

IN THE COURT OF SHAKESPEARE
(Referred by mutual agreement of Applicant and Respondent)

BETWEEN:

FAMILY OF X, A MINOR

Applicant (Plaintiff)

– and –

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE HIGH SCHOOL

Respondent (Defendant)

FACTUM OF THE APPLICANT

Matter No. 05/2007

Pamela Shapiro
Counsel for the Applicant

Lisa Guimond
Counsel for the Applicant

INDEX

FACTS	1
ISSUES	2
A. Is this case justiciable by the Court of Shakespeare?.....	2
B. Is there a limitation to the jurisdiction and power of the State in the Law of Shakespeare? .	2
C. Is the sacred or the revealed truth of G-d accepted in the public sphere according to the Law of Shakespeare?	2
ARGUMENTS.....	4
A. The issue at bar is justiciable by the Court of Shakespeare	4
B. The state has limited jurisdiction and must give way to sacred authority when appropriate.	5
1. The State has limited jurisdiction according to the Law of Shakespeare.	5
a) The Law of Shakespeare limits state jurisdiction, while still valuing the role of the State.....	8
2. The State cannot exercise authority over the realm of the sacred, according to the Law of Shakespeare.....	9
C. Although the sacred is not subject to the authority of the State, the Law of Shakespeare demands that it remain part of the secular public sphere.....	11
1. Parental and familial influence in Shakespeare prioritizes the sacred over secular well-being.....	11
2. According to the Law of Shakespeare, the sacred, while not subject to the authority of the State, must be represented in the public sphere.	15
ORDERS SOUGHT.....	17
LIST OF AUTHORITIES.....	18

FACTS

1. Sahar X, a sixteen year old student at William Shakespeare High School, and a Montrealer from the age of ten, has recently been twice barred from entering her high school while wearing the Muslim head covering that she has presumably worn since she began attending the school. Sahar wears the full “niqab in public at all times as an expression of her faith and submission to G-d.”¹ This is also in accordance with the wishes of her family.
2. Sahar was barred from entering her high school in response to complaints from some children and a few teachers, by virtue of a recently passed Quebec statute. The statute in question states in part that “in all public schools in Quebec, wearing symbols or dress by which students conspicuously manifest a religious affiliation is prohibited.” The Headmaster of William Shakespeare High School has “quoted with approval the Final Report of the French Presidential Commission” on a similar law in France which states that “ Being willing to adapt the public expression of one’s religious particularities and to set limits to the affirmation of one’s identity allows everyone to meet in the public space.”
3. The Family of X is presenting their claim before the court of Shakespeare in order that it might be recognized that the appropriate framing of this issue is not as one of expression or individual identity, but rather the lack of authority and jurisdiction of a secular state to make laws which pertain to and seek to limit the revealed truth of God in any form. Sahar’s family has appealed to the school, the Board and the Quebec Minister of Education on several occasions, to no avail. Sahar’s family, the Family of X, is presenting the case for Sahar’s right to wear her niqab while participating in the public sphere of the high school on her behalf, as Sahar is still a minor in the Court of Shakespeare as it pertains to this case.

¹ All passages in quotations in this statement of facts are particularly relevant quotations taken from the statement of agreed facts.

ISSUES

A. Is this case justiciable by the Court of Shakespeare?

4. The case at bar is justiciable by the court of Shakespeare as it does not ask the court to evaluate the worthiness or existence of any given religion, but rather to rule on a secular State's power to exercise authority over the sacred.

B. Is there a limitation to the jurisdiction and power of the State in the Law of Shakespeare?

5. Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Law of Shakespeare as embodied in the four plays at issue in the present case clearly delineate limitations to the jurisdiction and power of the State. The recently passed Quebec law prohibiting the manifestation of religious affiliation by symbol or dress in Quebec public schools is counter to the Law of Shakespeare in this regard.

6. Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Quebec law in question is counter to the Law of Shakespeare not because of its limitation on the individual or on freedom of expression (though this may be true) but because the Law of Shakespeare shows us that the revealed truth of G-d is outside the jurisdiction of the secular State. Sahar X wears her niqab in accordance with a specific manifestation of the revealed truth of G-d, and as such her act is distinguished from a self-centered conspicuous manifestation of a religious affiliation and cannot be barred by any valid act of State.

