



British Columbia
Human Rights
Tribunal

1270 – 605 Robson Street
Vancouver BC V6B 5J3

Phone: (604) 775-2000
Toll Free: 1-888-440-8844
TTY: (604) 775-2021
FAX: (604) 775-2020
www.bchrt.bc.ca

FORM 1.1 – INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINT

Use This Form to File Your Own Complaint

Case

Case Number: CS-015403

Date Received: 2025-05-27

Step 1 - Party Information

Who experienced discrimination (Complainant)?

Legal name – First name: Victoria

Legal name – Last name: Mansfield

Preferred name – e.g. traditional name, nickname, alias: Tori

Use my preferred name: When talking to me

Title: Ms.

Pronoun: She

Who will communicate with the Tribunal about this Complaint?

Another person – You must file a Form 1.2 with this complaint.

Name of the person who will communicate with the Tribunal

First name: Scott

Last name: Gilbert

Preferred name – e.g. traditional name, nickname, alias:

Organization name (e.g. law firm, if applicable):

Title: Mr.

Pronoun: He

Complainant's address for delivery

Mailing address: 105 E Hastings St, Vancouver, British Columbia V6A1N5

Phone number: 6045628092

Cell: 2368385658

Fax: N/A

Email: scottgilbertvan@gmail.com

Respondent contact information

I want to name the organization that discriminated against me: Yes

Name of the Respondent: The Owners, Strata Plan EPS3084

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): Strata at the building I was living and working at

Respondent Contact Email: miroslav.babjarcik@fsresidential.com

Mailing Address:

700-200 Granville Ave, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6Z 1S4

Phone: 8556838900

Cell: N/A

Fax: (604) 689-4829

Name of the Respondent: TPM Real Estate Management Ltd.

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): Landlord and employer

Respondent Contact Email: tpminfo@tpmmanagement.ca

Mailing Address:

2750 Rupert St, Vancouver, British Columbia, V5M 3T7

Phone: (604) 736-8775

Cell: N/A

Fax: N/A

Name of the Respondent: FirstService Residential BC Ltd.

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): Strata management company for the building I lived and worked at

Respondent Contact Email: miroslav.babjarcik@fsresidential.com

Mailing Address:

700-200 Granville Ave, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6Z 1S4

Phone: 8556838900

Cell: N/A

Fax: (604) 689-4829

Name of the Respondent: Lawrence Skwarek

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): private investigator hired by my landlord to investigate me

Respondent Contact Email: info@zontaresearchgroup.com

Mailing Address:

2750 Rupert St, Vancouver, British Columbia, V5M3T7

Phone: 778-995-2860

Cell: 778-995-2860

Fax: N/A

Name of the Respondent: Jayun McDowell

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): former strata president, current admin of Sequel 138 Facebook Group, 138easthastings.com website

Respondent Contact Email: jn@138easthastings.com

Mailing Address:

613-138 E Hastings St, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6A0E6

Phone: 604-345-6667

Cell: 604-345-6667

Fax: N/A

Name of the Respondent: Charly Kate

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): former strata president

Respondent Contact Email: charlykate@gmail.com

Mailing Address:

700-200 Granville Ave, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6Z 1S4

Phone: (604) 836-7667

Cell: (604) 836-7667

Fax: N/A

Name of the Respondent: Michael Kouvarellis

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): Former strata council member, neighbour that lived above me

Respondent Contact Email: michael.kouvarellis@gmail.com

Mailing Address:

413-138 E Hastings St , Vancouver, British Columbia, V6A0E6

Phone: N/A

Cell: N/A

Fax: N/A

Steps 2A - Areas of Discrimination & Step 2B -Grounds of Discrimination

Area: Employment

If your complaint is about employment, check if it's about: A job, Lower rate of pay based on sex for similar work

Ground

Physical Disability: Disability - employer believes I am a substance user

Sex: Sex - I am a female who was paid less than a male for the same work

Marital Status: Marital status - my boyfriend was recently fired by the same employer

Area: Services

Ground

Physical Disability: Disability - Respondent believes I am a substance user

Area: Publication

Ground

Marital Status: Marital status - my boyfriend was recently fired by the strata

Area: Tenancy

Ground

Physical Disability: Disability - landlord believes I am a substance user

Marital Status: Marital status - my boyfriend was recently fired by the landlord

Lawful source of income: Lawful source of income - landlord knows I receive disability income assistance

Step 3 - Details of the Discrimination

Details of the Discrimination for each Respondent

Respondent Name: TPM Real Estate Management Ltd.

