



Denis Rancourt <[REDACTED]>

FIPPA request A-11-42

Tracy Murray <Tracy.Murray@uottawa.ca>

Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 3:08 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Rancourt,

If you are not satisfied with my decision of October 12, 2011 made in the above mentioned file, as you know, you may file an appeal with the Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Yours truly,

Tracy Murray

Tracy Murray

Coordonnatrice de l'accès à l'information et de la protection de la vie privée |

Access to Information and Privacy Coordinator

BAIPVP | AIPO

Université d'Ottawa | University of Ottawa

550 Cumberland (M383)

Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

tracy.murray@uottawa.ca


Tél. | Tel. : 613-562-5800 (1667)

Télec. | Fax : [613-562-5914](tel:613-562-5914)



Le présent courriel et toutes les pièces jointes peuvent contenir de l'information privilégiée, confidentielle et/ou sujette au droit d'auteur s'adressant uniquement au destinataire. Toute utilisation, copie ou distribution non autorisée est strictement interdite. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire, veuillez supprimer le courriel et les pièces et en informer immédiatement l'expéditeur.

This e-mail, including all attachments, may contain privileged and/or confidential information and/or information subject to copyright. Any unauthorized use, copying or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and immediately notify the sender.

From: Denis Rancourt [mailto:
Sent: October 25, 2011 7:06 PM
To: Tracy Murray
Subject: Re: FIPPA request A-11-42

[Quoted text hidden]



Denis Rancourt [REDACTED]

FIPPA request A-11-42

Denis Rancourt [REDACTED]

Tue, Oct 25, 2011 at 7:06 PM

To: Tracy Murray <Tracy.Murray@uottawa.ca>

Dear Tracy Murray,

Today I left you a voice-mail asking when you will be able to answer my email (below) of October 17, 2011. I had asked you to reply by October 24th.

As I continue to await an answer from your office regarding my email (below) of October 17, 2011, please consider the attached: It is a letter from lawyer David W. Scott representing the University and stating that the University is funding the litigation in question (St. Lewis v. Rancourt) in access request A-11-42. The letter came only after two months of pressures for the University to disclose its involvement.

It is outrageous that a public university would fund this type of aggressive litigation (as a "private action") to silence one of its critics, and use a pretext of alleged blasphemy as its only justification.

There can be no doubt, given this additional evidence, that my access request is by no means unjustified: You must conclude that it is a justified request and that **there must be several respondent records**.

I therefore urge you to change you untenable initial conclusion immediately and I await your confirmation and a proper decision letter.

Please confirm immediately (by this week) and produce a new decision letter.

Sincerely,
Dr. Denis Rancourt

On Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 4:00 PM, Denis Rancourt [REDACTED] wrote:
Tracy Murry
Coordinator
Access to Information and Privacy
University of Ottawa

Dear Tracy Murray,

Re: FIPPA request A-11-42

I have received your decision letter of October 12, 2011, in the matter of my access to information request A-11-42.

In your letter you state "I am responsible for making this decision."

You also state: "I have concluded that your request is frivolous and vexatious and am of the opinion that your request was made for a purpose other than to obtain access and that it was made in bad faith."

As you know, I have made over twenty access to information requests to your office in the past. You have never suggested previously that any request was frivolous or vexatious. Indeed, several of my requests have led to IPC Orders against the University.

In addition, the litigation (mentioned in my September 12, 2011, access to information request) that motivates the recent request (A-11-42) is in the public record to which you have easy access:

<http://rancourt.academicfreedom.ca/background/stlewislawsuit.html>

Some of the legal reasons that the requested information is sought are described in paragraphs 61 to 67 of the Statement of Defence in the litigation:

<http://rancourt.academicfreedom.ca/Data/uofowatch/2011-07-22=Form-18A=SOD=Rancourt-v-St-Lewis-=pub.pdf>

There are also other legal reasons that the University's involvement in the lawsuit may be improper or illegal.

There are no reasonable grounds to conclude that my request is frivolous or vexatious.

And there are no reasonable grounds for you to advance the opinion that my request was made for a purpose other than to obtain access and that it was made in bad faith.

Your decision could be viewed as a bad faith attempt to delay access.

Therefore, I ask that you reconsider your decision regarding access and issue a proper access decision immediately.

By the attached file, I also wish to inform you that I have questioned the University about your statutory independence in making the access decision. In this regard, please inform me whether or not you were instructed to make the access decision, so that I can correctly attribute legal responsibility for the access decision in any following actions.

Please reply by October 24, 2011. Please clarify both if you will correct your October 12th decision and if you were effectively instructed by your superiors to make the October 12th decision.

Sincerely,

Dr. Denis Rancourt

 **2011-10-25-received=1858_001.pdf**
55K



Denis Rancourt [REDACTED]

FIPPA request A-11-42

Denis Rancourt [REDACTED]

Mon, Oct 17, 2011 at 4:00 PM

To: Tracy Murray <Tracy.Murray@uottawa.ca>

Cc: alain.roussy@uottawa.ca, allan.rock@uottawa.ca, diane.davidson@uottawa.ca, president@uottawa.ca, vr.gouvernance@uottawa.ca

Tracy Murry
Coordinator
Access to Information and Privacy
University of Ottawa

Dear Tracy Murray,

Re: FIPPA request A-11-42

I have received your decision letter of October 12, 2011, in the matter of my access to information request A-11-42.

In your letter you state "I am responsible for making this decision."

You also state: "I have concluded that your request is frivolous and vexatious and am of the opinion that your request was made for a purpose other than to obtain access and that it was made in bad faith."

As you know, I have made over twenty access to information requests to your office in the past. You have never suggested previously that any request was frivolous or vexatious. Indeed, several of my requests have led to IPC Orders against the University.

In addition, the litigation (mentioned in my September 12, 2011, access to information request) that motivates the recent request (A-11-42) is in the public record to which you have easy access:

<http://rancourt.academicfreedom.ca/background/stlewislawsuit.html>

Some of the legal reasons that the requested information is sought are described in paragraphs 61 to 67 of the Statement of Defence in the litigation:

<http://rancourt.academicfreedom.ca/Data/uofowatch/2011-07-22=Form-18A=SOD=Rancourt-v-St-Lewis-=pub.pdf>

There are also other legal reasons that the University's involvement in the lawsuit may be improper or illegal.

There are no reasonable grounds to conclude that my request is frivolous or vexatious.

And there are no reasonable grounds for you to advance the opinion that my request was made for a purpose other than to obtain access and that it was made in bad faith.

Your decision could be viewed as a bad faith attempt to delay access.

Therefore, I ask that you reconsider your decision regarding access and issue a proper access decision immediately.

By the attached file, I also wish to inform you that I have questioned the University about your statutory independence in making the access decision. In this regard, please inform me whether or not you were instructed to make the access decision, so that I can correctly attribute legal responsibility for the access decision in any following actions.

Please reply by October 24, 2011. Please clarify both if you will correct your October 12th decision and if you were effectively instructed by your superiors to make the October 12th decision.

Sincerely,

Dr. Denis Rancourt

 **2011-10-17=DGRtoARoussy-AR-DD=need answers=signed=with-attachments.PDF**
601K
