

CANADA / JUDGMENT

British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Stronks

2025 BCSC 2579

COURT

Supreme Court of British Columbia

DECIDED

24 November 2025

Source: bccourts.ca · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

2025 BCSC 2579 British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Stronks

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation:

British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Stronks,

2025 BCSC 2579

Date: 20251124

Docket: S19600

Registry: Smithers

Between:

Attorney General of British Columbia

Plaintiff

And

Wayne Kelly Stronks

Defendant

Before: The Honourable Justice Ahmad

Oral Reasons for Judgment

In Chambers

Counsel for the Plaintiff:

M.J. Kleisinger

Counsel for the Defendant:

No appearance

Place and Date of Hearing:

Smithers, B.C.

November 24, 2025

Place and Date of Judgment:

Smithers, B.C.

November 24, 2025

- [1] THE COURT: These reasons were delivered orally. They have been edited for publication. Neither the reasoning nor the outcome have changed.

I. Introduction

- [2] On this application, the Attorney General of British Columbia ("AGBC") seeks an order prohibiting the defendant, Wayne Kelly Stronks from sending correspondence to the Smithers Courthouse Registry ("Registry") or to any person who works there. The order sought does not preclude Mr. Stronks from filing a document in the appropriate form and submitted in person, through Court Services Online, or through an agent.
- [3] Although served in accordance with an order for substituted service made on October 28, 2025, Mr. Stronks did not appear at this hearing.

II. Background Facts and Evidence

- [4] The primary facts giving rise to this application are set out in the affidavit of Jessica Rysavy, the Manager of Court Administration for Court Services Branch of the Ministry of Attorney General in Smithers. Among other things, Ms. Rysavy describes Mr. Stronks' escalating conduct in his communications with the Court.
- [5] In brief, in September 2022, Mr. Stronks began regularly attending the Registry to file various letters, notices, and invoices addressed to justice participants. He continued his attempts to communicate directly with the judiciary despite being informed of the appropriate means by which to do so in accordance with Practice Directive 27. Although generally polite civil and polite on these attendances, his persistence was notable.
- [6] On September 7, 2022, the Registry began receiving letters from Mr. Stronks which he would typically deliver in person at the Registry counter. While the communications appear "legalistic" in character, they are not in a form contemplated by the Rules nor it is clear from their content what Mr. Stronks wants the Registry to do with them.

- [7] In May 2023, there was a noticeable change in the content and the method by which Mr. Stronks delivered his communications to the Registry. While all the communications after that date are delivered in their own individual stamped envelope, they are sent in what Ms. Rysavy describes as "bulk mailings", received at the same time - usually nearing or after an event in one of four actions in which Mr. Stronks is a party.
- [8] The bulk mailings include several different forms of communications, apparently self-tilted by Mr. Stronks variously as: a Non-Negotiable Notice of Acceptance, a Notice of Dishonor, a Notice of Repentance of Sins for Cause, a Notice of and Rescission of Requisition - General for Cause, and a Certificate of Dishonour.
- [9] As one example, the content of a "Notice of Repentance of Sins for Cause" received by the Registry on July 4, 2025 includes, in part, the following:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that I, Wayne Kelly of House Stronks, a sentient moral being, have examined the path my feet are on and have concluded that I have dishonoured many including but not limited to: Supreme Court of British Columbia Smithers Registry, The Honourable Justice [name redacted], Supreme Court of British Columbia Smithers Registry, and others yet to be determined.

I am sorry for my errors and THEREFORE, I now REPENT of my sin, As I become aware of additional sins I may have committed, I will repent them immediately.

- [10] The communications are addressed to numerous people, including judges and judicial officers, registrars, registry staff, and sheriffs. While the meaning or intent of the documents is not clear from their content, the ambiguity in some of Mr. Stronks' communications (e.g., "Dishonor may result for WARRANTS if you fail to respond") has caused concern among some members of the Registry staff about Mr. Stronks' intended next steps.
- [11] Between May 3, 2023 and March 27, 2024, Mr. Stronks delivered 1,235 letters to the Registry. Each bulk delivery took Ms. Rysavy anywhere from two hours to three days to review, file, scan, or otherwise deal with - time that she could have been dealing with other members of the public or attending to her other job duties.
- [12] In response to her written request dated April 3, 2024 to stop sending the letters, Mr. Stronks sent Ms. Rysavy a self-titled "Non-Negotiable Notice of Acceptance", followed by a "Notice of Dishonor", and a "Certificate of Dishonor". He continued to send bulk correspondence to the Registry until May 7, 2024.
- [13] On June 11, 2024, counsel for the AGBC reiterated the request that Mr. Stronks refrain from sending inappropriate correspondence and advised that if he continued, the AGBC may seek a court order to prevent him from further disrupting registry operations. Counsel expressly advised Mr. Stronks that "[s]uch an order would limit your ability to communicate with the [R]egistry".

- [14] The Registry did not receive correspondence from Mr. Stronks from then until June 12, 2025 when Mr. Stronks delivered five "Certificates of Dishonor".
- [15] On June 13, 2025, a lawyer for the AGBC reiterated the request that Mr. Stronks stop corresponding with the Registry and its staff in the manner he had been doing.
- [16] Since then, Mr. Stronks has delivered an additional 136 letters to the Registry. To August 19, 2025, the Registry has received over 1,500 written communications from Mr. Stronks. I am told that, as of the date of the hearing of this application, that number exceeds 1,600.
- [17] Put in context, on average, the Registry receives approximately five pieces of regular mail per day, five items by fax, and 30 emails from members of the public and legal counsel. The volume and nature of the correspondence from Mr. Stronks far exceeds the typical daily volume that the Registry staff is equipped to handle.
- [18] Ms. Rysavy acknowledges and is concerned with providing everyone, including Mr. Stronks, with access to the court system. She deposes:

Registry staff are responsible for opening, reviewing and responding to all mail delivered to the court registry. These items often contain legal documents or inquiries that directly affect individuals' rights and access to justice. The registry is frequently the first point of contact for the public - including self-represented litigants - and it is essential that correspondence is handled promptly and appropriately. Ignoring or discarding mail is not an option, as it may result in missed deadlines, procedural errors, or denial of access to justice. Registry staff are expected to manage all incoming materials diligently in accordance with operational standards and the CSB commitment to fairness and accessibility.