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: TPM provided employment at/on behalf of TPM, FJL, SJP, NHS -Paid less as a female worker for identical work, compared to a male counterpart. At 3 different jobs under same company. -Treated differently by my boss in an email, relative to previous worker. -I was fired from two jobs on the same day. I had done nothing wrong and was well liked at work.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: -Pay discrimination based on gender (I am a female who is repeatedly paid less than males, for exactly the same work) -My boss said that I would not be able to hold keys to apts, while the person I was taking over for could. Discrimination based on disability, because the employer had recently received a letter from the strata suggesting I was a drug user. -I was fired from two jobs on the same day, as retaliation for my boyfriend filing an RTB claim on my behalf two days earlier.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2024-05-29

Conduct: Former employer (who is also my landlord) pays a male worker significantly more than I had been paid a year earlier, to do exactly the same work. The cost is then billed back to charged back to me when this cost would typically be covered by the landlord.

Date: 2023-03-16

Conduct: I was fired from two jobs on the same day without warning and without cause. This happened the day after my boss learned that my boyfriend had filed an RTB dispute against her. The termination letter claimed a new worker had been found, but for months after that still no new worker showed up at the building. When one finally did, they were paid more and performed less duties.

Date: 2023-03-15

Conduct: My boss tells me to change the calculations on my invoices and bill only \$150 instead of the \$250 that she was paying a male for the exact same work for past 2 years.

Date: 2023-03-10

Conduct: My boss says I have to do more tasks than a male counterpart for the same pay.

Date: 2022-10-25

Conduct: I am asked to be the driver and labourer for a weekly pickup of food from the food bank. A previous job using the same truck with the same male worker paid us both \$25/h each. The new job would pay me \$18/h and him \$30/h and we would both do the same labour and I would be the driver while he sat there. Every friday morning we would do this.

Date: 2022-10-14

Conduct: My boss says in an email that I should not be allowed to hold a master key set to access all units, while the person I was taking over from did hold these. We both lived at the building, I had been there longer.

Respondent Name: TPM Real Estate Management Ltd.

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: Area: tenancy (at FJL Housing Society). Grounds: marital status, disability, lawful source of income -a dispute between the landlord and my boyfriend over a previous work relationship evolved into the landlord targeting me with ongoing threats of eviction, monetary demands, unreasonably intrusive inspections, lack of support and eventually eviction. -discrimination over lawful source of income was for many months used to create sense of imminent eviction, simply for being on disability income assistance and working part time for landlord in the past. She did not send me a T4A and then would say I was not complying with her income verification by not telling her how much she had paid me. I kept asking for the T4A and she still has not sent me the documents she said I needed to send back to her. The initial email she sent me even says none of that was even required and she kept making up more and more hoops for me to jump through.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: Respondent's correspondence regularly cited my boyfriend and his presence in my apartment as being a primary factor. She also often mentions illicit substances, accusing me of being intoxicated, having poor memory/intelligence as a result of substance use, or putting the apartment and building at risk for having smoking paraphernalia and doctor prescribed medications visible inside my apartment.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2024-07-10

Conduct: Landlord hires bailiffs to remove Victoria from her apartment after withholding the last 2 ministry rent payments and simply not depositing them. The ministry confirmed that they had been sent along with all the others for the building that did arrive as expected. They also said reprints could be provided upon request but that the request had to come from the landlord. The landlord was quick to issue an eviction notice for non-payment of rent but was not willing to ask for a reprint of the last 2 checks which mysteriously vanished without any explanation. Other than the obvious: she did not cash them because her goal was not to collect rent, but to remove this woman from the building for allowing her boyfriend to enter her apartment (which was entirely allowed and something the landlord knew she could not enforce, so she went with what she could do and exercised a genuinely "bad faith" eviction). Let's get some justice for Victoria!

