

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document / Description	Page
PART I – FACTS	1
Overview	1
A. Applicant’s motion for leave to represent the Applicant	3
The Applicant’s representative submitted	4
B. Order of Prothonotary Milczynski	5
C. Applicant’s appeal of Prothonotary Milczynski’s Order	5
D. The ruling on the Applicant’s appeal of the Prothonotary’s Order	6
E. Currently before the Court	6
PART II – ISSUES	6
PART III – SUBMISSIONS	7
A. Introduction: Whether the Administration of the Court is brought into disrepute	7
Madam Prothonotary Martha Milczynski	7
Order of Prothonotary Milczynski dated June 14, 2004	8
Pain and suffering	10
B. Public interest at the heart of this proceeding	10
C. Sacrificing for the interest of all (the common good)	11
D. The burden of costs awarded	12
E. Wasteful use of taxpayers’ dollars and Court’s resources	12
F. Standard of review: this Court should consider the motion <i>de novo</i>	13
G. Justice Hughes erred in determining the matter was not vital	14
Whether the matter and the questions raised in the motion were vital to the final resolution of the case	14

The “vitality” test	17
H. The orders are clearly wrong	19
Reasons for order	19
Whether the Appellant’s motion to the Motion Judge was redundant	19
Whether the Appellant has shown a proper basis	20
Special circumstances	22
“Special circumstances” test	22
Whether the court permits non-lawyers to represent parties	24
Whether the Order of the Prothonotary was reasonable	24
Representing the public interest	25
Issues of prejudice	27
Procedural equality issues	27
The right to be heard	28
I. Closing submissions	29
PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT	30
PART V – AUTHORITIES	31