



NO. 59306  
VERNON REGISTRY

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**ALYSON TURNBULL, TREVOR KLUG,  
and MARGARET GREBA**

PLAINTIFFS

AND:

**CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY,  
HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA AS REPRESENTED BY THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA  
and ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE,  
AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE FOR THE PROVINCE OF  
BRITISH COLUMBIA**

DEFENDANTS

**NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM**

Name and address of plaintiffs:

**ALYSON TURNBULL  
TREVOR KLUG  
MARGARET GREBA  
c/o Dugas Law  
#15, 3105 31st Street, Vernon, BC V1T5H9**

Name and address of each defendant:

**CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY  
  
HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA  
AS REPRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA  
  
ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE AS  
REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF  
JUSTICE**

4974259300282 R155

200.00

#10

This action has been started by the plaintiff for the relief set out in Part 2 below.

If you intend to respond to this action, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim on the plaintiff.

If you intend to make a counterclaim, you or your lawyer must

- (a) file a response to civil claim in Form 2 and a counterclaim in Form 3 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- (b) serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim and counterclaim on the plaintiff and on any new parties named in the counterclaim.

**JUDGMENT MAY BE PRONOUNCED AGAINST YOU IF YOU FAIL to file the response to civil claim within the time for response to civil claim described below.**

#### TIME FOR RESPONSE TO CIVIL CLAIM

A response to civil claim must be filed and served on the plaintiff,

- (a) if you reside anywhere in Canada, within 21 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (b) if you reside in the United States of America, within 35 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- (c) if you reside elsewhere, within 49 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you, or
- (d) if the time for response to civil claim has been set by order of the court, within that time.

## CLAIM OF THE PLAINTIFFS

### Part 1: STATEMENT OF FACTS

#### A. PARTIES

1. The Plaintiff, **ALYSON TURNBULL**, (hereinafter, "Alyson") is a resident of Edgewood, British Columbia.
2. The Plaintiff, **TREVOR KLUG**, (hereinafter, "Trevor") is a resident of Edgewood, British Columbia.
3. The Plaintiff, **MARGARET GREBA** (hereinafter, "Margaret") is a resident of Edgewood, British Columbia.
4. The Defendant, **CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY and HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA AS REPRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA** (hereinafter, "CFIA") is the federal agency responsible for the enforcement of the regulations pursuant to the *Canada Food Inspection Agency Act*.
5. The Defendant, **ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE** (hereinafter, "RCMP") is the federal agency acting within the Province of British Columbia pursuant to an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Province of British Columbia.
6. The Plaintiffs reside at a property located at 224 Langille Road, Inonoaklin Valley, Edgewood, British Columbia (hereinafter, "the Property").
7. Prior to the involvement with the Defendants, the Property contained numerous large trees of approximately 100 feet in height with an approximate age of 100 to 150 years.
8. The Property is owned and/or occupied by the Plaintiffs as a farm and residential property with a significant portion dedicated to present and future farming activities. An adjacent property is operated as an Ostrich Farm. The Property is not an ostrich farm or farm owned, operated, or occupied by Universal Ostrich Farms.
9. The Defendants obtained a warrant to search on September 3, 2025 (CFIA EIS File 2526WA0038) based upon the affirmation of Heather June Willis which purportedly was served upon the Plaintiffs and referred to "reasonable grounds to believe that the

following offences or violations have been committed” on the property:

- a) Failure to Notify a Veterinary Officer;
  - b) Failure to comply with conditions of notice;
  - c) Failure to Produce Documents;
  - d) Obstruct an Inspector;
  - e) Failure to Comply with conditions of Notice.
10. The RCMP and CFIA arrived at the Property with 3 warrants which were served to Karen Greba, when the Plaintiffs were absent from the Property. These warrants included the Plaintiffs' property creating the illusion without evidence that the Property is an ostrich farm.
  11. The Plaintiffs were not involved in the operation of an ostrich farm nor was there any involvement of the Plaintiffs in the activities forming the basis of the warrant. No documents were served prior to the warrant requiring any actions to be performed by the Plaintiffs prior to the warrant, contrary to the express wording of the warrant.
  12. The Defendants failed and continued to fail to provide any factual basis supporting the warrant including the affirmation of Heather June Willis which allegedly provided a factual basis for the warrant against the Plaintiffs' property.
  13. Shortly after the seizure and trespass on the Property, the Plaintiffs served the RCMP and CFIA with a letter of demand to vacate the Property. The Defendants refused to comply with the demand to vacate the Property. Case Officer “Seven” on behalf of the CFIA responded to the demand and stated that the warrant authorized the Defendants to “enter” the Property without authority to occupy the Property.
  14. The warrant contained no legal, moral, or statutory right to occupy the Property of the Plaintiffs.
  15. During the period of September 22, 2025 to November 2025, the Defendants, employees, contractors, agents, and representatives of the Defendants, have trespassed upon the Property of the Plaintiff on numerous occasions without the consent of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs advised the Defendants, employees, contractors, agents, and representatives of the Defendants, verbally and/or with proper signage on the Property of the illegal trespass and the Defendants, employees, contractors, agents, and representatives of the Defendants, continued to trespass.