Date: 2024-05-29

Conduct: Landlord sent me a bill for \$730 for the replacement of smoke detectors earlier in the month. When I worked for her I had charged her \$70-100 for the same job, and she would sometimes ask me for a better price. She would also typically cover that cost as not charge it back to the tenant as it is listed as a landlord cost in City bylaws, BC Housing operating agreement, and strata bylaws.

Date: 2024-05-26

Conduct: This letter describes the inspection on May 1 where the private investigator the landlord hired illegally blocked several of guests from accessing Victoria's apartment to provide her with comfort and support while this ex-RCMP officer was standing at her door announcing to others in the building that the "criminals in 313" would be going to jail today., We have video of these exchanges and asked the strata to retain their own video of these events, but of course the strata did not reply and the landlord also describes it as criminal activity but by that she means Victoria and friends. The letter goes on to accuse her of endangering the health and safety of the landoord and the building - something not one of the 4 police and 4 firemen who attended would agree with, nor would any of the other 18 residents on the floor, other than possibly the tenant in 316 who shares the landlord's last name, language skills, and ethnicity: Serge Lis

Date: 2024-05-25

Conduct: Landlord sends Victoria a letter complaining about the state of disrepair in her apartment, most of which was caused by her boyfriend removing all sorts of parts and fixtures as the prepared other units for new tenants over the past several years. Victoria had sent the landlord numerous emails informing her of this fact, and she was fine with it at the time, but seems to have forgotten about it by May 2024, and certainly never made any effort to bring the apartment up to normal standards. Instead, in this letter she mistakenly quotes an RTA section that describes the landlord obligation to maintain an apartment, and presents it as proof that it's Victoria's failure and obligation to fix everything right now and pay for it herself.

Date: 2024-02-23

Conduct: Landlord sends Victoria a "mandatory", "material" and "reasonable" "adendment" (sic) to her lease which is to take effect March 1 2024 (within days of when boyfriend is allowed to enter the building again). No amendment to a lease can be made mandatory by one party to it, according to the RTB, and this particular one is telling: it is billed as an insurance clause (which is mostly is) but there is one paragraph inserted randomly that says no FJL are allowed to have any guests who have worked for other owners at Sequel. This is a poor attempt to cover up the real intent here - to ban her boyfriend, who previously worked for all Sequel owners. Paradoxically, Victoria also worked for Sequel owners so this would mean she could not herself be a guest in any unit on that floor. Seriously!

Date: 2023-10-07

Conduct: Landlord sends Victoria a threatening email demanding that she "immediately rectify" a private parking contract negotiation involving Victoria's boyfriend and another tenant with some connection to the landlord's family. The boyfriend had not even entered the building for over six months and neither the landlord nor Victoria had any involvement in this parking agreement whatsoever, yet the landlord stepped in. Since the landlord had stopped talking to Victoria's boyfriend, when she decided to help her family get a better rate in a private parking spot negotiation, she told Victoria that this was entirely her responsibility now because she had let her boyfriend in the building six months ago, and this parking rate amounted to harassment and extortion, and Victoria must correct it for her lease was on the line if she didn't. No joke!

Respondent Name: The Owners, Strata Plan EPS3084

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: Area: Tenancy. Grounds: marital status, disability -After my boyfriend's employment ended, the strata began to apply pressure on my landlord because I had worked for him and he was no longer at the building, or working for them, but he was filing CRT and CRA claims that they advised him were his best options, but they didn't like how those negotiations were going so they started harassing me and my landlord by repeatedly sending unreasonable letters, fines and monetary demands.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: The strata made it clear to my boyfriend that they were not going to communicate directly with him anymore. That would have been fine, except that they still had grievances, and they manifested in a flurry of bizarre letters to me, through my landlord. The landlord took this as a signal from the strata that they wanted her to evict me, and saddled me with a pile of complaints that had nothing to do with me other than the fact that my spouse had been let go by the strata, and landlord. Time and again, these communications came with subtle or explicit references to their disdain for substance use, and the belief that I represented that problem in their eyes.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2021-05-27

