

Sahid v. Ramgopaul

Ontario Judgments

Ontario Court of Justice

Family Court - Toronto, Ontario

R.J. Spence J.

Heard: November 22, 2019.

Oral judgment: November 22, 2019.

Court File No. FO-07-00043127-0002

[2019] O.J. No. 7038

Between Diana Rosa Sahid, Applicant, and Bhojnarine Ramgopaul, Respondent

(88 paras.)

Counsel

J.A. MacKenzie, Counsel for Diana Sahid.

Bhojnarine Ramgopaul, In Person.

C. Chan, Office of the Children's Lawyer.

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

R.J. SPENCE J. (orally)

1 This trial was about a motion to change, specifically two orders; an order of Justice Sherr, dated October 7th, 2011, dealing with parenting issues. And an order dated October 5, 2019, where custody to mother was finalized.

2 In his pleadings, although father may have changed his mind on this point toward the end of the trial, father seeks custody of Alicia, who is 12 years of age as well as specified parenting time with her. Mother seeks to maintain the sole custody order in her favour and is seeking an order for access in the child's discretion. She also seeks variation of the child support order. As well as travel and government document authority both without the father's consent.

3 As I said, custody was finalized by order dated October 5, 2009, granting sole custody to mother. Decision-making as well as a parenting schedule was made final by order dated October 7, 2011. Now that order also addressed the issue of child support requiring father to pay \$270 per month to mother, based on an income to father in the amount of \$30,000 per year. Until 2015 father was having regular access to Alicia. In September of 2015 there was an incident where father slapped Alicia leading to a police investigation, which in turn led to a suspension of access as well as the involvement of the Children's Aid Society.

4 Around April of 2017 the child was expressing the wish not to attend access. She was complaining of verbal

Sahid v. Ramgopaul

abuse by the father, as well as negative comments that he was making about the mother and her family, and negative comments that were being made by the paternal family. In August of 2017 access was modified by cancelling the overnight visits. On October 6, 2017 father brought a contempt motion against the mother that was dismissed by Justice Sherr. In November of 2017 the office of the Children's Lawyer became involved.

5 On March 23rd, 2018, father's access was suspended on a temporary basis on consent. The parents also agreed that father and child would engage an individual counselling to address issues pertaining to access and father's parenting. On July 20th, 2018, the father consented to an order to provide proof of his enrolment and completion in the PAR and parenting programs, and that all contact between the father and the child would be in the child's discretion.

6 Between December 2017 and November of 2019, the clinician appointed by the Office of the Children's Lawyer conducted 28 different interviews, including 11 interviews with the child and 17 interviews with collaterals. The most recent interview with the child was on November the 20th, 2019, just two days ago. At that time the child said she wanted no further contact with the father by way of scheduled visits, that she herself preferred to decide when the time would be right to resume contact.

7 On October the 18th, 2019, the clinician from the Office of the Children's Lawyer wrote a detailed report setting out the history of her involvement, as well as the details surrounding the child interviews. I am going to refer to just a few of the more salient points with respect to the interviews that the clinician conducted with the child. The child consistently told of father's poor behaviours toward her and how her visits with him were causing her to feel ongoing anxiety. The child talked about verbal abuse from the paternal grandmother with whom the father lives, including twice calling the child fat. The child heard the father, "scream and yell a lot" and called and mother a hoarder and a hog. Father has said to the child that he is going to slit the throats of the mother and her grandparents.

8 The child talked about the father's excessive drinking, including seeing him drive after drinking. The child has engaged in repeated and ongoing counselling with the father. The child has become frustrated over the father's lack of meaningful change and his behaviour and attitude toward the child, the mother, and the maternal family.

9 The child has expressed the clinician that she experiences ongoing stress and anxiety due to a number of things, including her parents' divorce and the ongoing conflictual relationship between the parents. She experiences stress and anxiety over her father's actions, words and behaviours. She has expressed a fear of going to her father's house. She's also said to the clinician that everybody else in the house pays more attention to the other child in the home rather than to herself. She has also complained to the clinician that when the father yells at her, the paternal grandparents typically just sit idly by and do nothing.

