

CITATION: Chowdhury v. City of Toronto 2017 ONSC 522
DIVISIONAL COURT FILE NO.: 643/17
DATE: 20180122

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
DIVISIONAL COURT**

RE: MD AHASANULLAH CHOWDHURY v THE CITY OF TORONTO

BEFORE: THORBURN J.

HEARD at Toronto: written submissions

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On December 3, 2017, I directed the Registrar, pursuant to rule 2.1.01(3) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, to give notice to Mr. Chowdhury that the court was considering making an order dismissing his application for judicial review on the grounds that it appears to be frivolous, vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court.

[2] Mr. Chowdhury has filed a 10 page response to this Notice which he refers to as an “affidavit submission” and includes reference to facts and law.

[3] Mr. Chowdhury seeks to quash the Order of the Information and Privacy Commission adjudicator dated October 23, 2017. He also seeks an order to “provide the City job under the mentorship program”. He claims that he was eligible for and better qualified than other applicants but was not hired for any of four mentorship program jobs. Lastly he seeks an order to disclose all records and/or further searches related to the investigation and an order to stop any further investigation of him by the City police. He claims that these acts constitute a violation of his section 2(b), 7, 8, 11(d) and 15 Charter rights.


[4] He claims he is “a victim on the mind control and experimentation under the controlled by the City program”.

[5] Mr. Chowdhury sought production of records from the IPC. The reason for the production request is not clear but refers to alleged discrimination by the City of Toronto.

[6] There is no right to appeal a decision of the IPCO. Moreover, Mr. Chowdhury’s affidavit sets out no basis for the relief sought, including his Charter remedy. What records are sought, how they relate to Mr. Chowdhury, and why they would be relevant to any issue that Mr. Chowdhury may have with the City of Toronto is unclear as is the grounds for relief sought.

[7] For these reasons, the application for judicial review appears to be frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of the court process.

[8] For these reasons, I make an order pursuant to r. 2.1.01(1) dismissing Mr. Chowdhury's application for judicial review.



THORBURN J.

DATE: January 22, 2018