Conduct: The strata president told my boyfriend to find a different girlfriend who did not use drugs. It was done orally and not in writing, but the suggestion was made implicitly at first, then when he told her we were no longer seeing each other, she said "next time find a girlfriend that does not use drugs". We knew that his job would be at risk if we were seen entering each other's apartment so we had to pay for a third apartment across the street.

Date: 2022-11-18

Conduct: Strata manager sends bylaw infraction letter addressed to the tenant Victoria Mansfield saying she is in violation of strata bylaws for making unauthorized modifications to common property. Bylaw letters like this are always sent direct to the owner of the unit who then forwards to the tenant, so that alone is an indication of the intent to harass her. The modifications referenced are ethernet cords that her boyfriend had installed in previous years under a different strata, at their direction and he was paid to do it. The strata at the time of this letter had just finished ripping out all the video cameras that these cords were connected to, calling them "illegal" and "unauthorized" despite strata minutes showing the approval of them, and financial records showing they paid \$2500 to have 10 of them installed.

Date: 2024-04-08

Conduct: Strata management company sends Victoria's landlord an email about the FJL portal on the FSR website, and the landlord sends Victoria an email accusing her of trying to access unauthorized information available only to management. Victoria has never been to that website and has no interest in property manager log files or whatever was back there.

Date: 2024-05-08

Conduct: Strata sends Victoria a warning letter that the man living in the unit above her has submitted a complaint saying she was smoking in her unit on Apr 20 2024. This is the only response she received when she had submitted letters to both her landlord and the strata reporting that on the same day - Apr 20 - the man living above her was screaming and pounding on the floor, calling her a bitch and a junkie, and banging on the door of her apartment. She has reported him multiple times, and tenants on every side of him report the same type of experience with him, but instead of the strata or landlord doing anything to protect her, the issue another \$200 fine, making her that much closer to eviction.

Date: 2024-06-17

Conduct: Victoria reports to the strata that the man across the hall in 310 is again filming her apartment door from his window in violation of strata bylaws for having "unauthorized cameras" filming common areas. This is something the strata has falsely accused her boyfriend of on multiple occasions, even with respect to cameras they asked for and paid him to install. However now when Victoria is the one being harassed by this person across the hall who seems to be tracking details like when she comes and goes (and likely the one forwarding this info to the private investigator the landlord hired), the strata replies with the a legal opinion that says if the camera is physically inside the apartment of 310 then the strata cannot do anything, and not even a letter is sent asking for this activity to cease.

Date: 2024-08-15

Conduct: Strata manager sends a bylaw infraction notice threatening a \$200 fine to a strata lot owner who let my boyfriend walk through his convenience store and into the breezeway that is supposed to

be open to the public and not even considered part of the building. This shows the strata takes a big interest in him and goes out of their way to come down hard on anyone who is associated with him. He has no legal restrictions on entering the building and this is an example of the strata manager applying unreasonable pressure on other owners as well.

Respondent Name: Lawrence Skwarek

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: Over a period of just one month in May 2024, a private investigator and former RCMP officer named Lawrence Skwarek that my landlord hired was brought into my apartment multiple times, where he would search through my belongings looking for something he could use to have me criminally charged, evicted, or made to feel unwelcome at my building. He entered my apartment illegally and without notice, assaulted my friend, and then a week later changed the locks and I could not access my own unit for 3 days until he had time to meet me. To get the keys I had to sign a "binding" contract allowing him to hold keys and agreeing not to let my boyfriend have keys, under threat of having the locks changed again. He also threatened me by text message and insulted me and said awful things about my home in the public courtyard of my building where everyone could hear him. He was hired by the landlord to assist her with evicting me, which they succeeded at by lying to the RTB just two months later.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: The private investigator was hired shortly after I told my landlord that my boyfriend was going to move in with me, and I sent her an updated copy of the lease with his name on it. The private investigator refused to speak with my boyfriend, illegally blocked my boyfriend from entering the apartment, then locked me out of my home. He was being paid to commit these illegal and highly unethical acts that caused me much fear and unease. This was done to me because he was paid to give me a hard time over the landlord's dislike of my boyfriend.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2024-05-01

