

20. Calling Jessica Yaniv a "fake woman" creates hatred against the LGBTQ2SIA+ community. Jessica Yaniv is a transgendered woman, and a woman legally. These comments by David Menzies have created Jessica much harassment in the community she resides in.
21. David Menzies on August 26, 2019 went around with a photo of me in a locker room on a clipboard around Vancouver calling me Jonathan Yaniv, calling me a "conman" and "sex offender" saying I am a "man pretending to be a woman."
22. The BC Provincial Court cannot act on defamation, but they do have the jurisdiction for harassment, which is what this is. Liability for what David Menzies stated, calling me a "conman" and a "sex offender" and a "man pretending to be a woman" are statements he is liable for stating through the innuendo of the defendant's words. An innuendo is made where the meaning of words arises from inference or implication: *Hodgson v. Canadian Newspapers Co.*, (1998), 1998 CanLII 14820 (ON SC), 39 OR (3d) 235 (Ont. Gen. Div.); rev'd in part on other grounds, [(2000), 2000 CanLII 14715 (ON CA), 49 OR (3d) 161; leave to appeal ref'd [2000] S.C.C.A. No. 465. The innuendo must be one that a reasonable reader would draw from the words and it must not be one guided by any special knowledge, legal or otherwise: *Gatley on Libel and Slander*, 9th ed. (1998: Sweet & Maxwell), at 82, §3.15.
23. The law of liability for republication of these statements is as stated by Professor Brown in his text, *The Law of Defamation in Canada*, 2nd ed. (Scarborough: Carswell, 1994), at 348-350:
24. Republication occurs where the person to whom the words were originally published communicates them to someone else. The general rule is that a person is responsible only for his or her own publications, and not for their repetition by others. There is no liability for a republication by a third person that the defendant neither authorized nor intended to be made.
25. There is no liability upon the original publisher of the content when the repetition is the voluntary act of a free agent, over whom the original publisher had no control and for whose acts he is not responsible ...
26. However, there are several exceptions to this rule. The defendant may intend or authorize another to publish a harassing communication on his or her behalf. Secondly, a defendant may publish it to someone who is under some moral, legal or social duty to repeat the information to another person. Thirdly, a defendant may be liable if the repetition was the natural and probable result of his or her publication. These rules apply only where the information repeated is the same or substantially the same so that the sum and substance of the original charge remains. Once the requirements have been satisfied, the plaintiff is entitled to recover damages from the defendant both for

03/16