III. Discussion and Analysis

- [19] Pursuant to s. 18.1 of the Supreme Court Act, RSBC 1996, c. 443, the AGBC is responsible for the provision, operation and maintenance of court facilities, registries, and administrative services. I, accept, as the AGBC submits, that discharging this mandate implicitly requires the AGBC to take reasonable steps to provide a safe environment free of harassment for those working at and visiting the courthouse.
- [20] Moreover, s. 2(c) of the Attorney General Act, RSBC 1996, c. 22 requires the AGBC to superintend all matters connected with the administration of justice in British Columbia. Protecting and defending the integrity of all levels of court in the province falls squarely within these functions: *British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Randhawa*, 2024 BCSC 421 at para. 28.
- [21] Finally, the AGBC's *parens patriae* powers authorize her to seek injunctions where there is a public nuisance or an ongoing breach of the public law: *Randhawa* at para. 28, citing *In the Matter of Access to the Courts of Justice*, 2011 BCSC 1815 at paras. 3-4.

- [22] I am satisfied that the above authorities allow the AGBC to seek the orders sought. I am also satisfied that this Court has the authority to grant them: *Randhawa* at para. 29, citing *British Columbia (Attorney General) v. Andrews*, 2016 BCCA 361 at paras. 17 - 18.
- [23] However, limits should be placed on any orders granted. As Justice Iyer (then of this Court) notes in *Randhawa*:
- [31] In my respectful opinion, while the AG has the authority to bring applications such as this and the court has the power to grant them, they should be exercised sparingly, reserved for those comparatively rare cases where lesser measures are demonstrably ineffective. The right of all individuals to access the courts is fundamental and should be restricted as little as possible. However, where a person's exercise of their right of access directly or indirectly diminishes those of others and places unreasonable burdens upon court resources, restrictions are justified. They should be tailored to respond to the particular circumstances of the case.
- [24] I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances of this case to grant the orders sought.
- [25] In reaching that conclusion, I acknowledge that Mr. Stronks has not directly exhibited the "aggressive and threatening" or "confrontational" behaviour that resulted in the interim injunctive relief circumscribing the basis on which Mr. *Randhawa* was able to enter British Columbia courthouses. However, the content of some of Mr. Stronks' communications appears threatening or, at least, concerning. The views expressed by some members of the Registry staff in that regard is warranted.
- [26] It is also significant that none of the communications have any legitimate legal purpose and do nothing to legitimately advance Mr. Stronks' position in any court process. As counsel for the AGBC suggests, the non-sensical nature of the communications is very much akin to the types of organized pseudo-legal commercial arguments consistently rejected by the Courts.
- [27] The time required by the Registry to handle the volume, and to attempt to decipher the content, of Mr. Stronks' communications detracts from its ability to attend to other members of the public who do comply with the legal process, some of whom rely on the Registry staff for guidance in navigating the court system. That guidance, only a part of the Registry staff's important work, ensures that self-represented litigants can access the court system effectively and fairly.
- [28] The burden on court resources caused by Mr. Stronks' conduct is clear. The fact that Mr. Stronks continues to send voluminous correspondence despite written requests that he refrain from doing so highlights his disregard for the disruption he continues to cause.
- [29] I am satisfied that the injunctive relief sought is necessary to protect the public interest in equitable access to the justice system and to address the public nuisance caused by Mr. Stronks' conduct.

[30] I am also satisfied that the orders sought will only minimally restrict Mr. Stronks' right to access the courts. In particular, allowing Mr. Stronks to file documents in accordance with the Rules or direction of the Court, as contemplated, will not deprive Mr. Stronks of the ability to litigate in British Columbia, including by taking steps in the actions in which he is currently involved. While the form of order will restrict the way he can file documents (i.e., not by mail), he is not precluded from filing appropriate documents all at. In fact, three options (in person, through Court Services Online, or through an agent) will remain available to him.

[31] With those express allowances, Mr. Stronks will not be deprived of access to justice or the ability to maintain or defend a claim in court. I am satisfied that the orders sought are appropriate and they will be granted.

IV. Disposition

[32] To summarize, I make the following orders:

- a) An order prohibiting Mr. Stronks from sending correspondence, in any form whatsoever, to the Registry, or to any person who works at the Registry;
- b) The Registry staff is authorized to disregard and discard any correspondence received contrary to this order;
- c) This order does not apply to any document that Mr. Stronks submits for filing into a court file if all the following conditions are present:
 - i. the document is prepared in accordance with:
 - (1) the Rules of Court; or
 - (2) a specific direction of the Court; and
 - ii. Mr. Stronks submits the document for filing:
 - (1) in person; or
 - (2) through Court Services Online; or
 - (3) through an agent.

[33] So there is no uncertainty, I also make an order dispensing with the requirement for Mr. Stronks' signature on the form of Order.

[34] Thank you to counsel for his thorough review of the facts and the law giving rise to this application, for which I am grateful.

"Ahmad J."

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/25/25/2025BCSC2579.htm>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/british-columbia-attorney-general-v-stronks-2025>

Prepared on 26 October 2026 · Esheria