Conduct: yelled in the halls of my building that my apartment was "unsafe", "a fire risk" and "full of stolen stuff" then called me and my friends "criminals" that would be "going to jail today" (which did not materialize). The Respondent blocked my boyfriend and other lawful guests of mine from entering my apartment in violation of my lease, the RTA and the terms of his private investigator license

Date: 2024-05-21

Conduct: Respondent illegally entered my apartment without my consent. A friend of mine entered using my keys and was startled to find this man inside, at which point he assaulted my friend as he hastily left. A police report was filed and when police spoke to landlord she told them she was in the process of evicting me, which is what the Respondent was hired to do.

Date: 2024-05-27

Conduct: Respondent sent me a threatening text message saying I could not let anyone in my apartment and must "sign an agreement that is binding. Otherwise, there will be more unhappiness headed your way." (sic)

Date: 2024-05-28

Conduct: The Respondent changed the locks on the entry door to my apartment without notice and I was locked out for 3 days until I could arrange to meet him and get a new key, As a condition of being allowed back into my own apartment by someone who was not an employee of the landlord or management company, I had to sign a "binding agreement" with him that said he could hold a key to

my unit but my boyfriend could not, and if I ever let my boyfriend use my key then he would change the locks again. Never did this person or the landlord apply to the RTB to obtain an order restricting my boyfriend because they knew it would not be granted because there was no reason other than the landlord was getting pressure from the strata who had fired him and that turned into me getting harassed by a hired former RCMP officer.

Respondent Name: Michael Kouravellis

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: I was threatened multiple times by an angry man that lives in the unit above the one I was evicted from. He regularly had episodes where he would come down and bang on my door, accusing me of things like smoking or being too noisy, then proceed to pound on his floor/my ceiling while yelling things like "you fucking bitch". He would also make reports to the strata accusing me of smoking in my apartment that would result in fines.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: The man above me used to have a good relationship with my boyfriend and even handed him several hundred dollars once on Christmas Day to thank him for his work at the building. After my boyfriend was fired, this man began to harass and threaten me, often making references to my boyfriend, and using words like "junkie".

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2024-03-30

Conduct: There were many such events but this date is one where I have an audio recording of the Respondent banging on the floor above, and screaming at me from his apartment. It made me feel very unsafe in my apartment. I reported this multiple times to both my landlord and the strata manager, and even sent them audio recordings, but my reports of feeling unsafe and being threatened by abusive men are not ones the strata or landlord has ever even replied to.

Date: 2024-06-02

Conduct: While walking down the halls of my building, the Respondent was coming in from the ground level. As he passed me in the stairwell he yelled some nasty things like "piece of shit" to my boyfriend and "junkie bitch" to me.

Respondent Name: FirstService Residential BC Ltd.

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: The strata management company and the strata hired a lawyer to prepare a lawsuit that seeks on the order of \$50,000, to be served on Victoria. This action coincided with the end of her boyfriend's one year probationary ban from entering the building, a full two years after the event the lawsuit is about. The lawsuit contains a number of factual inaccuracies that are necessary for the story the lawyer tells to even be viable. The lawsuit stated that the vehicle involved in damage to the loading bay gate on Feb 20 2022 was owned by Victoria's boyfriend, and that she worked for him, so the lawsuit names her because she owes the strata a duty of care which was not being followed therefore the strata wants to sue her for the full value of the gate replacement plus many additional costs and damages. The reality is that Victoria owned the vehicle that was never registered for commercial use and no work of any kind was happening at that time which is specifically what the strata had insisted on not long before.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: The lawsuit is clearly a response to the fact that Victoria's boyfriend had filed a series of CRT claims where he asked to be paid for the work he did fixing the loading bay gate and restoring it to working condition that passed multiple safety inspections after several companies had declared it not fixable. The strata did settle