10 The child made a video that she wanted her father to watch to explain her feelings toward the father and why she feels the way she does. The video and the letter that she wrote to her father, which was in the video, refer to the daughter/father relationship and why the child feels estranged from her father. The clinician's evidence is that the father saw the video but did not acknowledge any wrongdoing. He did not acknowledge the legitimacy of his daughter's fears. He expressed that the child was being influenced by family members because he remembers things differently than the child. However, at the trial the father claimed he didn't really see or hear the video clearly because it was on a small screen. The child had been hoping for an acknowledgement and an apology from the father. She didn't receive that, and she found that distressing. At this point I make the following finding, the father's evidence that he didn't see or hear the video is simply not believable. There would have been multiple opportunities for him to raise this with the Office of the Children's Lawyer or the court to arrange for another viewing. He did not do so. Today at court was the first time he raised this.

11 After the extensive investigation that the OCL clinician completed she came to certain conclusions and I'm going to read directly from a portion of her report.

Throughout the course of the involvement of the OCL in this case, and numerous private interviews over the past 22 months, Alicia has been clear and consistent in articulating her views and preferences

regarding parenting time with her father. She has expressed that she does not wish to have in-person or telephone contact with her father on a regular basis at this time. And her ability to articulate her own reasons for feeling this way indicate that her views have been independently formed. Alicia has had the benefit of therapeutic support from her own therapist Ms. Faiza Bhatti at the Family Enhancement Center and a family therapist Ms. Theresa Milk at the Etobicoke Children's Center. And the collateral information received by the OCL from these two therapists is consistent with the views and preferences expressed by Alicia. While Alicia was initially open to attempting to rebuild her relationship with her father through reunification therapy with Ms. Milk, she has consistently stated since the summer of 2019 that she no longer wishes to engage in further therapy sessions after sharing her feelings with her father by video and not receiving the reaction she had hoped for. As described above, Alicia feels that her father has not fully accepted responsibility for his past behaviours and wishes that he would respect her wishes.

12 I want to point out that the father in his testimony today did say that he was sorry for some of the actions that he engaged in. Specifically, he was sorry that he had slapped Alicia. And he was sorry that he effectively coerced or forced his daughter to write a letter which turned out to be a lie, and which put the mother in a bad light. I can't imagine what the scene was when he came to his daughter and said I want you to write a letter which you know is a lie, and which I know is a lie, but because I want your mother to look bad I want you to write this letter, forcing Alicia to write that. In the court's view that comes very close to, if not outright, emotional abuse.

13 The child is doing well in the mother's care. Mother has always made decisions for the child. The child feels secure with her mother. The parents have a long-standing history conflict. They have had no real contact with one another for at least one year. There is no basis whatsoever to change custody. The child is 12 years old. She is clear and consistent in her views. She is tired, understandably so, of continuing with counselling. She is not prepared to engage directly with her father at the present time. If she is going to have contact with her father at some point in the future she wants to be able to have a say in how this works. The father expressed the concern that if an access order was not made then the child might refuse any contact whatsoever until the age of 18 years. I do not conclude, and I pointed this out to the father during his submissions, I do not conclude from the evidence that this is likely to occur. The mother herself has tried to promote the relationship between Alicia and her father. Specifically, I heard evidence, that was not contradicted, that she found a picture of the father and put it on the child's dresser in her bedroom. The child unprompted send a text message to her father in August of 2019. While I understand the father's fears, in my view, the evidence does not bear out his worst concerns.

14 The child is about to enter her teenage years. She has been caught up in a long-standing dispute with her father for years. There has been conflict between her parents. I am sure that the cause of the conflict is not strictly one-sided. It generally takes two people to create conflict. She is old enough to decide that it is time for this to come to an end. She does not want to be caught up in the conflict any longer. She wants her father to acknowledge to her directly, that he understands her feelings. He has not done so. She is old enough to have a say in whether and under what circumstances any access will occur in the future.

15 The father's request to change the sole final custody order in favour of the mother, dated October 5, 2009, is dismissed and mother will continue to have so, final custody. The order dated October 7th, 2011, is rescinded in its entirety. The mother shall be the sole decision maker for all matters pertaining to the child. The father's access, if any, shall be in the sole discretion of the child as to frequency, duration, and any corresponding conditions. The father may offer cards, letters and gifts to the child, but not directly. It must be through a mutually agreeable third-party. The father may answer any text messages that the child sends him, but under no circumstances shall he initiate any text messages to the child or any other form of contact directly to her. Mother shall be at liberty to travel with a child and to apply for all government and government related documents for the child, all without the consent of the father.

