

## HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

### D. B. v. Canada

Communication No. 15/1977

24 April 1979

### ADMISSIBILITY

*Submitted by: D. B. on 8 August 1977*

*Alleged victim: The author*

*State party: Canada*

*Date of decision on inadmissibility: 24 April 1979 (sixth session)*

### Decision on Admissibility

The communication, comprising the initial letter dated 8 August 1977 and subsequent letters dated 21 March and 25 December 1978, is submitted by D. B., a Canadian citizen who appears also to hold British and French nationality. From the material submitted by the author, it appears that he had, prior to the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights for Canada, accumulated a number of fines, imposed for breaches of parking regulations, which he refused to pay. As a consequence, it appears, the author was repeatedly arrested, from 1975 to 1977, under warrants of arrest issued by the Municipal Court of Montreal, which meted out several sentences of payment of fines or imprisonment in lieu of payment of fines or for contempt of court. It further appears from the material submitted by the author that he has also been sentenced to imprisonment for refusal to pay alimony to his ex-wife.

The author claims that the Municipal Court of Montreal did not have competence to act in his case, that the entire judicial system of Canada is corrupt and that the judges, the members of the legal profession and the municipal authorities of Montreal have consistently flouted his rights under the law, in violation of several articles of the Covenant.

Before considering a communication on the merits, the Committee must ascertain whether it fulfils the basic conditions relating to its admissibility under the Optional Protocol. In this connection, the Committee has endeavoured to elicit from the author clarifications regarding questions of admissibility of the communication and the facts complained of.

A thorough examination by the Committee of all the material submitted by the author, including his last submission, dated 25 December 1978, in response to the Committee's request for clarifications, has not revealed any precise allegations of fact in substantiation of the claim that he is a victim of violations by the State party of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant.

The Human Rights Committee therefore decides:

The communication is inadmissible.