one of these claims, paying only the material cost for which receipts existed. This claims in this lawsuit had never been made verbally or in writing at any point in the two years prior, and it was filed one week before Victoria's boyfriend was to be allowed back in the building. There is good reason to be suspicious of the motives behind the claims in this lawsuit considering the gate was paid for by a referendum of the owners who voted by a 3/4 majority to pay out of pocket to replace the gate entirely after the strata made the case over and over that it was necessary.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2024-02-20

Conduct: The strata, with the oversight of the Respondent, files a lawsuit that is unnecessary and would have been costly to prepare. The defendants are both people on social assistance who are unemployed, underhoused, and not only unable to pay what is sought, but unlikely to be capable of mounting an adequate legal defence to it. The fact that the lawsuit is even happening and being paid for by the owners is not well known by the owners whose names it is in, and there is no discussion of the merits of this actions on the otherwise very active Facebook page. Many building residents would have known that the vehicle in question was owned by Victoria and there is no evidence that any work was happening at the time of the incident in question. Despite this, the lawsuit claims that her boyfriend owns the vehicle and because he employs Victoria they are now to be viewed as contractors who should pay the strata for not exercising a duty of care and for intentionally defrauding the strata. The strata manager should have done his research, and at least reached out to the defendants to ask who owned the vehicle, and should have done this a long time before they filed the paperwork. He also should have done his job and followed the Strata Property Act and the strata bylaws which not only say that any event where damage to common property that is caused by a tenant results in a chargeback to the owner of the strata lot the tenant rents from. FSR is negligent for not doing this.

Respondent Name: Jayun McDowell

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: The building Facebook group quickly become a toxic environment following the termination of my boyfriend as building manager. Lots of accusations and questions were being posting every day, and the group admin were censoring the content so that only the posts that were in line with the position of the strata would be allowed to remain. My boyfriend had been removed from the group a few weeks prior so I was actively posting comments in support of him. Because of this I was abruptly removed without notice and unable to view or respond to any comments being made about either of us in this very lively forum.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: My exclusion from the group resulted from the fact that my boyfriend was being terminated from his job at the building and I was making comments in the Facebook Group that were in support of him at a time when the group administrators viewed him as being behind an effort to remove them from the building strata council. I was removed so that bad things being said about him would go unchallenged

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2022-11-01

Conduct: Jayun McDowell has been an admin of the building Facebook Group for several years, including at the time I was abruptly removed from the Group without notice or explanation. Jayun had recently lost her seat on council as the strata president and considered my boyfriend to be the driving force behind that effort. In response, she first removed him, so that he would not be able to respond to the attack on him made by her and others, then the same thing happened to me and I was deleted -

for political purposes, and absent any transparent policy or bylaws approved by the strata. The page appears to represent the view of the building and residents and be offered in good faith by an elected strata, but in reality is a highly censored propaganda vehicle that officially the strata manager and council say they have no control over. Jayun was involved in removing me for saying positive things about my boyfriend at a time when she wanted to disseminate her message that he needed to go.

Date: 2025-05-27

Conduct: The Sequel 138 Residents Facebook Group remains active to this day with Jayun still an admin. The page continues to feature content that contains falsehoods and misinformation about me that is never fact checked by the administrators and consciously distorted by them for political purposes. More than two years later this content remains online and is promoted by Jayun, while I remain unable to respond to any of the accusations or correct falsehood. If I used the account of a friend at the building I can view what remains posted, but if I were to make a post using the account of someone else I know the Group admin are likely to remove that person from the Group as well and there is no way to appeal when this happens and it's not something the strata bylaws talk about at all. I continue to be negatively affected by the actions of this group admin because they still have a campaign of criminal harassment against my boyfriend that bubbles over onto me as well.

