

**CITATION:** Simon-Aaron v. Food Basics, 2025 ONSC 5334  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-25-00748753-0000  
**DATE:** 20250918

**ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

**RE:** Charles Simon-Aaron, Plaintiff

-and-

Food Basics Supermarket [Metro: Parent Company] & His Majesty The King in Right of Canada (Royal Canadian Mounted Police And Canadian Security Intelligence Service), Defendants

**BEFORE:** Robert Centa J.

**COUNSEL:** Charles Simon-Aaron, self-represented plaintiff

Meredith Wilson-Smith, for the defendant His Majesty The King in Right of Canada

Christina Stewart, for the defendant Food Basics Supermarket

**HEARD:** September 18, 2025 (in writing)

**ENDORSEMENT**

- [1] The registrar's office referred this motion to me pursuant to rule 2.1.01(7) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, following receipt of a written request under rule 2.1.01(6) from the lawyers for the His Majesty The King in Right of Canada.
- [2] On September 5, 2025, I directed the registrar to give notice to Mr. Simon-Aaron that the court was considering making an order dismissing the proceeding under rule 2.1.01.<sup>1</sup> The registrar invited Mr. Simon-Aaron to deliver written submissions explaining why the proceeding should not be dismissed. On September 16, 2025, Mr. Simon-Aaron filed a ten-page, single spaced submission, which I have reviewed.
- [3] For the reasons that follow, I dismiss the proceeding as frivolous and vexatious.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Simon-Aaron v. Food Basics*, 2025 ONSC 5106.

**A. Rule 2.1**

- [4] Rule 2.1.01 permits the court to stay or dismiss a proceeding if it appears on its face to be frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of process of the court. In *Gao v. Ontario (Workplace Safety and Insurance Board)*, Myers J. explained:

Rule 2.1 is not meant to apply to close calls. It is not a short form of summary judgment. But that does not mean that it is not to be robustly interpreted and applied. Where a proceeding appears on its face to meet the standards of frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of process, the court should be prepared to rigorously enforce the rule to nip the proceeding in the bud. Rigorous enforcement of this rule will not only protect respondents from incurring unrecoverable costs, but should positively contribute to access to justice by freeing up judicial and administrative resources that are so acutely needed to implement the “culture shift” mandated by the Supreme Court of Canada. The new rule tailors appropriate procedural fairness for the category of cases involved and is an example of early resolution of civil cases that is very much in line with the goals set out in *Hryniak*.<sup>2</sup>

- [5] A frivolous proceeding lacks a legal basis or legal merit or has been brought without reasonable grounds.<sup>3</sup> A frivolous proceeding is one that is readily recognizable as devoid of merit, as one having little prospect of success.<sup>4</sup> A frivolous action is one that will necessarily or inevitably fail.<sup>5</sup>
- [6] A vexatious application is one taken to annoy or embarrass the opposite party or is conducted in a vexatious manner.<sup>6</sup>
- [7] The court is not to use rule 2.1.01 for close calls. However, neither the opposing parties nor the court should be required to devote scarce resources to proceedings that are clearly frivolous. Allowing such proceedings to occupy space on the court docket takes time away from other, more meritorious cases. There is simply no benefit to allowing clearly frivolous proceedings to continue.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> 2014 ONSC 6100; *Scaduto v. Law Society of Upper Canada*, 2015 ONCA 733.

<sup>3</sup> Annotation to rule 2.1 in *Ontario Superior Court Practice*, the Hons. Todd Archibald, Stephen Firestone and Tamara Sugunasiri; *Van Sluytman v. Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital*, 2017 ONSC 692, at para. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Gill v. MacIver*, 2023 ONCA 776, at para. 3; *Lavallee v. Isak*, 2022 ONCA 290, at para. 19; *Pickard v. London Police Services Board*, 2010 ONCA 643, 268 O.A.C. 153, at para. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *R. v. Haevischer*, 2023 SCC 11, at para. 67.

<sup>6</sup> *Gill*, at para. 3; *Lavallee*, at para. 19; *Pickard*, at para. 19; and *Henderson v. Wright*, 2016 ONCA 89, 345 O.A.C. 231, at para. 20.

<sup>7</sup> *Dunning v. Colliers Macaulay Nicolls Inc.*, 2023 ONSC 73, at para. 26; *Foley v. Victoria Hospital London Health Services Centre*, 2023 ONSC 4978, at para. 5.

**B. *The statement of claim***

- [8] Mr. Simon-Aaron seeks damages from the defendants arising from an incident that allegedly took place on July 31, 2025, when he consumed two cans of a Caribbean non-alcoholic beer and two cans of a nutritional supplement. After consuming these beverages, Mr. Simon-Aaron pleads that he could not sleep and that was in a state of “mental delirium” and that his brain felt “like it was on fire.”<sup>8</sup> Mr. Simon-Aaron concluded that his beverages “were spiked with crystal meth.”
- [9] Mr. Simon-Aaron pleads that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service spiked the beverages in an act of revenge against him. He pleads that the RCMP and CSIS “illegally enter [his] residence at will whenever [he] is sleeping or absent and engage in their intrigues.” Mr. Simon-Aaron pleads that the RCMP and CSIS have engaged in similar activities for the past 41 years, although previously they spiked his beverages with “mind altering drugs” or “psychoactive drugs,” not crystal meth.
- [10] In his statement of claim, Mr. Simon-Aaron seeks damages for “attempted murder; pain and suffering; mental trauma and torture.” He seeks damages from the RCMP, CSIS, and Food Basics, where he purchased the beverages, because the staff at the grocery store were the “proxies” for CSIS and RCMP officers.
- [11] Mr. Simon-Aaron relies on, among other statutes and instruments, the *United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*.