C. Is the sacred or the revealed truth of G-d accepted in the public sphere according to the Law of Shakespeare?

7. According to the Law of Shakespeare, it is not only acceptable but required that the sacred remain present in the public sphere. This can be seen both directly through the lives of

the characters in the plays, and indirectly through the prioritization of the sacred over secular by parental and familial figures.

ARGUMENTS

A. The issue at bar is justiciable by the Court of Shakespeare

8. Prior to addressing arguments which show that the Quebec statute is *ultra vires* State powers according to the Law of Shakespeare, Counsel for the Applicant would like to briefly address the issue of justiciability. In an earlier judgment of this court, Bolongaro J. stated that he “would be inclined to hold that the issue of whether god exists according to the laws of Shakespeare is beyond this court’s jurisdiction.” As the court is undoubtedly aware, this judgement does not engage such a question. The issue before the court is not one of the validity or degree of Sahar X’s religious belief, nor does the issue engage the minority status of said belief. In fact, belief or lack of belief does not figure more than tangentially in this case. The case at bar engages the matter of the extent of State jurisdiction according to the Law of Shakespeare. As such, this issue is justiciable in the same vein as the issues in *Marbury v. Madison* and *Reference re Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act (BC)* were for other courts. The court of Shakespeare has not only the ability but the duty to rule as to the extent of State power under the Law of Shakespeare. A ruling that the statute in question is *ultra vires* the powers of States is necessary and appropriate for the court to decide. And while it is possible that the province of Quebec or other State powers will subsequently decide to litigate upon issues of what valid religious belief is, in the case at bar the issues of minority versus majority status of religions or necessary religious actions are not engaged. We are concerned solely with the delineation between sacred and secular, and the extent to which secular (or State) power cannot infringe upon the realm of the sacred.

Attorney General of Canada v Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors. [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 [*Same-Sex Marriage*].
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).

Reference re Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act (BC), [1985] 2 SCR 486.

B. The state has limited jurisdiction and must give way to sacred authority when appropriate.

9. The province of Quebec is acting outside of its jurisdiction according to the Law of Shakespeare in passing a law which has the effect, as it has been applied in this case, of prohibiting Sahar from obeying the truth of G-d as it has been revealed to her.

1. The State has limited jurisdiction according to the Law of Shakespeare.

10. According to the Law of Shakespeare there are limitations to State jurisdiction. For example, the oracle, in *The Winter's Tale*, represents a territory that is not subject to the State's exercise of power. When Leontes, in *The Winter's Tale*, rejects the oracle's revealed truth the repercussions demonstrate that he has stepped outside the bounds of the appropriate exercise of State power.

11. That Leontes cannot overrule divine revealed truth, as expressed by the oracle, is evidenced by the fact that the word of the oracle is physically manifest as truth—via his son's death—at the same time as Leontes rejects it as falsehood. The revealed truth, as stated by the oracle, overtly contradicts Leontes' judgments. Leontes responds as follows: "There is no truth at all I' th' oracle./ The sessions shall proceed; this is mere falsehood." Immediately upon interfering with the oracle's revealed truth, Leontes is informed that his son has died. His son's death matches the oracle's prediction that "the King shall live without an heir, / if that which is lost be not found." Leontes' attempt to use his state authority to rule in matters of the divine is undercut by the very fact that the word of the oracle is followed-up with evidential action: the death of his son. The action of the play as a whole bears out the truth revealed by the oracle, in that the truth of the oracle's prediction extends beyond the mere death of Leontes' son. Even

though Leontes' recognizes his fault, "Apollo, pardon / My great profaneness 'gainst thine oracle," he must reconcile himself with his limited jurisdiction in the face of divine truth before the play is resolved. The play shows us clearly that Leontes was in error in trying to suppress the revealed truth of God. It is thus shown that, according to the Law of Shakespeare, state authority cannot oppose divine authority.

The Winter's Tale III.ii.137-138,140-141, 133-134, 150-151.

12. The State's limited jurisdiction is further underlined, in the Law of Shakespeare, by the experience of Antigonus, in *The Winter's Tale*. Obeying the State when it is acting outside its jurisdiction is incorrect according to the Law of Shakespeare. Order, as upheld by the State, is destabilized when the State uses its power in matters that are beyond its scope. That Antigonus should be punished for obeying a State order, is, according to the Law of Shakespeare, a reflection of the necessary consequence of a State's failure to act within reasonable boundaries. The punishment, itself acts not only as a sanction against Antigonus but as a sanction against the State; as such it warns of the improper use of power and control by the State.

