

June 7, 2016

The Panel and The Registrar
Alberta Court of Appeal
2600, 450 1st Street SW
Calgary, AB, T2P 5H1

DELIVERED BY FAX 403.297.5294 (1 page)

CC: Anne Rensonnet VIA EMAIL: anne.ensonnet@gmail.com

RE: Rensonnet vs. Uttl, Appeal No. 1601-0058AC
Ms. Rensonnet's letter to The Registrar's Office dated June 3, 2016

Dear Panel and Dear Sir/Madam:

I have appealed the decisions of Justice Poelman as pronounced on February 18, 2016. The pronouncement triggered the appeal deadlines including the dates when the appeal is to be heard. The family law matters are fast track appeals with speedy deadlines and hearings for a reason. Ms. Rensonnet's letter does not disclose any reasons to set aside the rules and delay the key decisions with respect to our children's best interest.

At Trial, Justice Poelman found Ms. Rensonnet controlling and found that Ms. Rensonnet established the pre-trial status quo unilaterally and preemptively, starting with unnecessary ex parte application, without notice, much less consultation with me, the children's father (and clearly in contravention of the Family Law Act). Among Ms. Rensonnet's numerous unilateral and preemptive actions, Ms. Rensonnet enrolled unilaterally and preemptively the children in Francophone 100% homogenous preschool and later enrolled our older child, unilaterally and preemptively, without any notice or consultation with me, in Francophone 100% homogeneous kindergarden.

One of the issues on the appeal is whether the older child should start Grade 1 at the beginning of September 2016 in Francophone 100% homogenous school even though I, the child's father do not understand nor speak French.

Clearly, it is in the best interest of the children to hear the appeal as scheduled in conformance with the Alberta Rules of Court, and to make the decision where the children will attend Francophone 100% homogeneous school and whether their father's involvement in their education will be marginalized before the older child starts Grade 1 this September.

Moreover, Ms. Rensonnet's letter discloses no reason to ignore the Rules and no reason to postpone the decisions about the best interest of the children until the issue of the bill of costs and the formal judgment roll is settled. Justice Poelman merely informed us that we will have a hearing sometimes in June and did not commit himself to any specific date. Moreover, he did not say whether or not another hearing will be necessary and he did not commit himself to settling the matter by certain time. Accordingly, the formal judgment roll and the bill of costs may be settled many months later, depending on Justice Poelman's schedule. At this point, it is over six months after the trial and neither the bill of costs nor the formal judgment roll have been settled.

Sincerely,

Jan Uttl
januttl@gmail.com