Step 4 – Time Limit to Make Complaint

Respondent Name: TPM Real Estate Management Ltd

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2024-05-29

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Respondent Name: The Owners, Strata Plan EPS3084

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2025-01-30

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Respondent Name: FirstService Residential

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2025-01-30

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Respondent Name: Lawrence Skwarek

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2024-05-28

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Respondent Name: Jayun McDowell

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2024-06-01

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Respondent Name: Michael Kouravellis

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2024-05-30

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? No

Respondent Name: Charly Kate

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2021-03-01

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? No

Did all of the conduct happen in the last year for all Respondents: No

Is all the conduct related or similar: Yes

Explain how the conduct is similar or related

The majority of the discrimination stems from the termination of my boyfriend's role as building manager in Aug 2022 and the disputes that come out of that. Those disputes continue to this day. To understand the reasons why he was terminated, you need to look back one year earlier, to the biweekly meetings Scott Gilbert had with strata president Charly Kate where she began implying that people in the building were questioning why he was dating Victoria, a resident of the subsidized housing floor that was known to be a drug user. Because of Charly's comments, Scott and Victoria moved across the street for the next few years. Charly resigned from the strata in late 2021, and Jayun took over as president. When the loading bay gate was damaged, Scott and Jayun disagreed on what to do about it: Jayun wanted to replace it entirely at a cost of \$50-100k, while Scott wanted to repair it for \$5-10k. It would take Jayun over a year to raise the funds for a new gate, so Scott began fixing it with his own money in early 2022. Once it was fixed he asked to be paid for it, and conflict ensued because the strata said they had not approved the work and didn't feel Scott was qualified to fix it, while Scott said it was broken and nobody else wanted to fix it, and now it works. He was terminated in Aug 2022, and the strata got a new gate in 2023. Following Scott's termination, he was banned from the building for 12 months, during which time he filed various claims at CRT to get paid for the repair work he had done, at CRA over his designation as employee vs contractor, and with the labour board. The strata did not like this but was unable to do anything directly to Scott in response, so they began to target his girlfriend Victoria with fines, allegations, Facebook posts she was unable to respond to, and eventually she was fired from her two jobs, removed from the building under a bad faith eviction, and then served a lawsuit from the strata saying she should pay for the new gate.

Explain any gaps in time

There is a gap of about 6 months from the time when Charly began making comments about the relationship between Scott and Victoria, to the point where Scott received his termination letter. The harassment and discrimination against Victoria began shortly after Scott's termination and has continued to the present day. There was somewhat of a gap where tensions were reduced somewhat from Mar 2023 to Mar 2024 while Scott had a probation order that required him not to enter the building, but when that ended the conflict flared up again and Victoria is the one who suffered the

most, with May 2024 having the most events of harassment, followed by her eviction in June. From July 2024 to Feb 2025 not much happened because both Scott and Victoria were both homeless and unemployed, without stable telephone numbers or reliable access to a computer. They lived in a convenience store closet for a while, and are now staying in a pickup truck with they two dogs. In Feb 2025 they were surprised to be served with a lawsuit demanding that they pay the full replacement cost of the loading bay gate. When they read the wording in this lawsuit they were so offended that they decided to file the HRT complaint they had felt was warranted all along, but they didn't want such a complaint to put Victoria's housing at risk. Now that she had been evicted and the strata was still coming at them even after they had lost everything, the HRT complaint began to take form. We submit this now on the last day we possibly can to meet the 1 year deadline on many of the important events from May 2024, and we sincerely hope our honest and heartfelt account of the discrimination Victoria was subjected to is recognized. She would like her housing and her jobs back, but if that doesn't happen, a financial settlement would suffice.

Ask Tribunal to accept late complaints

Why did you file late?