The Winter's Tale II.iii; III.iii

13. Antigonus' death is not a random act, but is instead the natural order reacting against the state's misuse of power. According to Manderson J., "In *The Winter's Tale*, the legal judgment on Antigonus' awful obedience is tolerably clear." As such, Court of Shakespeare has found that Antigonus' being killed by a bear is seen as a punishment for having acted improperly, even when the order to do so was given by the State. According to the Law of Shakespeare, following state orders can lead to negative consequences when those orders relate to matters outside the state's proper sphere of power. By following Leontes' orders, Antigonus is validating misplaced authority. His death, according to the Law of Shakespeare, is a warning against the misuse of state authority.

Attorney General for Canada: ex parte Heinrich [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1
The Winter's Tale III.iii 55-57, 105

14. According to the Law of Shakespeare, Sahar should not be forced to obey a ruling that infringes on the revealed truth of God since the state is exerting an excess of control in matters it has no power to rule on. Counsel for the Applicant submit that, according to the Law of Shakespeare, the State has limited jurisdiction and, as such, should refrain from judging on matters relating to the revealed truth of God. Just as Isabella, in *Measure for Measure*, resists committing an act that jeopardizes her soul, so too does the Family of X resist the law that jeopardizes Sahar's observance of the revealed truth of God. In *Measure for Measure*, Angelo's indecent proposal threatens Isabella's ability to adhere to the revealed truth of God. That Isabella successfully resists Angelo's command, confirms the fact that, according to the Law of Shakespeare, the state should be limited in its power to rule on matters that relate to the revealed truth of God. Angelo's failure to force Isabella to act against the revealed truth of God, can be read, according to the Law of Shakespeare, as a sign of the state's inability to rule on matters that pertain to the revealed truth of God.

Measure for Measure II.iv.107-109; III.i. 69- 71

15. Counsel for the Applicant would also like to draw attention to the fact that while the corrective measures in *The Winter's Tale* are initiated by a reaction of natural order against State figures, it is not appropriate for these measures to be replicated in the case at bar. As Manderson J. noted in *Attorney General of Canada v Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors.* “[t]he jurisprudence of this court draws on Shakespeare. It does not claim to *be* him.” As such, while the Law of Shakespeare shows us that there are limits to the jurisdiction of the State, and within Shakespearian plays the State's refusal to respect its limitations are met with a reaction from the natural order frequently resulting in death or the threat of death; it does not follow that the

appropriate response to State action which is *ultra vires* its jurisdiction in our world is to wait for political figures' wives and children to die as was the case in *The Winter's Tale*. In the instant case, both parties have agreed to come to this court, and it is from this court – and not natural order - that we seek a judgment on this case.

The Winter's Tale
Same-Sex Marriage supra ¶ 8.

a) The Law of Shakespeare limits state jurisdiction, while still valuing the role of the State.

16. The Law of Shakespeare values the role of the State, even while limiting its jurisdiction. As such, the Family of X is by no means arguing that the province of Quebec is not a valued and necessary institution. Indeed, their desire for Sahar to attend public school is a clear manifestation of their allegiance to State authority and State institutions.

17. In *The Winter's Tale*, Paulina's resistance to Leontes' judgement does not preclude her allegiance to the state. Paulina sides with Hermione and the oracle, and in doing so, recognizes the degree to which Leontes' powers are limited when attempting to control matters that are of a divine nature. Yet even while Paulina challenges Leontes by saying, "[i]t is an heretic that makes the fire, / Not she which burns in 't," she also states, "I'll not call you tyrant." It is the oracle, and not Paulina, that labels Leontes "a jealous tyrant." While Paulina would be justified in naming Leontes a tyrant, she maintains her endorsement of Leontes as head of state even while castigating him for having overstepped his bounds. Paulina's relative restraint can be seen as a continued recognition of Leontes' role as head of State. Paulina values the role of the state even when she is challenging its authority. The challenge functions as a means of clarifying the state's limited powers of authority. It is thus evidenced in the Law of Shakespeare that valuing the role of the state is not precluded by the fact that the state has limited jurisdiction.