16 I turn next to child support. Justice Sherr's support order dated October 7, 2011, required the father to provide a financial statement six months after the date of that order. The father did not provide the disclosure. The order also required the father to provide the mother with his 2010 income tax return within six months of that order. The father

Sahid v. Ramgopaul

did not provide the mother with his income tax return. On January the 3rd, 2019, Justice Sherr ordered the father to file a sworn financial statement, as well as specified financial disclosure, which the mother had sought in her case conference brief, including; income tax returns and notices of assessment and reassessment for the past three years; copies of financial statements of the company or business under which he operates; bank and credit card statements for the business for the past three years. The father never provided this disclosure. I wish to be clear, the father provided none, none of the order disclosure. As of today, the start of this trial, the father has provided no financial disclosure whatsoever. He was asked why he disobeyed all of these court orders. He responded that he did not have time. This, even though his business tax filings had all been completed, according to the evidence.

17 Father has run his own mechanic shop since about 2010. The evidence before the court is that his business is doing well. Including the father's own statements that he is updating and modernizing his equipment; that he needs more skilled employees, and that his business is growing to the, "next step." There is evidence before the court that mechanics typically earn about \$29 per hour in Toronto. This would translate to about \$60,000 per year. A printout from the father's business webpage states that he also accepts cash. Father acknowledged this at trial. Mother seeks an imputation in the amount of \$75,000. Rule 13 of the Family Law rules mandates full financial disclosure. Courts have consistently stated that the trial judge is entitled to draw an adverse inference against the party who fails to comply with ordered financial disclosure. For example, see the case of *Szitas v. Szitas*.

18 In this case the lack of financial disclosure is particularly egregious, dating back to 2011. Including the father ignoring a number of different court orders. This is not a case where some financial disclosure was provided and some was not provided. This is not a case where most of the financial disclosure was provided. This is not a case where even a little bit of financial disclosure was provided. This is a case where the father absolutely disobeyed repeated court orders and provided zero financial disclosure.

19 In this case having regard to the father's absolute refusal to make financial disclosure, together with the other evidence set out in paragraphs 56 to 64 of the mother's affidavit, sworn November 20th, 2019, I draw an adverse inference against the father and impute income to him in the amount of \$75,000 per year. I find that the request to impute income at \$75,000 per year in the face of father's complete refusal to make any financial disclosure whatsoever is reasonable in the circumstances. Based on an imputation of \$75,000 per year, child support for one child is \$700 per month.

20 The mother also seeks section 7 expenses for dance classes in the amount of \$151 per month. I find those costs to be reasonable and in the best interest of the child. I find the father's proportionate share to be 57 percent, which works out to \$86 per month. Accordingly, the total child support payable by the father to the mother for one child shall be \$786 per month. The support order shall be payable effective October 1st, 2017, which is the first day of the month immediately following the mother's claim. Any submissions from you?

21 MS MACKENZIE: I'd like to make submissions on costs.

22 THE COURT: Go ahead.

23 MS MACKENZIE: So the mother was successful today, wholly successful in her claims and she's seeking costs today in the amount of \$6,878.88.

24 THE COURT: How much?

25 MS MACKENZIE: Six thousand, eight hundred and seventy-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents.

26 THE COURT: Six thousand, eight hundred and seventy-eight dollars?

27 MS MACKENZIE: Yes

28 THE COURT: You can leave out the pennies.

29 MS MACKENZIE: Okay.

30 THE COURT: What's the basis for that?

31 MS MACKENZIE: That's based on the time spent. My estimate for today was actually six hours, I was estimating 10:00 to 4:00. I was actually here at 9:00 so it's about five and a half hours that we've been here. And that's for all the preparations ...

32 THE COURT: Did you make an offer to settle?

33 MS MACKENZIE: I did do an offer to settle, Your Honour.

34 THE COURT: Let me see Your offer to settle.

35 MS MACKENZIE: I can show you the offer to settle and a bill of costs.

36 THE COURT: Did you give this to the father?

37 MS MACKENZIE: I sent the offer to settle to the father.

38 THE COURT: What about what you're showing me now?

39 MS MACKENZIE: The bill of costs? I have another copy that I can provide to him. A moment's indulgence. This is the bill of costs. So that's based on the time spent to prepare. But I'd also ask that Your Honour consider several other factors.

40 THE COURT: Just, just give me a moment, please.

41 MS MACKENZIE: Certainly, your honour.

42 THE COURT: This offer was not served in accordance with sub rule 18.14.

43 MS MACKENZIE: It was served late and that's just because of the short timelines given to prepare for the trial. It was set down on November 14th, and so ...