This filing is actually made on time. We were able to file just inside the one year time limit for the final instance of discrimination for all the important respondents. We did feel that Charly Kate should have been included as her comments were significant, but they are too far in the past so were removed. This is definitely a case that has many respondents and each of them has a series of significant events that collectively show a coordinated pattern of statements and actions that involve unfair and poor treatment of Victoria Mansfield, and together they constitute a pattern of discrimination that a whole group of otherwise well intentioned people are responsible for. It began with a disagreement, spread through the strata council in closed door meetings, then through the building via Facebook where Scott and Victoria were blocked, and then to new residents and new council members in the complete absence of both Scott and Victoria from the building. Filing this was not easy considering Victoria has no money, no experience with complaints like this, and is also facing the daunting task of defending against the strata lawsuit. She knows that the respondents will all have lots of resources to pour at fighting this and in doing so will likely make even more hurtful and inappropriate comments about her personal life. The respondents will do this from their stable housing, while having an insurance company pay for the team of experienced lawyers to do all the work. It's daunting to say the least and the cards are stacked against her. But she is comforted by the case law of previous tribunal wins for other people who have experienced similar treatment and she remains committed to seeing this process through and accepting whatever the Tribunal deems appropriate based on the facts. Thank you for considering her complaint and taking the time to read these arguments.

How will accepting your complaint benefit the public?

The public will benefit by learning of a case where a woman who was once homeless and unemployed was able to secure an apartment in a new "social mix" building that promised long term stable housing for low income residents of the downtown Eastside of Vancouver. She made friends in the building, and began a romantic relationship with the building manager - something they were both very happy about. That turned into employment for her at the building she lived at, and later at two other buildings managed by her landlord. Everything was going well for both Scott and Victoria, until the disagreement arose around the loading bay gate repairs, and some in the market rent section of the building questioning the appropriateness of the Building Manager having a relationship with someone from the third floor, known as the low income floor where people often use drugs, don't

have access to laundry facilities and are so often talked about behind closed doors as the ones in the building responsible for the spread of pests in the building, or bikes that go missing. Those are the inevitable tensions that arise in a building with a mix of income levels. This complaint can provide a precedent that would help others who fear making a complaint if it might cost them their job, or their housing. This filing needs to be accepted because it covers both at the same time, which is not typical. There are so many people involved in this case and hearing the specifics will demonstrate how "group think" can set in, allowing the environment of one building to turn. One day everyone is signing praise for the work of two people they see every day, but when a few bad faith actions are taken, and those people are not allowed to speak in the meetings, Facebook discussions or even be allowed at the building, a different narrative can take over - one that is rife with misrepresentations, half truths, and discrimination based on marital status, gender and disabilities. This complaint needs to proceed.

Why would the delay in filing not harm anyone else?

There are many events in this complaint. A number of them did happen over a year ago, but they are all part of a pattern of discrimination and are all continued by the same people right up to the present - by their own initiative. We are aware of no reason why this filing would be harmful in any real way to any of the respondents. It would be harmful to Victoria if it were not heard, and that's why she stayed up late every night for almost a month going over the material and considering the different emails and events, trying her best to make a good case that is accurate, honest, and one that shows where the problems are so that we can all identify what needs to be looked at for remedy. We want this process to be a positive one that finds common ground and results in positive change and recognition of the actions that can cause harm in a community. It's not about punishment, or demanding money, fighting or drama. We want to resolve our differences and the ultimate goal for Victoria is being allowed to return to work and getting stable housing again. Every person wants and needs that, and she deserves to have both those things back because she lost them because of things her boyfriend did and said, so he is helping to write this case and he will be the one to issue apologies if they are due. If we cannot reconcile our differences, then we will trust the tribunal members to determine an appropriate resolution for everyone, and we commit to accepting whatever comes from this process.

Step 5 - Other Proceedings

Do you have another proceeding about the same events? No

Step 6 - Remedies

Select the kinds of remedies you want that are available under s. 37 of the Human Rights Code:

- Order to stop the discrimination
- Declaration that the conduct is discrimination
- Steps or programs to address the discrimination (examples: training, policy)
- Compensation for injury to dignity, feelings, and self-respect

- Compensation for lost wages or other expenses such as moving expenses, photocopying, costs of attending the hearing (keep receipts)
- other

Detail - Something specific (job back, policy...): jobs and housing back, private recognition of the discriminating events

Step 7 - Mediation

Do you want to attend a mediation? Yes