**C. *Mr. Simon-Aaron’s written submissions***

- [12] In his submissions, Mr. Simon-Aaron explains that CSIS and the Canadian state has “been obsessed with the name and person that is Charles Simon-Aaron” since 1982. He explains that he has been subject to “an unrelenting, unrepentant campaign of harassment, intimidation, lies, character assassination, slander, defamation, creation of a doppelganger, [and] economic and psychological sabotage.” He describes the tactics as follows:

As a subject of this measure of full-spectrum transgenerational campaign of surveillance I have been the subject of Canadian state [RCMP] thefts, of wallets, credit cards, Presto cards, clothing, books, official documents, shoes; illegal home invasions: burglaries, theft of food items, removal and return of household items, usage of toilet and not flushing, spraying apartment beddings and seats with Lidocaine, food poisonings, theft of my rental agreements, Ontario Health Cards and Citizenship cards, shutting down of my computer, thefts of my smartphones, wiping menstrual tampons on my

---

<sup>8</sup> In the statement of claim, Mr. Simon-Aaron makes liberal use of full caps, bolded text, and underlining. To improve readability, I have removed that formatting from the direct quotes taken from from the statement of claim.

apartment's walls and beddings, clothing, sofas, chairs, computers. Substituting new Chinese noodles, say to be utilized by December 20th, 2025 with noodles with a best before date of June 2017. A lack of vigilance has led to me consuming the latter at high personal medical cost. These are all indices of the quality and variety of efforts on the part of RCMP/CSIS to interfere and sabotage normalcy in my life. Placing Crystal Meth in two nutritional beverages is historical and normal within the RCMP/CSIS chosen pattern of engagement with the life of Charles Simon-Aaron.

- [13] Mr. Simon-Aaron provides the following explanation for why CSIS and the RCMP have engaged in this 43-year campaign against him:

CSIS and other members of the Five Eyes Intelligence Network attempt to recruit agents to work on their behalf quite frequently—especially those intellectually capable and accomplished. CSIS has admired the intellectual acumen of Charles Simon-Aaron, who possesses a PhD in Social and Political Thought and specializes in Geo-Politics, African Studies and the social history of ideas. Having him work for them and support the neoliberal ideological agenda of British, American and Canadian intelligence would be a coup of enormous proportions.

Charles Simon-Aaron as a progressive, anti-racist, social equalitarian Black intellectual is viewed as a threat to pro-Zionist interests in Canada because he can articulate an historically driven pro-global humanity critique of institutionalized Zionism in Canada and in Occupied Palestine. Stopping him from becoming a Professor or gaining notoriety domestically must be done; killing him or making of him an addict of Crystal Meth is all in order in defense of Zionist extremity by CSIS/RCMP and the Mossad. Charles Simon-Aaron, has been scenario-mapped as a powerful social coagulator, someone whom could stir mass sentiment towards Palestine. His influence in the nation's four million strong population of Africans is just potentially too damaging to the cause of Zionism if he were able to reach that constituency with a critical of anti-Zionist politics on the basis of its commitment to racism, white supremacy and genocide. Zionism would survive in Canada with a dagger in its heart since it could not defend its commitment to racism to peoples of Aboriginal and African heritage. Crystal Meth is the least cost for Zionism to pay to protect itself.

CSIS wants Charles Simon-Aaron to add him to their staff of Africa watchers who monitor the political economy of modern African societies and their policies towards Canadian mining companies.

These Africa watchers are loaned to regime change operations of British, American and Zionist intelligence agencies and corporations in Africa.

**D. Conclusion: the proceeding is frivolous and vexatious**

- [14] I am satisfied the action lacks both a legal basis and legal merit. Mr. Simon-Aaron has brought this action without reasonable grounds. This action will inevitably fail.
- [15] Mr. Simon-Aaron's statement of claim is confusing and makes little sense. It is little more than the articulation of a wild conspiracy theory. It contains many allegations that state agents conducted surveillance of Mr. Simon-Aaron, repeatedly entered his home when he was absent or asleep, and attempted to harm Mr. Simon-Aaron for over 40 years. The statement of claim is devoid of material facts. It relies on a series of conclusory assertions, which are incapable of belief.
- [16] The statement of claim contains rhetorical questions and unusual punctuation, including the liberal use of text rendered in full caps, bold and underlined text. Mr. Simon-Aaron has attached photographs and an email to himself as part of the statement of claim. This type of punctuation, formatting, and organization is typical of a frivolous proceeding.
- [17] I have also considered Mr. Simon-Aaron's submissions. Although he could have persuaded me that his action should be allowed to proceed, he did not do so. Far from it. Mr. Simon-Aaron's submissions are deeply troubling and demonstrate that this action is not only frivolous, but it is also vexatious. I am satisfied that Mr. Simon-Aaron would conduct this litigation in a vexatious manner.
- [18] I have no doubt that, if I allowed this action to continue, it would ultimately fail and that, in the meantime, it would consume a vast and disproportionate amount of court time.
- [19] I dismiss the proceeding pursuant to rule 2.1.01(1), without costs.

---

Robert Centa J.

Date: September 18, 2025