I am wrong' at the end. In fact, Deena Hinshaw did not state she disagreed with or was forced against her will to enact the Orders she wrote, signed and published that were part of the 'Impugned Orders' in Ingram v Alberta.

That being said, it is possible to use this decision to get some PHA charges dropped (the very few that are left) but that remains to be seen. Dropping these final tickets is of no value to the rest of society and only impacts the few people like Chris Scott who are part of the larger group currently 'selling' this decision as a victory. Note that I have helped numerous people get their tickets withdrawn in the last three years using a simple process of asking for Full Disclosure, an area in which I am recognised as an expert by Alberta Justice and PPSC, along with the Courts. Dropping these last few cases now changes nothing for the future. However, this decision changes everything, and not in a good way. Now any 'Order' made by the CMOH will be unchallengeable by any means other than by the CMOH themselves (although there is always the option to fire the CMOH that still lies with the Health Minister, at this time). With the artificial ramping up of Cases already happening, we will see the Winter to end all Winters. This Case made what is to come even worse. How is this a win?

In Ingram v Alberta, Deena Hinshaw was asked three questions regarding her Orders and the answer was NO to all three.
https://albertacourts.ca/docs/default-source/qb/judgments/ingram-v-alberta-(chief-medical-officer-of-health)-2022-abqb-311---reasons-for-decision.pdf?sfvrsn=8d09af83_5
https://www.albertacourts.ca/docs/default-source/qb/judgments/ingram-v-alberta-(chief-medical-officer-of-health)-2022-abqb-595---reasons-for-decision.pdf?sfvrsn=46de6982_5

- *"Did the premier and cabinet … ever direct you, Dr. Hinshaw, to impose more severe restrictions in your CMOH orders than you had recommended to them?"*
- *"Did cabinet ever direct you to impose more severe restrictions on particular groups such as churches, gyms, schools and small businesses than you had recommended to them?"*
- *"Did you ever recommend to cabinet that restrictions should be lifted or loosened at any period of time and that recommendation was refused or ignored by cabinet?"*

Deena Hinshaw wanted to be MORE restrictive throughout COVID (until July 2022 when the SAG published their report on Masks (see https://dksdata.com/MASKS#AHSSAG). Now Ingram v Alberta has provided the Case Law to ensure any CMOH in Alberta can do whatever they want without challenge, something that Rath is now openly admitting (despite his and other lawyers initial misleading statements on the 'win'). This alone is a disaster for the coming flu season with what is now in place. It even puts in the framework for an Independent CMOH (like the OAG etc.) who is not answerable to the Health Minister so would have ZERO checks and balances. A literal WHO wet dream.

Even the Ultra Vires argument Grey and Rath put forward in the initial application (and for most of the hearing) was unsupportable and not the reason for the decision. See Ingram v Alberta [11], [12]. It was only towards the end of the hearing that Ingram (the applicant) finally added an argument consistent with CM. Note that I had already presented that Government acting Ultra Vires position (which was the actual decision of the judge, not what Rath and Grey originally argued) in my filing in November 2021 to which Rath and Grey had full access. Rath had the files even before I went to Court because Marilyn Burns sent them all to him without my approval. They refused to put that argument forward at that time in their case... but then added in through Ingram (the applicant) later in 2022 (see [13])!

See Page 11.

https://dksdata.com/Court/DavidDicksonPackage/25-AffidavitInResponse_Filed_Redacted.pdf

49) Further, in the Crown's evidence [emphasis added] *"Peter Lehmann Wines - 2015abqb481 excerpt";*

> *"[57] available against the Crown, so long as the Crown is not acting* ***unconstitutionally or ultra vires its lawful authority****:* ***Grand Council of Crees (of Quebec) v The Queen*** *(1981), [1982] 1 FC 599 at 600;* ***Lameman v Alberta****, 2013 ABCA 148 at paras 40–41, 553 AR 44 [****Lameman****]. This common law bar has been codified in the* ***Proceedings Against the Crown Act****, RSA 2000, c P- 25, s 17(1)."*
>
> *"[58] The Alberta Court of Appeal has suggested that* ***permanent injunctions against the Crown might be available*** *in the context of novel claims in rapidly evolving areas of the law (****Lameman*** *at para 42)."*

I am working through the 90-page summary now. It isn't just a loss; it is a disaster for the future. Everything being said about this case as a 'win' is arguably a pack of lies. Worse is what is behind this.