The Winter's Tale II.iii.113-114; III.ii.131

2. The State cannot exercise authority over the realm of the sacred, according to the Law of Shakespeare.

18. According to the Law of Shakespeare, the State must not interfere with matters of a sacred nature. Having recognized his fault at the beginning of the play—a fault that results from his stepping beyond appropriate state boundaries to rule in matters of the divine—Leontes admits that his error has made so that Paulina has every right to speak freely. He says: “Go on, go on;/ Though canst not speak too much, I have deserved/ All tongues to talk their bitt’rest.” At the end of the play, however, Leontes, does not simply permit Paulina to speak freely, but rather allows her speech to manifest itself as a physical sign of faith; the latter occurs in the symbolic awakening of the statue of Hermione. Paulina’s faith can be likened to the revealed truth of God, in that the revelation performed at the end, with the statue and the implication of magic, recalls the rightness of the prophecy put forth by the oracle at the very beginning, and necessarily engages the fact that the state need abstain from ruling in matters of a sacred nature.

The Winter’s Tale III.ii 212-214; V.iii 95-97; III.ii 130-134; V.iii 90, 110

19. There are two main issues to be dealt with here, the first being the import of whether Hermione is actually resurrected, and the second being the nature of the “faith” that Leontes must awake. Counsel for the applicants is willing to concede that Hermione may have remained living and absented herself from the public sphere for 16 years. While Antigonus’ dream, the son’s lack of resurrection and other textual inferences suggest that she was truly dead; there are equal textual suggestions that she was in hiding. However, the fact remains that if Leontes had not awoken his faith, Hermione would not have returned to the public sphere and the kingdom would have remained compromised. As such, the only truly important question is the nature of the faith that had to be awoken.

The Winter’s Tale V.iii 95; V.iii 30-31; III.iii 15-45; III.ii 200; V.ii 112-115; V.iii 125-7; III.ii. 133.

20. Leontes' action of awaking his faith is an expression of the need for secular authority to recognize its inability to govern matters of sacred truth. Counsel for the Applicant respectfully submits that Manderson J.'s characterization of faith as an earthly manifestation of trust in another failed to take into account the broader context of Hermione's return. In *Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors.*, the scene in question was being contemplated as it pertained to the institution of marriage. However, Leontes had already accepted that his actions had been wrongful and that Hermione was trustworthy. Manderson J. acknowledges that the ultimate end of this reawakening of faith is the restoring of the State to effective government further in the same judgement. Hermione's resurrection was not enacted in order to reinstate her marriage for its own sake, but as an indication that Leontes had reconciled himself to the divine and as such his kingdom was whole.

The Winter's Tale III.ii. 150-168, V.iii 33-42.
Same-Sex Marriage supra ¶ 8.

21. The Law of Shakespeare states that the state cannot exercise authority in sacred matters. Leontes, though well within his powers to prevent Paulina from bringing the statue to life, allows the action. Indeed, he endorses and deems lawful what he could, the text suggests, validly claim as a heretical act. Accepting Paulina's performance, Leontes proclaims: "If this be magic, let it be an art/ Lawful as eating." The context at the beginning of the play wherein Leontes defies the oracle and is punished, demonstrates the limits to state power. The end of the play provides for the state to recognize that it is limited when it comes to matters concerning the sacred or divine. The Law of Shakespeare shows us that matters of the divine are effectively beyond state control and that this must be recognized if the State is to rule effectively.

The Winter's Tale V.iii 98, 90, 110-111; III.ii 144

22. Leontes allows Paulina to speak and thus manifest her faith, without questioning the consequence of such speech. According to the Law of Shakespeare, that the matter is related to a revealed truth of God, is enough to distance it from the control of the state. Thus, applying the Law of Shakespeare to Sahar's case means acknowledging the fact that the issue at hand is not whether it is "true" sacred truth, but whether it is the state's right to silence it. Leontes' action in *The Winter's Tale* shows us that the Law of Shakespeare situates the sacred outside the jurisdiction of the secular State. As such, the Quebec law is inapplicable to Sahar to the extent that it attempts to suppress observance of the revealed truth of God.

The Winter's Tale III.ii 212-214; V.iii 98

C. Although the sacred is not subject to the authority of the State, the Law of Shakespeare demands that it remain part of the secular public sphere.

23. While the Law of Shakespeare provides that the secular has no jurisdiction over the revealed truth of G-d, it also insists that the sacred remain a part of the secular public sphere.