16. From September 22 to November 13 the RCMP occupied the Property 24 hours a day without the consent of the Plaintiffs. CFIA employees, contractors and agents had been on the Property along with the RCMP.
17. The Defendants were notified of the trespass on a constant basis and have, in a high handed, capricious, and arbitrary fashion continued to trespass on the Property.
18. The adjacent property has been the subject of litigation between the Defendant CFIA and the Universal Ostrich Farm in the Federal Court and the Supreme Court of Canada.
19. The central issue in the litigation was the enforcement of a cull order and disposition order by the CFIA against Ostrich's located on the Ostrich Farm.
20. On September 24, 2025, the Supreme Court issued an *interim-interim stay* halting "*the enforcement of the Notice to Dispose dated December 31, 2024, and any steps under CFIA's stamping-out policy.*" The Plaintiffs are not party to the court hearing, order, or in any way represented in the CFIA proceedings involving the Ostrich Farm.
21. A warrant to search issued on September 3, 2025 (CFIA EIS File 2526WA0038) was obtained on the sole basis of enforcing that Notice and its related measures. The CFIA, with the assistance of the RCMP, entered the Property of the Plaintiffs without any prior notice to the Plaintiffs.
22. CFIA had no jurisdiction to occupy or continue occupying or controlling the Plaintiffs property at any time. Their ongoing presence and actions - including the construction of hay-bale enclosures ("kill pens") using the Plaintiffs property, importation of equipment through the Plaintiffs property, and exclusion of lawful owners - are without any lawful authority and constitute an ongoing breach of both property rights and the Supreme Court order. The CFIA and RCMP engaged in a pattern of occupying and controlling the Plaintiffs property without legal justification and without lawful authority.
23. The RCMP and CFIA transported contaminated hay across the Property without consent. The Plaintiffs pleaded and requested that the RCMP and CFIA cease spreading contaminated hay on the Property and were met with laughing, taunting and a complete disregard for the Property rights of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs were mocked and ridiculed when attempting to enforce their property rights and cease the contamination of

the Property. The conduct of the RCMP and CFIA constituted abuse and caused mental distress to the Plaintiffs.

24. The access point the Property was damaged by the RCMP and CFIA without any regard for the Plaintiffs property or rights. The RCMP and CFIA encouraged, directed, and permitted heavy trucks and equipment to pass and repass on the Property without any legal or lawful authority. The Property is now marred and damaged by deep ruts and pathways created by the RCMP and CFIA.
25. Since September 22, 2025, CFIA and the RCMP had maintained a 24-hour presence on the Property, accompanied by RCMP vehicles and command posts. During this period, they have:
  - a) Disabled video surveillance systems;
  - b) Restricted the owners' right to enter or monitor their own land;
  - c) Harassment with the use of lights and surveillance on the Plaintiffs land;
  - d) Disregarding the rights of the owners to bring dogs and pets on the Property in complete disregard for the basic right of the owners;
  - e) Refusing to allow the harvest of garlic and/or apples;
  - f) Refusing to allow family or friends to visit the Property;
  - g) Controlling or eliminating access to the Property;
  - h) Erected multiple walls and enclosures using hundreds of hay bales and fencing;
  - i) Facilitated the repeated arrival and removal of dumpsters and unmarked trucks;
  - j) Requested and maintained two separate airspace restrictions (NOTAMs) under Section 5.1 of the *Aeronautics Act*, preventing drone or aerial observation - including by the media and independent monitors.
  - k) RCMP and CFIA maintained 24-hour presence on the Property using it as a storage and transportation area without consent. RCMP and CFIA were on the Property daily traveling back and forth and entirely restricting the owners' use and enjoyment of the Property;
  - l) The RCMP and CFIA engaged in spreading kill pen bales of hay on the Property without the knowledge or consent of the owners.

26. RCMP's mandate is to uphold the law impartially including orders of the Supreme Court.
27. The RCMP's and CFIA's engaged in the continued occupation of private property and entirely disregarded the information confirming the Property of the Plaintiffs was not the ostrich farm.
28. The custody order under the stay order does not grant CFIA possession, exclusion, or control of private land. The Property remains under the lawful title and authority of the Plaintiffs.
29. The occupation of the Property was highhanded and capricious, constituting a trespass with severe harm to the Property.
30. The damage to the residents includes, but not limited to, the following:
  - a) Stress;
  - b) Anxiety;
  - c) Intimidation;
  - d) Unlawful imprisonment;
  - e) Unlawful interference with the occupation of the Property;
  - f) Interference with the use and enjoyment of the Property.
31. The damage to the Property includes, but not limited to,
  - a) Irreparable harm to the Property;
  - b) Damages in trespass;
  - c) Damage to the crop;
  - d) Loss of income;
  - e) Loss of use and enjoyment of the Property; and,
  - f) Devaluation of the Property and permanent impairment for financing, farming, and resale.