44 THE COURT: Go ahead.

45 MS MACKENZIE: ... got this offer to settle November 19th. The father didn't serve any offer to settle. He didn't respond, didn't make any counter to offer to settle. And the mother has received orders at trial that are either in her offer to settle or better than what was in her offer to settle. So she's beat her offer to settle. And pursuant to the rules the successful party is entitled to the costs. And I'd also ask your honour to consider the father's lack of preparedness and his behaviour. You know, he didn't file any material. He didn't bring any of the material he was served with to trial. He didn't file the financial disclosure, even though he admitted to having it. And I think that the father has shown a lack of respect to this court, to Your Honour, to my client, to the OCL, in showing up an hour late and then stating at the end of his closing submissions that he has better things to do than to be here. So I'd ask that Your Honour consider all of that. And I'd also like to point out that if the father had provided some financial disclosure throughout this proceeding that perhaps the issue could have been settled. And the mother and her counsel could have spent less time trying to ascertain what the father's income might possibly be on our own. And the issue of child support may have been avoided at trial. Thank you, Your Honour. Oh, just as well, Your Honour, I

Sahid v. Ramgopaul

ask that if possible that the order for costs, any order for costs that Your Honour may make be enforceable as child support through the Family Responsibility Office.

46 THE COURT: What percentage of your time including the trial today in preparation was pertaining to child support and what preparation pertained to custody and access issues?

47 MS MACKENZIE: Fifty percent.

48 THE COURT: Well, then why would the court make an order applying 100 percent to support?

49 MS MACKENZIE: Okay. I understand that.

50 THE COURT: Over to you. She's asking for a costs order in the amount of \$6,878, I'll leave out the pennies, for the reasons that she has articulated.

51 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: Okay. Well, with the child support, I mean, she just came up with a number for \$75,000. Like she can, I've seen her in court last week she said 50,000, and now she's up to 75000. So I don't understand where you're getting this, this number from. And I'm not making \$75,000.

52 THE COURT: She's asking for a costs order of \$6,878.

53 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: If I could afford a lawyer I would have a lawyer here to back me up, but I clearly can't afford that.

54 THE COURT: I don't know what you can afford. That's not really my bailiwick. And the reason I don't know what you can afford is because you have failed to file a single piece of paper. You are the author of your own misfortune. You haven't given me anything. I can tell you that in the 17 years I've been doing this job, this is one of the most egregious cases of non-disclosure made by somebody in a support case. Not a single piece of paper. So when you stand there and you make a bald statement, "I can't afford", and "I don't make", that falls on deaf ears.

55 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: Do you know how much time I have to allocate to come to court and go to OCL and do all this other stuff, and run a business? When am I to find the time to do -- like, I totally understand I have financial statements to bring in, but you have to understand the bulk of the other stuff that this woman and the other organizations are causing on my shoulder, and adds a great deal of stress on my shoulders. I go to work I can barely function for the last three, four, five years with the stress I have to incur not seeing my kid. So I don't know if you've taken that into consideration, the stress factor that I have to take on every day that I go to work, how can I even function I haven't seen my kid for 20 minutes in two years and this is the mother sitting right here and thinks that's perfectly fine. And there's lots of allegations against her that I didn't bring up in court today. I tried to keep nice and short. But there's lots of allegations against her in a contempt motion. Lots of stuff I have of wrongdoings on her behalf.

56 THE COURT: Go ahead.

57 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: There's a lot of wrong doings on this person's behalf and I didn't bring none of it.

58 THE COURT: I can only consider the evidence that's before the court. I can't consider what's hiding in your back pockets. I can't consider what's at home in your desk drawer.

59 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: And ...

60 THE COURT: Sir.

61 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: Sorry. Yeah.

62 THE COURT: I can't consider anything that isn't before the court. I have tried to explain to you on more than one occasion that I make decisions based on two things, the law and the evidence. It's your job to give me the evidence that you want me to rely on. So don't tell me about the things that I don't know anything about. This was a trial.

63 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: And also, I was here in court last week. Do you think that somebody who is unrepresented has enough time to get an affidavit, do his financial statement and compile all of his paperwork?

64 THE COURT: What affidavit? What affidavit?

65 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: Whatever paperwork I need to like get on my paperwork.