1. Parental and familial influence in Shakespeare prioritizes the sacred over secular well-being.

24. Having shown that secular State has limited jurisdiction, which excludes the power to rule over the sacred, Counsel for the Applicant submits that the appropriate response in this instance is for Sahar's family to prioritize her sacred well-being. The parental and familial relationships featured in the selection of plays which govern the case at bar prioritize spiritual well-being over well-being in the secular world. The priorities encouraged by the Ghost, as opposed to by Gertrude and Claudius, as well as the reaction of Isabella to Angelo's proposition both illustrate this point. It is worthwhile to note that when Jordan J., in her judgement on this bench, stated that of the various obligations espoused by the Law of Shakespeare, feudal duties are clearest, followed closely by familial duties she notes that both duties are informed or

qualified by obligations to the divine. “Feudal duties may depend on a powerful sense of divine sanctions or simply on a commitment to preserving the state and its order of succession.”

Furthermore, “[d]uties between siblings are similarly qualified, especially in light of divine law (*Measure for Measure*, 3.1.152-153).” While Jordan J.’s statements focus on what informs a feudal duty, and not on what the limitations to a justifiably imposed feudal duty or state action according to the Law of Shakespeare are, her comments are informative in that they highlight the supremacy of divine truth in Shakespeare at least insofar as they relate to duties between siblings. Counsel for the Applicant submit that the interactions in *Hamlet* show that the prioritization of divine law or the revealed truth of G-d also informs parental duties.

Hamlet I.v 25; I.ii 68-73, 100-117

Measure for Measure II.iv 184-185

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1 [*Bard de la Mer*].

25. In *Hamlet*, the Law of Shakespeare demonstrates that it is appropriate for families to prioritize spiritual well-being over secular well-being. Hamlet follows the Ghost’s command to avenge his death, rather than his mother and step-father’s admonitions to focus on the secular world. Although this leads to Hamlet’s alienation from friends and family, and ultimately to his death, it is also the only path of action through which Hamlet can be at peace, and the only means for righting the state of Denmark.

Hamlet

26. The familial characters which encourage Hamlet to prioritize the secular are represented as weak and self-serving. In contrast to the Ghost, Gertrude and Claudius both urge Hamlet to cease his mourning and embrace the secular aspects of his life. As they are portrayed as either actively sinful or at least morally weak characters, the Law of Shakespeare indicates that their actions are not desirable or valued.

Hamlet I.ii 68-73, 100-117

27. Although Claudius frames his advice to Hamlet in the context of excessive mourning being “a fault to heaven,” the motivation for his admonition is not religious but secular well-being. While it cannot be conclusively shown that his advice to cease mourning is motivated by a desire to have the former King forgotten, he does not encourage the pursuit of religious or even intellectual activities, but instead asks that Hamlet remain in Elsinore and contemplate his future on the throne. As such, he is encouraging the emphasis of secular over sacred. Claudius’s weak and devious character is attested to by his confession of having murdered the King, his attachment to worldly goods even as he is purging his soul, and his devious manner in bringing about Hamlet’s death.

Hamlet I.ii 100-117; III.iii 36-67; IV.vii 149-160.

28. Queen Gertrude, for her part, directly requests Hamlet to cease thinking about his deceased father and to “look like a friend on Denmark,” which can be interpreted as the new King. Gertrude, though not as fully vilified as Claudius, is also portrayed at the very least as fickle and inconstant. As such, both of their endorsements of secular over spiritual well-being is evidence that the Law of Shakespeare values the opposite in families.

Hamlet I.ii 68-73, 155-157.

29. In contrast, the Ghost emphasizes spiritual well-being through retribution, ultimately at the expense of secular well-being. Although it arguably remains unclear whether the Ghost in *Hamlet* is a true emissary from G-d, it is amply shown that the Ghost does reveal truth unknowable to living man through any other means. Furthermore, although Hamlet initially doubts the Ghost’s word, he devises a plan to test the information given to him by the Ghost, and the test bears out the Ghost’s word. Most conclusively, although Hamlet does not hear Claudius’s confession, the audience is privy to it and thus knows that what the Ghost says is true. This is consistent with the Law of Shakespeare as expressed by Engle J., when he stated that

“Shakespeare virtually *always* arranges for audiences, who sit in ultimate judgment in his plays, either to hear a confession of a past crime or to witness the arrangement or enactment of present crimes”[emphasis in original]. Counsel for the Applicant also contend that, while not absolutely conclusive, it is persuasive that the character of the Ghost is described as ‘The Ghost of Hamlet’s father’ in the *dramatis personae* of the play, and not as a “Ghostly figure” or other more ambiguous phrasings. As such, Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Ghost, as Hamlet’s father, demonstrates the Law of Shakespeare when he charges Hamlet to revenge his wrongful murder, rather than to prioritize his survival in a corrupt kingdom by obeying the new head of State. The familial prioritization of spiritual over secular well-being is endorsed by the Law of Shakespeare. As such, the Family X is lawfully and appropriately representing Sahar’s interest in this case.

