

# Court of King's Bench of Alberta

**Citation: Piri v Good Samaritan Society, 2026 ABKB 28**

**Date:** 20260112  
**Docket:** 2506 00781  
**Registry:** Lethbridge

Between:

**Gabri O. Piri aka Jennifer L Laurie**

Applicant

- and -

**Good Samaritan Society; Head Office  
Angela Henke, Hospitality Manager**

Respondents

---

**Apparent Vexatious Application or Proceeding (AVAP) Notice  
of the Honourable  
Associate Chief Justice  
D.B. Nixon**

---

[1] On November 4, 2025, the Applicant filed an Application against the Respondents, together with an Affidavit sworn on the same date.

[2] On November 21, 2025, counsel for one of the Respondents, The Good Samaritan Society, wrote to the Court and asked it to review the Application under Civil Practice Note 7 (“CPN7”).

[3] CPN7 sets out summary procedures, using rule 3.68 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta Reg 124/2010, for assessment of a “claim, defence, action, application, or proceeding that appears on its face to be frivolous, vexatious, or otherwise an abuse of process”.

[4] I reviewed the Application. Based on my review of the facts and analysis of the law, I find the Application appears on its face to be frivolous, vexatious, or an abuse of process for the following reasons.

[5] The Applicant seeks “justice”, “compensation”, “back pay”, a mental capacity assessment for a former colleague, and an “unlocking” of her Locked-In Retirement Account (LIRA). The Applicant states that her grounds for making the Application are that she was “not properly terminated/offboarded”. She claims she received neither an acceptance letter for her tendered resignation nor a complete record of employment which has led to a number of subsequent cumulative grievances.

[6] In support of her Application, she relies on: the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985 c C-46; the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I to the *Constitution Act, 1982*, Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982 (UK)*, 1982, c 11; the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, SA 2020, c O-2.2; the *Employment Standards Code*, RSA 2000, c E-9; the *Personal Information Protection Act*, SA 2003, c P-6.5; and what appear to be internal human resources policies of The Good Samaritan Society.

[7] Although CPN7 requires any deficiencies in a pleading to be clear on the face, I also reviewed the Applicant’s supporting Affidavit to glean more information on the factual basis for her allegations. Following several alleged workplace events, the Applicant states she “feels” that she was “[s]abotaged to be forced to quit”.

[8] Amongst other things, the Applicant refers to a “SST Tribunal ... Where EI was the Commission” which may be a reference to the federal Social Security Tribunal of Canada and/or the Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC). She refers to a denied appeal, and instructions (assumably from the “SST Tribunal”) to “take it to a Judicial Review in Federal Court instead”.

[9] Based on my review of matters, the Application may be vexatious in that the Applicant appears to be pursuing multiple proceedings in different forums hoping for a positive result, or an abuse of process in that the Applicant is not following established appeal processes for her legal or administrative proceedings. Nonetheless, the Applicant may also be unsure of where to turn given the multiple forms of relief she seeks arising from her numerous grievances with her (former) employer.

[10] Given the context, I direct the following as the next steps.

- a. The Clerk will file and serve this Apparent Vexatious Application or Proceeding Notice (“**AVAP Notice**”) on the Applicant and the Respondents.
- b. If the Applicant wishes to respond to this AVAP Notice, she must prepare a Written Submission of no more than 10 pages. In her submissions, the Applicant may wish to address the following questions:
  - i. What is the status of the Applicant’s proceedings before the Social Security Tribunal of Canada and/or the CEIC, if these are in fact the administrative bodies to which the Applicant is referring? The Applicant appears to be attempting to challenge the findings of these bodies by bringing an application against the Respondents in this Court. The Applicant may wish to clarify why she believes this is appropriate and how this Court has jurisdiction.

- ii. The Applicant states that her status is “OFF ON PAID LEAVE” [*sic*], but that she is “still employed without being paid”, and also that she tendered her resignation unwillingly. The Applicant may wish to clarify her current employment status.
- iii. The Applicant also alleges bullying and harassment and relies on provincial legislation in making her claims. She may wish to clarify, what, if any, action she has taken with provincial regulators, such as Alberta Occupational Health and Safety (OHS), the Workers Compensation Board (WCB), the Alberta Human Rights Commission, and Employment Standards. It appears that she may have submitted at least one complaint to Alberta Health Services (AHS) concerning dietary health in the workplace, but the status of any ongoing regulatory proceedings involving The Good Samaritan Society (if any) is unclear.
- iv. The Applicant makes several references to the *Charter* in support of her Application. However, it is unclear who she alleges owed her *Charter* rights and how they were breached. The Applicant may wish to clarify these points. We raise this because generally only governments have obligations under the *Charter*, not private individuals or organizations.

The Applicant must file and serve her Written Submission within 14 days after receiving this AVAP Notice. The Written Submission must be emailed or delivered to the address of Associate Chief Justice D.B. Nixon, located at the Calgary Court Centre, 601 – 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Calgary, Alberta T2P 5P7, and must be marked “To the Attention of Associate Chief Justice D.B. Nixon”. It must also be served on the Respondents.

- c. If the Applicant does not file and serve a Written Submission by the deadline, the Court will make a final decision on whether the Application should be struck out in whole or in part under rule 3.68 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*.
- d. If the Applicant does file and serve a Written Submission, the Respondents have seven days to provide a Written Reply of up to 10 pages. The Written Reply must be addressed “To the Attention of Associate Chief Justice D.B. Nixon” and should be sent to the address set out in paragraph “b” above. It must also be served on the Applicant.
- e. Once the Court receives the parties’ Written Submissions and Written Replies (if any), the Court will make a final decision on whether the Application should be struck out in whole or in part under rule 3.68 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*.

[11] The Applicant may find the free legal resources available at <https://www.canlii.org/> helpful. The Applicant may also wish to contact Lethbridge Legal Guidance at (403) 380-6338. For information or assistance filing documents, she may wish to contact Court and Justice Services at 1-855-738-4747.

[12] Counsel for the Respondents may prepare and serve an Interim Order staying this Action until the CPN7 process is complete. The Applicant’s approval of that Order is not required, pursuant to rule 9.4(2)(c) of the *Alberta Rules of Court*.

**Dated** at Lethbridge, Alberta this 12<sup>th</sup> day of January 2026.

---

**D.B. Nixon**  
**A.C.J.C.K.B.A.**

**Appearances:**

Gabri O. Piri (aka Jennifer L Laurie) – None  
Applicant

Zac Houston – Written Submission  
Neuman Thompson  
Counsel for one of the Respondents, The Good Samaritan Society