The applicant's arguments failed, and the exact opposite conclusion was made by Justice Romaine which the lawyers then twisted into 'their' win. The lawyers argued a Charter challenge and yet other lawyers now complain the judge mentions the Charter issues in her decision. As the Justice is required to provide the information relating to the reasoning behind her decision in the event of an appeal, this is reasonable, especially considering the importance of the Case. The applicants' experts were eviscerated during their cross examinations and even Rath and Grey dropped Dave Redman's evidence from their final arguments. Look at the summary of Dave Redman's testimony and then go and watch the examination under Oath. Their experts (and Rath and Grey) argued that everyone over 60/65 should have been isolated and the rest of the Province let out ("Focused Protection"). This action (taken in Care Homes and still in full force until June 19th, 2023) is specifically what killed most people in care homes. These lawyers and experts know this. https://dksdata.com/Care.

This is what the Government wanted and has implemented for most of the last three years, if anyone had paid attention. It is also the reason Sweden had double the per capita deaths vs. Canada in 2020 (contrary to the popular opinion Sweden didn't lock down). Sweden implemented "Focused Protection" in the most extreme form in Care Homes for 8 full months in 2020. See https://dksdata.com/ExcessDeaths#SwedenExcessDeaths. The Ingram experts argued that as part of this 'Focused Protection', everyone over 60/65 should have been vaccinated the instant a vaccine was available. The Ingram experts even argued that asymptomatic transmission was rife with Omicron. Does this sound like a case where these lawyers and experts were on YOUR SIDE?

The applicants/lawyers lost every argument on the Charter except for Tanner and a Section 2a argument about not being able to have Christmas with family. That was it. All other Charter challenges were struck down. They argued Ultra Vires in the pleadings saying Deena Hinshaw had NO AUTHORITY because she was not elected and the Judge's decision was the EXACT OPPOSITE, leading to case law now reinforcing what the WHO want. Doctors in control of ALL health emergencies (even without a State of Emergency being called through legislation) and the elected officials having NO SAY to stop them. This gives Danielle Smith the perfect excuse to say she can't do anything when restrictions are imposed by her pick of CMOH (Mark Joffe) who champions masks and vaccines more than Deena or Bonnie Henry.

Again, the Charter and Alberta Bill or Rights challenge (the basis for the application) was struck down other than Tanner missing out on family Christmas (a Charter Section 2a 'win' that has no value to anyone else as shown in the dismissal of the applicant Ingram's similar argument).

However, there was a shoring up of Section 1 and a dismissal of all Section 7 challenges as a result, adding to every other Charter failure we have seen. What did Einstein say about repeating one's mistakes? As I said, a tentative 'win' of the Orders that were held as necessary but may lead to a few old tickets being dropped. However, this more importantly allows more restrictive and unchallengeable Orders for the future. Now read the PHA and see what powers the CMOH and MOH have to isolate, detain, enter without warrant, destroy and more.

https://kings-printer.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=P37.cfm&leg_type=Acts&isbncln=9780779843398.

Whereas the Health Minister could intervene before, this case could end that ability leading to ‘Medical Marxism’ here in Alberta and by extension of the decision, Canada as a whole.

Not a WIN, but an unadulterated disaster now being used by lawyers and more (the ‘freedom groups’) to further support the same delay and donate tactics that have stopped us ending this from the start. Now more useless lawsuits lining lawyers’ pockets will follow and nothing will be done to focus on stopping this.

I may publish my detailed review in the coming days, but this is already unraveling and more spin is following.

But believe what you want and keep donating to these people. It helps no-one and saves no-one. But it does distract from what is coming so the government and other monsters can keep pushing their true agendas.