Hamlet I.v 25; III.ii 72-84, 248-259; III.iii 36-67.
A Question of Character: Laird vs The Crown [2005] 4 C. of Sh. 1.
Hamlet dramatis personae; I.v 25.

30. The familial prioritization of sacred over secular well-being in the Law of Shakespeare is further demonstrated by Isabella in *Measure for Measure*. Although the action in question is between siblings, rather than parent and child, the absence of blood-related parental figures in *Measure for Measure* renders this an informative, if not conclusive, example. When faced with the choice between her sacred vow of chastity and saving her brother’s life, Isabella firmly and conclusively prioritizes the sacred. Isabella further clarifies that her choice is not one of selfishly choosing her own well-being over that of her brother when she clarifies:

...were it but my life,
 I'd throw it down for your deliverance
 As frankly as a pin.”

Although in another character, it could be questioned whether this statement was mere rhetoric, Isabella’s frankness and worthiness is underlined by the entire play and thus her words ring true.

For example, even when she is genuinely pleading with Angelo to spare her brother's life, Isabella is honest about the fact that she abhors the sin her brother is condemned for. Although Isabella by no means endorses her brother's death she has no hesitation when forced to choose between earthly death and spiritual sin. As such, the Law of Shakespeare prescribes that it is appropriate for families to prioritize sacred over secular well-being, and not to acquiesce to the demands of the State in such matters. However, this does not mean relinquishing their right to participate in the secular public sphere.

Measure for Measure III.i 153-155; II.iv 184-187; III.i 106-108; II.ii 29-33, 49-50; III.i 78-80.

2. According to the Law of Shakespeare, the sacred, while not subject to the authority of the State, must be represented in the public sphere.

31. *Measure for Measure* shows that the Law of Shakespeare not only values the sacred but insists upon its presence in secular society. Isabella is a representative of strong religious values in *Measure for Measure* and voices her desire to not only join a convent but to live a chaste and strictly religious life. However, at the end of the play the Duke proposes a union to Isabella, suggesting that not only will she not sequester herself in a convent, but that she will be an active participant in secular life. In contrast to the other marriages at the end of *Measure for Measure*, the Duke's proposal to Isabella is not in fulfillment of her desires or as punishment for her actions. Rather, it is of the Duke's own initiative and is in recognition of her worthiness.

Although, as Yachnin J. pointed out, Isabella is as near as rigid a follower of the law as Angelo, the law she follows is sacred law and she is consistent and apparently altruistic in her belief – most unlike Angelo. Thus, the insistence that she incorporate into the public sphere represents not an improvement on her, but rather how her presence as a representative of the sacred is necessary for the public sphere. As such, the Law of Shakespeare requires that the sacred be present and represented in the secular public sphere. It is not consistent with the Law of

Shakespeare to require Sahar to choose between participation in the widely used secular public school system and following the sacred ordinance that she must to wear a niqab. On the contrary, the Law of Shakespeare demands that she attend to both her sacred and secular duties, which requires her to attend public school while wearing the niqab.

Measure for Measure I.iv 1-5; V.i 531-6.

The Bard de la Mer supra ¶ 24.

Measure for Measure II.iv 154-9.

ORDERS SOUGHT

32. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this Honourable Court

GRANT a mandamus order specifying that Sahar X be admitted to William Shakespeare High School while continuing to wear her niqab,

Which is respectfully submitted before this Court.

Pamela Shapiro
Counsel for the Applicant
9 March 2007

Lisa Guimond
Counsel for the Applicant
9 March 2007

LIST OF AUTHORITIES**BINDING JURISPRUDENCE**

Attorney General for Canada: ex parte Heinrich [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1.

Attorney General of Canada v Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors. [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1.

A Question of Character: Laird vs The Crown [2005] 4 C. of Sh. 1.

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1.

SECONDARY JURISPRUDENCE

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).

Reference re Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act (BC), [1985] 2 SCR 486.

CODEX, INSTITUTES, DIGESTS

All's Well That Ends Well

Hamlet

Measure for Measure

The Winter's Tale