## **Part 2: RELIEF SOUGHT**

THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS are as follows:

- (a) A permanent injunction restraining the Defendants, employees, contractors,

- agents, and representatives of the Defendants, from trespassing upon the Property;
- (b) An order that the Defendants remediate the Property;
  - (c) An order that the Defendants forthwith remove all encroachments upon the Property and remediate any damages to the Property including but not limited to replacement of trees, removal of any road construction, and removal of any unauthorized construction and soil.
  - (d) General Damages;
  - (e) Special damages;
  - (f) Punitive and/or Exemplary Damages;
  - (g) Damages for Trespass and Intrusion;
  - (h) Damages for the diminution of value of the land;
  - (i) Damages for the Tort of Harassment'
  - (j) Interest;
  - (k) Costs of the action on a Special Costs or on a solicitor and his own client basis;
  - (l) Alternatively, court-ordered costs; and
  - (m) Such further and other relief as to this Honourable Court may seem just.

### **Part 3: LEGAL BASIS**

1. The Defendants, employees, contractors, agents, and representatives of the Defendants have and continue to enter and/or encroach upon the Property of the Plaintiffs.
2. The entering of the Property and the encroachment constitute a trespass.
3. The Defendants had no legal or statutory right to enter the Property. The warrant used to enter the Property was not based upon any disclosed fact and the ongoing occupation of the Property was without legal right.
4. The Plaintiffs rely upon the case of *Webb v. Attewell* 1993 CanLii 6873 (BC C.A.) which provides that, where there is an oppressive, arbitrary, or unconstitutional trespass by a government official or where the defendant cynically disregards the rights of the plaintiff in the land with the object of making a gain by his unlawful conduct, exemplary damages may be awarded. If the trespass is accompanied by aggravating circumstances which do not allow for an award of exemplary damages, the general damages may be increased.

5. The three elements of intrusion upon seclusion are: (1) that the defendant's conduct must be intentional or reckless; (2) that the defendant must have invaded without lawful justification the plaintiff's private affairs or concerns; and (3) that a reasonable person would regard the invasion as highly offensive, causing distress, humiliation or anguish. In this case the Defendants are liable for intrusion for intentional and/or reckless invasion of the Plaintiffs property without legal justification. It is clear that the invasion was highly offensive and caused serious emotional and physical harm.
6. The Defendants are liable for assault and battery for the intentional infliction of physical and mental harmful and offensive conduct.
7. The Plaintiffs seek damages for trespass, assault and battery and general damages for stress, anxiety, and punitive damages.
8. The Plaintiffs seek damages for diminution of value to the Property and the expenses of remediation.
9. The Plaintiffs seek damages for the tort of harassment;
10. Section 39 of the *Law and Equity Act* provides the Supreme Court with jurisdiction to grant relief by way of an injunction.

Plaintiff's address for service:

Dugas Law  
 #15, 3105 3P<sup>1</sup> Street,  
 Vernon, BC V1T 5H9

E-mail address for service (if any): shanedugas@dugaslaw.ca

Place of trial: Vernon

The address of the registry is:

Vernon Law Courts  
 3001 - 27<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Vernon, BC V1T4W5

Dated: February 10, 2026




---

Signature of  
 plaintiff  lawyer for plaintiff  
**M. Shane Dugas**

Rule 7-1(1) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules states:

(1) Unless all parties of record consent or the court otherwise orders, each party of record to an action must, within 35 days after the end of the pleading period,

- (a) prepare a list of documents in Form 22 that lists
  - (i) all documents that are or have been in the party's possession or control and that could, if available, be used by any party at trial to prove or disprove a material fact, and
  - (ii) all other documents to which the party intends to refer at trial, and
- (b) serve the list on all parties of record.

## APPENDIX

### **Part 1: CONCISE SUMMARY OF NATURE OF CLAIM:**

The claim arises from trespass, negligence, and breach of statutory duty.

### **Part 2: THIS CLAIM ARISES FROM THE FOLLOWING:**

A personal injury arising out of:

- a motor vehicle accident
- medical malpractice
- another cause

A dispute concerning:

- contaminated sites
- construction defects
- real property (real estate)
- personal property
- the provision of goods or services or other general commercial matters
- investments losses
- the lending of money
- an employment relationship
- a will or other issues concerning the probate of an estate
- a matter not listed here

### **Part 3: THIS CLAIM INVOLVES**

none of the above (categories listed)