Court File #: CV-22-0069-1880-0000

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:

DR. BYRAM BRIDLE

Plaintiffs

- and -

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH, JEFFREY WICHTEL, LAURIE ARNOTT, CHARLOTTE YATES, SCOTT WEESE, GLEN PYLE, ANDREW PEREGRINE, DOROTHEE BIENZLE, AMY GREER, DAVID FISMAN, NICK DULEY, JANE OR JOHN DOE JUNIOR SCIENTIST

Defendants

REPLY

- 1. The Plaintiff Dr. Byram Bridle Replies to the Defendants' Statement of Defence as set out below.
- 2. The Plaintiff Dr. Byram Bridle relies on the facts set out in his Statement of Claim, and, unless expressly admitted, denies the Defendants' assertions.
- 3. With respect to paragraph 2 of the Statement of Defence, and the John or Jane Doe junior scientist, the Plaintiff states that this statement draws the inescapable conclusion that the Defendants know the identity of this John or Jane Doe and request the Defendants provide his/her identity forthwith.
- 4. With respect to paragraph 13 of the Statement of Claim the Plaintiff states that if so, the lawyer on record for the Defendants is in a (potential) conflict of interest in representing Mr. Duley and furthermore, given that fact, gives reasonable inference that Mr. Duley colluded, as pleaded, with the other Co-Defendants.

Court File No./N° du dossier du greffe : CV-22-00691880-0000

Electronically filed / Déposé par voie électronique : 18-Dec-2023 Toronto Superior Court of Justice / Cour supérieure de justice

5. The Plaintiff, with respect to paragraphs 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25,

26, contest those assertions.

6. In particular, with respect to paragraph 26, this bald assertion is contradicted by

the Defendants' own assertion that anything ("physically") done outside the

university campus, including online harassment, was not within the Universities

jurisdiction, to remedy. The issues of the intentional torts are not a matter of a

labour dispute as it deals with intentional tort and criminal activity against the

Plaintiff, by the Defendants.

7. With respect to paragraph 27 the Plaintiff contests this assertion and further states

that the "evidence" alleged, much of which is the Twitter tweets by the

Defendants, are necessarily plead as statements in furtherance of the conspiracy.

8. The Plaintiff further contests the statements and assertions set out in paragraphs

28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 of the Statement of Defence.

Dated at Toronto this 8th day of March

, 2023.

ROCCO GALATI LAW FIRM

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Rocco Galati, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.

ni

1062 College Street, Lower Level

Toronto, Ontario M6H 1A9

TEL: (416) 530-9684

FAX: (416) 530-8129

Email: rglfpc@gmail.com

Lawyer for the Plaintiff

2

Court File No./N° du dossier du greffe : CV-22-00691880-0000

Court File No.: CV-22-0069-1880-0000

Dr. BYRAM BRIDLE

-and-

Glen PYLE et al

Plaintiffs

Defendants

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO

REPLY

Name: ROCCO GALATI LAW FIRM PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Rocco Galati, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.

LSO No.: 29488Q *Address*: 1062 College Street

Lower Level

Toronto ON M6H 1A9

Telephone No.: 416-530-9684 *Fax No.:* 416-530-8129

Lawyer for the Plaintiff