66 THE COURT: What affidavit? What affidavit?

67 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: I had to swear some, some paperwork oh, some, I know I had to do the financial statement but a couple other paperwork I had to do to come here. You think me, me being a person that's unrepresented with the lawyer can get all that stuff compiled in one week?

68 THE COURT: Well, I do think that since you were ordered to make disclosure eight years ago, and you failed to make disclosure, that we're not talking about a week we're talking about eight years.

69 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: But the eight years, this is ...

70 THE COURT: We're talking about eight years. And then another disclosure order was made in January of 2019, and then another disclosure order was made after that. So you know, your plea that you didn't have enough time to make disclosure is really disingenuous. It's not a sincere plea because you have ignored the order to make financial disclosure going back to 2011.

71 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: You know what? My business took a brute force of a hit and only now it's starting to pick back up.

72 THE COURT: I don't know anything about your business other than what I've said and my reasons for judgment. You hurt yourself by not making financial disclosure. I am required to obey the law. That's what courts are required to do. I can't make it up as I go along. I can't just look at you and say you're a nice guy, you're not a nice guy, whatever it is, I have to make decisions.

73 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: The Court's supposed to obey the law, on their behalf there's a lot of wrong doings that nothing has been justified, nothing had been held up. Their wrongdoings go under the, under the mat.

74 THE COURT: Anything else you want to tell me?

75 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: No.

76 THE COURT: Okay. Mother seeks costs in the amount of \$6,878. The governing principles for costs are set out in the Family Law Rules. Rule 24 states, "The successful party is presumed to be entitled to costs. There is a presumption that a successful party is entitled to the costs of a motion enforcement case or appeal." This is a case. If the costs which are being requested are to be rebutted by the opposite party there's an obligation on the party seeking to rebut that presumption to provide a basis for rebutting the presumption. That hasn't been done. The mother was entirely the successful party. The mother also served an offer to settle on November the 19th, offers to

settle are governed by Rule 18. Sub rule 18.14 says as follows, "A party who makes an offer is unless the court orders otherwise, entitled to costs to the date the offer was served and full recovery of costs from that date if the following conditions are met ..." And the only condition I'm going to read out is that, "The offer relates to trial or a hearing of a step other than a motion is made at least seven days before the trial or the hearing." The mother's offer to settle was made three days ago, it wasn't made at least seven days ago. So I'm not going to provide the mother with full recovery of costs even though she did better than that offer. However, sub rule 18.16 gives the court discretion over costs, and allows the court to take into account any written offer to settle the date it was made in the terms, even if sub rule .14 does not apply. So the problem with the offer is that it wasn't served seven days in advance, but the court has the discretion to consider any offer. So I'm going to consider this offer. Every single piece of this offer is the piece that the mother either did as well as or exceeded. She had offered to settle the issue of child support on the basis of imputing income to the father in the amount of \$60,000. The court held that father's income should be imputed at \$75,000. Father complains that he didn't have enough time to deal with all of this, if he could have afforded to hire a lawyer he would have done so. I'm going to take into account not only the offer to settle but also the other circumstances that are set out in rule 24. And one of the purposes of a costs order is to discourage unreasonable behaviour by a party. And in my view, the father has demonstrated unreasonable behaviour. How has he demonstrated unreasonable behaviour? First of all, despite the fact that the court made an order that he was to file certain material prior to this trial he didn't file a single piece of paper. He hasn't complied with court orders going back to 2011. Despite his statement on the stand that he has done everything that the court has ordered him to do, he clearly hasn't done everything the court has ordered him to do. Not only that, but he showed up today one hour late for trial, one hour, without any explanation whatsoever to the court or even an apology. Not even an apology. In my view, the father's behaviour shows disrespect for the court process. On the basis of all of those circumstances I'm going to make an order for costs payable by the father to the mother in the amount of \$5750. One half of that is to be attributable to child support and to be enforced by the Family Responsibility as child support. You can do the math, Ms MacKenzie, and figure out what one half of that is. I'm also making an order, Ms MacKenzie, that you are to take out this order forthwith. And I'm dispensing of the father's approval of the draft order. Anything else?

77 MS MACKENZIE: No, Your Honour.

78 THE COURT: So I just have a few words for the father before we finish up for the day. I don't know what's more important to you, the -- how much money you have to pay in support or being a parent to your daughter. And I know what would be more important to me, if I were in your shoes. And I know what would be more important to most parents in your shoes. There's a path here for you to fix the relationship between you and your daughter. There's a pathway. But you have to understand that there are things on your shoulders that you have to do. And the very first thing you have to do is take a huge step back. This is the discussion that I tried to have with you after all of the evidence was in and when you were making your submissions and I asked you what kind of a message you wanted your daughter to receive as a result of this trial. You need to stand way back and give your daughter the time and the space and the energy that she needs to heal from all of this that's going on. She didn't ask to be brought into this world. She had the misfortune of being brought into a life with all kinds of conflict and with a father who has demonstrated, according to the OCL report and according to your own evidence, with a father who has demonstrated an insensitivity towards his child's feelings. Now, there's no doubt in my mind that you love your daughter. If these cases were just about love we wouldn't need courts, almost all parents love their children. And I don't have any doubt that you love your daughter. The problem that you have to wrestle with and come to grips with is that you need to understand how your daughter feels, whether you think she's right, whether you think she's justified is completely irrelevant. It doesn't matter. Those are her feelings. And there will never be a meaningful relationship between you and your daughter until you recognize the genuineness of her feelings and that you understand where those feelings come from. In your heart of hearts you may believe, well, she's not entirely justified in feeling with way about that, or that way about this thing, but you're missing the point when you start to go down that rabbit hole. You're missing the point. It doesn't matter whether your daughter is justified. It only matters that those are her feelings. That's all that matters. Because here's the thing, if you don't give legitimacy to her feelings she's going to have no reason to come to you and say, okay, well, I want to have a great relationship with you. She's going to have no reason because why would she want to have a strong, loving and nurturing relationship with somebody who doesn't respect her enough to recognize how she feels. Now you can sit there like you're doing

now and you can shake your head and you can engage in the body language that you're engaging in, or the better thing for you to do would be to take this away and think about it for a long time. Think about it. I can't tell you how many times I see cases like this and it's up to you, as I said to you before, you're an adult, you make choices, nobody is going to make those choices for you. You can go home, and you can say the judge was full of it, the mother is full of it, the OCL is full of it. I know I'm right and that's the way it's going to be. Or maybe, you can start to absorb and assimilate and pay attention to some of the things you've heard today. I don't have an axe to grind. It's not my daughter. I'll never see her. I have no relationship with you. I never saw you until four hours ago. I have no reason other than what's before me, the evidence that I heard I have no other reason to say what I'm saying. And also based on my considerable experience doing this kind of work. So it's up to you. You can fix this. And you can fix it pretty quickly. Or you can dig your heels in. If I didn't say it in my decision dealing with support issues, I am also making an order that the father is to make financial disclosure to the mother no later than June the 30th, each year, commencing 2020. That financial disclosure is to include income tax return from the previous year, notice of assessment and notice of reassessment. This is an order. Will you comply with it? I have no idea. But if you don't then you're not complying at your own peril. So every single year no later than June the 30th you're to make full financial disclosure to her. Mother is similarly required to make the same financial disclosure to you, but only if she's continuing to seek section 7 expenses. If she no longer seeks section 7 expenses she has no obligation to make financial disclosure. Do you understand what I mean about the order for financial disclosure?

79 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: Yes.

80 THE COURT: So you need it, if you have a kitchen calendar, you need to mark it up, put gold stars on it, the date of June 2020. And every single year you need to put reminders in your electronic calendar, tie strings around your finger or do whatever you need to do. I can't tell you how many times I have seen cases come back to me where that sort of an order has been made and five years go by there's no disclosure and the person who's entitled to support says now I want increased support based on all those years when the income has gone up. She has no obligation to remind you to make the disclosure. She has no obligation to phone you, text you, remind you in any way. The obligation is yours to make that full financial disclosure. You don't have to come back to court ever again. This case goes back to 2007. You don't ever have to come back to court. All of these things and any adjustments that have to be made can be made outside of court. But it's dependent on your actions. Anything else from you, Ms MacKenzie?

81 MS MACKENZIE: No, Your Honour.

82 THE COURT: Anything else from you, sir, that you don't understand or any questions, procedural questions that don't involve my revisiting my decision? Because I'm not going to do that. Is there anything you don't understand about what I said?

83 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: No.

84 THE COURT: Pardon me?

85 BHOJNARINE RAMGOPAUL: No.

86 THE COURT: No? Okay. Anything else from the OCL?

87 MS CHAN: No, Your Honour.

88 THE COURT: All right. Have a good day. Good luck everybody.
... WHEREUPON THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED