

# In Canada you can be required to pay support to a woman you dated, even if you're not married, don't kids and don't live together

September 11, 2020 | 853 upvotes | by [ProjectImmortality](#)

---

I don't know if this was posted before, but this is the stuff of nightmares. A Canadian court ordered a guy to pay +\$50k/**month** for **10 years** to a woman he was dating. They were never married, had no kids together, and never shared a home. Link to the news article:

<https://globalnews.ca/news/7327501/couple-no-home-no-kids-spouses-ontario-court/>

Let's review some facts:

1. They dated for 14 years
2. No kids
3. No shared bank accounts
4. Not living together
5. The poor guy proposed **several times**, she finally accepted, but **refused to legally marry him**
6. The poor chump gave her "thousands of dollars every month, a credit card, paid off her mortgage and showered her with expensive gifts"
7. They travelled together (I'm going to guess on his dime)

When they broke up she asked the court to be recognised legally as his partner and for him to pay support. The first court's decision was for him to pay her +\$50k/**month** INDEFINITELY. Can you imagine? The guy appealed and the sentence was reduced from indefinitely to 10 years...

You can't make this stuff up. Be careful out there.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

AutoModerator[M] [score hidden] 11 September, 2020 04:25 PM stickied comment

### Visit our new off-site forum: Forums.red

**Browse our tribes and forums, or create your own today on <https://www.trp.red> free!**

*I am a bot, and this action was performed automatically. Please contact the moderators of this subreddit if you have any questions or concerns.*

mrcs84usn • 378 points • 11 September, 2020 05:01 PM

Honestly, I don't think any RPer would ever fall for this crap. When reading the article, this dude did a lot of "she-is-basically-my-wife" behavior.

7.5 carat diamond ring

quit her job and 'regularly' (whatever that means) slept over

Referred to her with his last name

Gave her thousands every month, paid off her mortgage, gave her a credit card.

This dude was a FULLY invested pussy beggar. I don't particularly agree with the courts, but I do see where they were coming from.

Brokenbyher2019 • 226 points • 11 September, 2020 05:15 PM\*

He did make a lot of mistakes, however, the legal precedent issue here is the Ontario courts "expanded" the interpretation of what it mean to "live together." Now means.

If you gift

If you vacation

If you pay for xyz

If you sleep over at each others seperate houses

Now:

In Ontario at least. Gifting a gf, vacationing with gf, paying for xyz for gf, and sleeping over at said gf house means you are now in cohabitation and therefore she is entitled to your support.

That precedence is dangerous. Anyone with any idea of law, US or otherwise can see the disaster coming

Edit: this change is real people, its no longer hypothetical. The laws are on the books therefore expect to see other divorce attorneys referencing this case to support their clients decree.

[deleted] • 50 points • 12 September, 2020 01:38 AM

So, let me get this straight: if you provide a person with a free stuff for a period of time, that entitles them to free stuff in perpetuity? Was he preventing her from working? Was she unable to work? Does she not have independent means? It makes no sense at all. She basically had an opportunity to save massive amounts of her own money by having someone else cover her expenses. If anything, one could argue that she should pay HIM, because he wasted a fair amount of time and money on her, which he could have redirected elsewhere, and no children came from the pairing.

Edit: I see that she quit her job. But why? Did he force her to? She could have kept working the whole

time. Yet, she did not want to actually marry him, even though he was rich. Very strange.

Brokenbyher2019 • 20 points • 12 September, 2020 02:27 AM

Obviously I know your question was rhetorical but there has been a systematic concentrated effort to suppress mens rights for decades this is bad but not surprising

Drowssap145145 • 10 points • 12 September, 2020 01:40 PM

Because these courts assume every relationship still work like in the 1800's, when women were unable to sustain themselves and practically forced to marry.

inertargongas • 5 points • 12 September, 2020 01:11 PM

Your questions suppose female accountability, where none exists. Her decisions are irrelevant.

\_Icarus\_Reborn\_ • 100 points • 11 September, 2020 06:00 PM

This is the rub here.

Precedent has been set and can now be used.

If I was that fella, I'd be looking to skip to a South American or Asian country that doesn't have any legal covens with Canada. Sounds like he can afford a pretty nice life out there.

smurfnyad • 50 points • 11 September, 2020 06:37 PM

Preferably someplace with no extradition treaty and also renounce his Canadian citizenship. I don't think she deserves a dime much less 6 million dollars over 10 years. How much should Stedman get if he and Oprah breakup? It should be nothing and it would be nothing.

livefreeofdie • 33 points • 11 September, 2020 08:58 PM

How rich this simp was?

Giving \$50k every month where she can bang others.

Omg.

[deleted] 12 September, 2020 12:27 AM\*

[removed]

livefreeofdie • 33 points • 12 September, 2020 03:39 AM

When you get money for free(inheritance or lottery) you have literally no value of it.

TheBlockedUser • 15 points • 12 September, 2020 08:47 AM

Exactly. And combine that with the beta simp mentality, and you birth the hero to this story.

evoblade • 4 points • 12 September, 2020 04:27 PM

He should spend that money appealing the case

UEMcGill • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 02:06 PM

There's a minor upside. NJ has permanent alimony and there's story after story where a woman will do exactly what the woman in Canada did. She won't cohabitate but she'll let him do all the things a partner

did. There was a story I think where the dude was going to jail for contempt and meanwhile wifey had a secret live in but they maintained that he had a separate residence.

I could see where you could use it to you advantage in that case.

mrrooftops • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 10:05 PM

Let's see if sugardaddy.com and seekingarrangements.com are going to blow up in Canada because of this

xPURE\_AcIDx • 3 points • 11 September, 2020 06:04 PM

You made a lot of that up. The law about common law is here.

<https://www.separation.ca/family-law/common-law/>

Clearly this was a very special case. The lawyers must have successfully convinced the judge that the couple was married. You don't need to be "legally" married (as in via a registry) to be considered "legally" married. Going through a registry is just the official way of declaring marriage. If they acted like a married couple, and there was a verbal contract (the proposal)... Then a family court would consider you married.

(now im not defending the law regarding divorce... But you can take away how bad of an idea marriage is for a wealthy individual).

Brokenbyher2019 • 37 points • 11 September, 2020 06:40 PM

Clearly you lack the understanding of law and how court precedent works. The plaintiff (the female and her attorneys) clearly, yes, made an argument that the judge - then appeal court- upheld (mostly). But, their argument had to get to a judge which means that there was no clear precedence to fall back on. 95% of family law cases in the US ( i know this case is not US) dont go to trial. They are ruled by precedence. The rest of those cases only a small fraction ever create new precedence. Yes, this is a special case. But you fail to understand that the judge had to interpret (the articles words not mine) what it meant to be considered married in the eyes of justice under Ca Ontario law.

If they acted like a married couple, and there was a verbal contract (the proposal)... Then a family court would consider you married.

This statement alone from you clearly shows you lack the legalese and understanding of law, well, beyond a layman's understanding that is.

"Acting" is too vague a reason even for courts. They need clear and concise variables. See mine above, the new ones created as an example. Common law marriage, even in CA does not require a "proposal" to define marriage or common law marriage. So again, linking to a website and spouting off does not an attorney make you.

Also your name checks out.

inertargongas • 5 points • 12 September, 2020 01:14 PM

"Stare decisis" is the legal precept that allows court cases to be decided based on precedent. Any poor court decision can be repeated for the rest of time by pointing to it as precedent. Fucked up way to operate.

xPURE\_AcIDx • -18 points • 11 September, 2020 06:45 PM

Yet you didn't link to any sources...

Brokenbyher2019 • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 06:50 PM

I dont need to, im correct.

Ibannedbypowerabuse • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 09:30 AM

Class alpha vs beta, your home boy pure acid ain't got no plates.

aamour1 • 9 points • 11 September, 2020 06:43 PM

But it now set the precedent and will be used as reference for future cases making it the new baseline

disgruntledearthling • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 10:51 PM

I wonder if the judge was female

yomo86 • 2 points • 16 September, 2020 02:09 PM

The problem is the convincing in and of itself. Simping or not this girl openly refused getting hitched, it's in the docket, yet, plays the victim and wants alimony. Common law marriage was to be a fall back option for those who cannot get married in time (disease etc.) but she openly defies that notion.

[deleted] • 10 points • 12 September, 2020 01:41 AM

"FULLY invested pussy beggar." ROFLMAO!

MattyAnon • 20 points • 12 September, 2020 12:47 AM

Referred to her with his last name

That's just stupid. I wonder if it's true or she made it up.

Gave her thousands every month, paid off her mortgage, gave her a credit card.

This is extremely stupid of him. Under dumb fucking Western rules: the more you support a woman the more you owe her. I've never seen a good justification for this.

Nergaal • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 12:22 AM

but I do see where they were coming from.

this is a precedent. first they came for the useful idiots.

18cmOfGreatness • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 06:17 PM

No, I can't see where they are coming from. Until this post I didn't even know that you need to pay for a WOMAN and not for kids in the western countries. It is a joke? Why the hell someone should owe their financial support to a healthy adult? It is literally treating women as children on a legal level, lol. He gifted her his money because he wanted, she should be grateful and not obliged for anything more than he gives her. Imagine a situation where you donated to charity once, but courts decided that you now obliged to pay this charity organisation monthly for the rest of your life.

arakouzo • 3 points • 13 September, 2020 07:12 PM

This dude was a FULLY invested pussy beggar. I don't particularly agree with the courts, but I do see where they were coming from.

This is literally the legal standard. Marriage, as far as the court was concerned, is a financial arrangement.

She quit her job and he supported her. Paid her mortgage. Sent her money every month.

As far as the court is concerned, that is acting like husband and wife. That is 99.9% of being married. It doesn't matter who slept where or how often, who had what address, or even the fact that she explicitly refused to legally marry him multiple times. If you are financially supporting her, that is acting married, and you are legally married.

-Radical\_Edward • 3 points • 15 September, 2020 04:49 PM

The thing is, she refused to marry him, she said no. This is literally schrodinger marriage.

Dimenzije90 • 2 points • 16 September, 2020 02:20 PM

but I do see where they were coming from.

Well im completely blind, 50k a month for 10 years..... For what exactly? Even if they were married. Its just fucking ridiculous.

ChukKnucks4PuckLuck • 2 points • 16 September, 2020 11:20 PM

I started to write something similar, but you nailed it. Don't act like a pathetic beta and youll never have to worry about this.

StarchRunner • 2 points • 17 September, 2020 05:58 PM

I don't particularly agree with the courts, but I do see where they were coming from.

If that dude tracked down the judge and used him as the missing link in a tractor pull, hypothetically, I wouldn't necessarily agree with it but I would see where he's coming from.

pebblefromwell • 100 points • 11 September, 2020 04:50 PM

Liquidation of assets move to a country that has no extradition to Canada. All could be done in a year.

[deleted] 12 September, 2020 03:08 AM

[deleted]

inertargongas • 29 points • 12 September, 2020 01:15 PM

I'm not a fan of cryptocurrency, but if ever there were a use case, this is it.

thoughtlow • 27 points • 12 September, 2020 03:52 PM

As someone who has worked in the legal sector for 6 years I see what divorce does to men. In the UK the courts are biased and more lenient on women.

My friend's partner cheated on him for 3 years and then tried to take all of his assets. He was aware of it over the final year and was slowly moving his assets into cryptos. In the court he's just declared that this money has been lost (says it was gambling for him).

There is no way to prove if he is lying or not. I am happy that he got away with it because she took everything from him, including his private pension.

Manuel\_S • 3 points • 13 September, 2020 08:40 AM

As someone in the field: is it so that the laws in anglo-saxon countries specifically benefit women - or are set up so that they only benefit women - or is it the policy of the courts.

In my country, when you marry you can choose: - separate assets - joined assets - joined acquired property

You cross the option, and that's it.

[deleted] 13 September, 2020 08:42 AM

[deleted]

Manuel\_S • 3 points • 13 September, 2020 08:49 AM

That also exists here, but has less rights than a marriage. Its more for on the case of death, the common-law spouse can inherit as well.

The ridiculous antics that we hear about from US/UK countries are just... outrageous.

CHAD\_J\_THUNDERCOCK • 2 points • 17 September, 2020 05:13 PM

Unethical life pro tip: Its even better if he puts it into a privacycoin (monero is the most popular) - with bitcoin you can see where the money is at any time. Bitcoin is actually super traceable. Many pedophile rings are getting taken down on the darkweb because of this (which is a good thing).

Another thing you can do is take huge gambles on your network. Take all your money and bet it on red at a roulette table. Video it. If you lose keep the video as proof you lost it. If you win destroy the video, and put half the winnings into a crypto like Monero.

TigerXtrm • 68 points • 11 September, 2020 05:00 PM

At that point I would just leave the country and go into hiding somewhere. Fuck that bitch.

That said, the guy showered her in money and gifts and was then surprised she was a golddigger.

Surprise!

sehns • 13 points • 12 September, 2020 06:40 AM

His business interests are probably based in Canada, so its never that simple. Whats fully insane here is the female judge in the original case before he appealed ruled \$52k a month was to be paid **forever** not just 10 years

inertargongas • 10 points • 12 September, 2020 01:17 PM

Let's not lose sight of the fact that 52k a month for any amount of time is ludicrous. Even one month of that is too many months. When someone stops bringing value into my life, why should I be forced to add value to theirs?

FunStayReee • 1 point • 8 October, 2020 04:27 AM

so assuming shes ~20 now, and she lives to a hundred, the guy would need to budget 50M for his imaginary wife support fund

what the actual fuck

poppypopsicles • 1 point • 2 October, 2020 07:08 AM

Leave the country? Why?

Surely a hitman can off a random woman for \$1,000,000?

TigerXtrm • 1 point • 2 October, 2020 07:38 AM

At one million it's still cheaper to leave the country.

poppypopsicles • 1 point • 2 October, 2020 07:42 AM

How so?... It's wildly difficult and expensive to leave a country and renounce citizenship, and acquire citizenship in a foreign country. And if your business is in your home country, you're likely going to get the money sucked out of it by the government anyway. So you are going to shut everything down?

Also, I would assume \$1,000,000 is vastly too high. I'm sure it's more like \$100,000. Hell, does Canada have gangs? Random gang bangers would drive by and blow her away \$10,000.

Not to mention...wouldn't you find some joy in having someone who financially tried to rape you this hard murdered?

FunStayReee • 1 point • 8 October, 2020 04:30 AM

It's wildly difficult and expensive to leave a country and renounce citizenship, and acquire citizenship in a foreign country.

not if you have money

finding a safe, livable country that won't have a Alimony agreement with Canada though, that will be tricky

CaspatheGhosty • 1 point • 11 October, 2020 05:35 AM

Sadly dude seems too square to have her offed he'll probably gladly pay her fee to "get her back"

[deleted] 11 September, 2020 04:37 PM

[deleted]

inertargongas • 7 points • 12 September, 2020 01:20 PM

Anyone with that kind of money should've been squirreling it away someplace less cucked than fucking Canada of all places, just as a preemptive measure.. know your enemy, and take decisive action *before* he decides to strike.

Domebeers • 18 points • 11 September, 2020 06:04 PM

" However, he insisted she sign a marriage contract and came up with several drafts. She refused. "

Don't be dumb (not you OP, I mean guys in general). I tell this to my clients all the time. Especially if they have some money. If the bitch doesn't sign it, find another bitch.

The courts in Canada hate men, and wealthy men especially. This isn't new. I'm not saying it's right or fair, but it is reality. Being red pill'd means seeing and accepting reality. The ruling is insane, but guys need to know the judges are insane and don't care.

Prenups, co-habitation agreements, are a must.

ChrimsonChin988 • 4 points • 12 September, 2020 03:14 PM

Wait, I thought the reason she refused to sign was because she didn't want to officially marry his beta ass.

But you are saying this was a 200IQ move on her part? Idk man, I'm just thinking she got real fucking lucky that 1) she didn't sign a prenup and 2) they somehow still were declared spouse although they weren't.



My reasoning is even if it was a 'shitty' prenup in her eyes, no deal would still be worse for her than a shitty deal. But who knows maybe she was consulting a lawyer all along because she knew she wanted to leave him and the lawyer told her there was a substantial chance they could convince the court.

[deleted] 11 September, 2020 04:37 PM\*

[deleted]

ToraChan23 • 59 points • 11 September, 2020 06:25 PM

Even give her a job at your work even for a high salary

This is a *horrible* idea.

smurfnyad • 32 points • 11 September, 2020 07:10 PM

Someone should post this over at femaledatingstrategy so that they can collectively cream their pants as they read this. It would be the best orgasm a man has ever given them.

ToraChan23 • 39 points • 11 September, 2020 07:15 PM

I love that subreddit.

They are doing exactly what they are supposed to do according to their nature, and putting it out clear to see so men can be prepared to handle women like that.

waslookoutforchris • 6 points • 12 September, 2020 02:30 PM

Fds is as eye opening as RP. In their “woke” rage they’re clearly proving as true everything they disagree with. Like a child’s tantrum...

paul\_a\_8002 • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 06:37 PM

Most women think like that that unfortunately.

lefty929 • 88 points • 11 September, 2020 04:47 PM

What if you go away for a 7-day vacation with your plate? Does that constitute living together now? What about 3-days?

You have bitches over to fuck them, does that mean they technically lived with you for a bit?

What if your plate secretly quits her job while she's with you? Suddenly you are secretly her provider?

C'mon. It's retarded and illogical to *solely* blame the guy for this. Is he partly responsible? Of course. Is he the root cause of what's fucked up about this? Obviously not.

The primary fuck up here is a biased, outdated court system that still caters to women.

Balderdash79 • 16 points • 11 September, 2020 08:42 PM

You have bitches over to fuck them, does that mean they technically lived with you for a bit?

In the state of Florida, if someone lives in your house for 4 days or if they receive mail at your house, they are considered a tenant and can only be involuntarily removed through eviction proceedings.

Source: A friend (Hi Janet) who was helping out a single mother and kid by providing short-term lodging. The woman turned out to be a lazy drama bitch and it took almost 3 months of single-mother-sob-story legal wrangling to get the slag evicted.

ToraChan23 • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 06:29 PM

What if you go away for a 7-day vacation with your plate? Does that constitute living together now?  
What about 3-days?

I would wager no, because wherever you would be staying on the vacation isn't YOUR place; it's most likely a hotel.

Even if you go on vacation to your private vacation home, I think there needs to be an establishment of some form of permanent domicile, like her receiving mail there, for it to count. Check your country's laws on that one.

What if your plate secretly quits her job while she's with you? Suddenly you are secretly her provider?

Unless you stupidly pay a bill, loan her money, or pay her a certain amount every month, she is just an unemployed woman.

C'mon. It's retarded and illogical to *solely* blame the guy for this. Is he partly responsible? Of course. Is he the root cause of what's fucked up about this? Obviously not.

No, this is 100% the guy's fault.

If I get bit by a rattlesnake, I can't blame the rattlesnake for doing what rattlesnakes do. I was the dumbass who went to where a rattlesnake lived, fucked with it, allowed it to get close enough to strike, and let it bite me.

He did way too many fucked up things for there to be anyone other than himself to blame.

Dspsblyuth • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 11:24 PM

Even if she has a job don't spend too much on her

MattyAnon • 14 points • 12 September, 2020 12:45 AM

"Lack of a shared residence is not determinative of the issue of cohabitation"

Holy fucking shit. What crazy doublespeak is this where cohabitation is defined to exist without sharing a residence.

reddie76 • 2 points • 28 September, 2020 09:49 PM

Abandon all hope, yee who enter.

ScarletWhiteEmerald • 29 points • 11 September, 2020 05:05 PM

That is just messed up to read. I wonder if it's possible for him to claim tax refunds on his previous years of personal income since the woman wasn't working and the courts consider them to be spouses over the past 14 years.

aamour1 • 14 points • 11 September, 2020 06:45 PM

Might as well post claim her as a dependent at that point

Overkillengine • 14 points • 11 September, 2020 09:14 PM

Which would actually be a good move to fuck with her. I doubt she'd want to owe all sorts of back taxes

that would be assessed.

KingCrow27 • 11 points • 11 September, 2020 07:31 PM

Systems like this is how you destroy society's morals and family units. Way to go Canada.

blacwidonsfw • 26 points • 11 September, 2020 04:52 PM

I am so scared of this. I have been dating my gf 5 yrs+ and I just bought a house (on my own not with her). Any advice to keep it that way

Shieldless\_One • 23 points • 11 September, 2020 06:31 PM

Don't get married and don't give her thousands of dollars of month just because she has a pussy like the guy in the OP did.

mgtowthroww • 23 points • 11 September, 2020 08:03 PM

Install cameras in your house and keep all texts. My ex-wife after ten years claimed I raped her. When they make an allegation like that, they keep the house (called exclusive possession) while you have to pay for it and find another place to rent.

[deleted] 12 September, 2020 12:08 AM

[deleted]

mgtowthroww • 6 points • 12 September, 2020 01:03 AM

Just be careful in speaking with cops going forward. Always say "My lawyer told me not to speak with you".

Brokenbyher2019 • 16 points • 11 September, 2020 07:04 PM

If you honestly want to know, call talk to and pay for an attorney's time in your area/state... that's the only way

Aerophage1771 • 12 points • 11 September, 2020 08:29 PM

Don't let her live there for extended periods (longer than 5 days), don't call her your last name, don't propose, don't buy her a ring. Guy in the article is a special kind of dumbass.

The\_Sinnermen • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 01:08 PM

If she lived 3 years with you you're fucked

hwhitefarmer • 3 points • 15 September, 2020 03:17 PM

Scared of a woman? She should know if she tried such a thing you would burn the world to the ground you gave in to her bullshit

blacwidonsfw • 1 point • 15 September, 2020 04:34 PM

I like my world now how it is

HeadMembership • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 02:40 AM

Dump her or marry her. Two options.

arakouzo • 27 points • 11 September, 2020 05:50 PM

It's a pretty messed up interpretation. The common law rules in Canada are supposed to be: 1) Cohabitation; 2) Sex; 3) At least 3 continuous years.

The court just sort of threw out #1 and half of #3 and said "Cohabitation doesn't mean cohabitation. And continuous doesn't mean continuous. Really, the law just means sometimes living together for short stretches of time and acting like a married couple when you do it... oh yeah, and the woman's explicit refusal to marry the man despite numerous requests by him to do so has no effect on our ruling. They were definitely common law married. In fact, the fact that he wanted to marry her makes us more likely to rule that they were married."

The real reasoning behind the ruling was that she quit her job and let him support her. Once a woman is financially dependent on a man, that is "acting married", no matter who's fucking who, who lives where, or how often they fuck or stay over. Because nobody's hiding it any more. Marriage is a financial arrangement. If you act financially married, that is 99% of marriage. Nobody gives a shit who fucks who or who lives where.

disgruntledearthling • 14 points • 11 September, 2020 10:54 PM

Quebec, of course, is different. I lived there with the mother of my 2 kids and didn't have to pay her a dime when I lived. We divided assets and that was that. Quebec law is very clear on that.

FunStayReee • 2 points • 8 October, 2020 04:33 AM

its the only part of QC law that *does* make sense from what I hear

TheGweatandTewwible • 46 points • 11 September, 2020 04:33 PM

Nah, that's 100% on him. Canada is a lost hope but come on. What a miserable 14 years that must've been

SaneSiamese • 48 points • 11 September, 2020 06:12 PM

began a romantic relationship after meeting in October 2001. At the time, she was 38 and separated with two children, court records show. He was 46 and divorced with three children.

If I was rich enough to spend \$600k/year on pussy, I'd do a lot better than a 38 year old single mom.

Windforce • 10 points • 12 September, 2020 01:29 PM

Jesus fucking christ, imagine having a 100 million dollars and putting a 38 year old woman with 2 kids on a pedestal. The guy wins the simp of the year award for sure.

It would be model tier girls 18~25 only with no kids or previous marriage. Wow this guy's father must be rolling in his grave knowing his beta son is flushing away the money he made.

paul\_a\_8002 • 5 points • 12 September, 2020 06:41 PM

Yea there should have been a clause in his inheritance that his son doesn't get any money if he acts like a little bitch.

I'm still flabbergasted he wasted time on a 38 year old single mother. You could get any woman you want with this much money. It should be nonstop 18-22 year olds.

lefty929 • 58 points • 11 September, 2020 04:51 PM

Nah, it's 100% on the idiotic judge, appeal board, and general Canadian public (specifically Ontario) that don't protest or voice outrage about this double standard bullshit.

Two people *not* living together, who are in a relationship but maintain separate homes, lives and families, *should absolutely not be obliged to support each other should they break up.*

That's equality and simply common sense. If it were a man and his sugar momma, would it be the same verdict? What about two gay men? This is basically some pussypass shit.

Blast the guy all you want, but this is primarily a fuck up in the legal system.

TheGweatandTewwible • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 09:00 PM

I don't disagree that Canada has become a chickenshit country in terms of giving women pussy passes (so has the U.S. but it's still not as bad). But even some of the most pussy whipped guys I know wouldn't stoop THAT low. The legal system needs to be held accountable but as a man you have to have at least common sense to protect yourself

Downtherabbitholelol • -9 points • 11 September, 2020 05:01 PM

Sugarmoms don't exist bud, did you forget females date up?

lefty929 • 12 points • 11 September, 2020 05:41 PM

Sugarmommas don't look for dirty unhygienic neckbeards that's why you're not seeing them ☐☐☐☐

Exterminatus4Lyfe • 3 points • 11 September, 2020 10:56 PM

"Dating up" isn't always financial, there are factors of HMMV that aren't to do with money.

Brucebruce90 • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 06:32 PM

Yea, but they have different criteria for up..

Have u really never heard of Kevin federline? He was poor white trash, she was loaded.. now she pays him child support...

NabroleonBonaparte • 29 points • 11 September, 2020 05:28 PM

This is what happens when men are raised by women and grow up feminized.

They act like a female wearing their shorts around their ankles, squealing with tears in their eyes. Then they grow up voting for socialism and bigger government.

Guy was a foolish beta, but if he simped as hard as he did for her, he probably was "an ally" for these ridiculous ideologies floating around in society.

[deleted] • 8 points • 12 September, 2020 01:44 AM

This is what happens to you when you are wealthy enough to "keep" a woman like that. The courts reason that since you have a lot of money, whoever you date is entitled to a piece of it. This maybe be "good for the economy," since one person usually only spends a certain amount of their wealth. But if the court can get their claws into your stash, they can then siphon some off and double or triple the amounts being spent on a regular basis. Women are great spenders and consumers. I wonder if this legislation is product of retail sellers lobbying, amongst other business interests lobbies. They all get together and put their heads together to figure out how best to keep the money flowing into the economy. Depressed, bitter, washed up women are prime targets. It would also explain a lot of the narcissism in the cultural programming. That also helps grease the machine.

rektum\_expander • 7 points • 11 September, 2020 05:11 PM

What the fuck Canada?! Get your shit together man.

CabernetPerignon • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 07:31 PM

If she was his common law partner, then he got fucked law wise. Point of not marrying someone is to skip the entire process he's gone through. Hope he goes to supreme court - sure seems like he has the money to do so.

[deleted] • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 11:05 PM

Okay Canada is officially a shit hole.

[deleted] • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 05:29 PM

I honestly don't believe that this is not just one of those "the judge is just a complete idiot" type of things. If this is the way Canada's legislation works, then press F.

Realworld • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 05:54 PM

I was incredibly dense in my teens & 20s and thought I needed to be highly educated, top athlete, and moneyed to get a woman. Overshot the goal and found myself attracting upper-class business professional women. All in their late 20s to mid-30s. Uniformly attractive, well-educated, competent, confident, and adventurous (and fair-minded). My type of women. Also all higher income than mine.

Get vasectomy early on, deflect pressure to marry, and fish in the upper-class dating pool. No risk of getting screwed by Family Court.

ChrimsonChin988 • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 03:18 PM

How long do most stay after you tell them you can't get kids and dont wanna marry

Realworld • 4 points • 12 September, 2020 04:31 PM

First few years with vasectomy in my late 20s, new women would insist they had no interest in children. After 2-3 months of active sex, they'd suggest I get it reversed for no particular reason. After few more months of no luck with that, they'd move on to their next target.

After I'd had vasectomy for more years, fewer women thought they could persuade me but some stayed and tried. By my early-30s a new pool of successful women sought me out as ideal to their life goals. None have complained about my vasectomy.

No-marriage was trickier. From my mid-30s on, women have not wanted to let me go. I finally married in my late 40s to calm long-term life partner who meshed very well with me. No risk to me, since most women I dated from late-20s on were old-money upper class. They had their own money.

My future wife was mathematician and actuary who thrived with me and was promoted up through industry to international VP. I was the "trophy wife" that executives need going up in management.

Unlike true trophy wives, male 'trophy spouses' become more valuable as they age.

ChrimsonChin988 • 2 points • 14 September, 2020 05:11 PM

Thanks for the reply. I'm early 20s but figured the answer would be something along those lines. Looks like I'm in for a lot of fun lmao. There's no way I'm getting married though.

About that last part, in which industries is trophy wife-(or man) still a real thing? Shit sounds so stupidly outdated and I know for a fact that it's definitely not required everywhere anymore.

Realworld • 2 points • 14 September, 2020 06:56 PM

'Trophy wife' takes some explanation. They're not Melania-style replaceable decoration. They need to be intelligent, well-educated, attractive, interesting, competent, and independently successful. Their primary use to corporate is providing a stable, stress-free home environment so executive can concentrate on business. They invest broad skills in enabling their spouse's goals in

life. Melinda Gates is example of a trophy wife.

When my wife's insurance company was purchased by international investment firm, they first sent highly competent appraisers to individually meet corporate execs. Quickly honed in on my wife as a critical employee. Invited both of us to England to scope us out. Peeled my wife away to show her around and impress her with power & society they'd be sharing with her. Assigned CEO's wife to entertain / accompany me for 3 days and report back her impression. I was oblivious to machinations going on and opted to visit museums across London. We chatted about historical context/significance of display items. She enjoyed herself and reported back favorably.

Lasers\_Pew\_Pew\_Pew • 7 points • 11 September, 2020 07:44 PM

THIS IS INSANE.

So if I ever win the lottery I have to remain single forever or whoever I live with I have to give them half my shit, even if we weren't married, and even if we never lived together at all?

What is this BULLSHIT.

superman1995 • 6 points • 12 September, 2020 04:02 AM

Moral of the story, raise your SMV, and move to Canada. Once there, find a suga mama. Give the fuck of her life to some "independent, career-focused woman" and get her to pay for your shit. Do it for a while and then have her pay for the rest of your life.

[deleted] 11 September, 2020 06:11 PM

[removed]

kingslayer-x\_x • 18 points • 11 September, 2020 10:13 PM

Honestly this shit pisses me off.

I don't know who I would get killed first. The judge or the girl. This is bullshit. Men fucking put the hours in, make their wealth and get fucked over.

Canada is a feminist country through and through.

The other day I saw an ad about how in order to "promote female entrepreneurs" the Canadian government has a fund of \$15 million.

Go see Jordan Peterson's video where he gives his arguments against Bill C-16 (Gender identity) the parliament is literally waiting for him to finish so they can move on.

HeadMembership • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 02:51 AM

He inherited 100m from his dad. I get what you're saying, but that's not the case with this guy.

kingslayer-x\_x • 7 points • 12 September, 2020 03:26 AM

True but this will really fuck things up for all the up and coming men. We need to have our eyes and ears open at all times.

No one gives a single fuck about single guys in 19-40. All you have is yourself. Never take a chance.

Shit is real and will cost you a lot of wealth and time.

But yeah this guy is also a classic beta with inherited wealth. No surprise.

DextroShade • 5 points • 12 September, 2020 12:01 AM



THIS, and I'd also pay one to make example of the judge too, after I'd left the country of course.

joshiemcswaggy • 14 points • 11 September, 2020 04:41 PM

This cant be true, what has the world become

AKDaily • 3 points • 11 September, 2020 05:49 PM

Where have you been the past 8 years?

turbospeedsc • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 08:32 PM

Currently escorts are and will become the cheapest form of sex, for \$50k a month, he could be fucking 50 top quality girls a month, be done in a couple of hours and keep going on with his life, if you want something more stable 10 SB , for 5k a month you can get a pretty nice SB keep rotate them daily, and be gone of problems discussions etc., and the only thing they will get is your money on your terms.

[deleted] 12 September, 2020 09:11 AM

[deleted]

turbospeedsc • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 04:27 PM

in my experience, rich guys use escorts/sugar baies very often, but in a low key way, not the sleazy street prostitutes, but the 9/10 masters degree student kind, young hot up and coming lawyer, when i was i politics, i met and fucked a couple of those ( paid by my bosses).

Those girls go to partys reunions and stuff, and look and act, like fine educated woman, that will fuck the brains out of their client, and be gone in the morning, no compromises, no problems no strings.

Jim\_E\_Hat • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 08:35 PM

Asset protection. **You** don't own your assets, a trust (or other entity does).

redgow87 • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 08:45 PM

I still never get why guys think it's smart to use outright spending to woo women who aren't at least their wives. Once you condition a woman to this, you think she's just gonna walk away because you said so? You also open up yourself to getting used, played, and abused .not worth it. If you wanna do this, do it for a hooker who understands its a business and that she has to give to receive and not just fuck you over because she feels entitled to your money

RAlphaMale • 6 points • 12 September, 2020 12:01 AM

Shit like this makes me want to go full MGTOW. I get that the guy was a weak idiot but the fact that our society allowed this baffles me. 600k a year for existing, probably getting railed by chads she doesn't even know, all on BetaBux's dime.

antifeminist3 • 5 points • 12 September, 2020 01:38 AM\*

I'm Canadian. The judge's reason for calling this relationship a 'common-law relationship' was heavily influenced by two things:

1. he gave her money
2. They frequently slept at each others house such that it happened on most days.



Had he done neither, the judge would have decided against palimony. So the judge basically decided that because the man gave her money, this entitled her to more money.

Xyphered • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 08:35 AM

Yea that's when all my money would be in an international bank and I'm leaving Canada

jm51 • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 01:32 PM

How would it have played out if he was already married and she was his side piece?

If I were wealthy enough to attract fortune hunters, I'd be looking for a marriage of convenience to a woman equally wealthy. Equal wealth means no advantage to divorce and being married would protect each of us from gold diggers.

antifeminist3 • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 02:36 PM

In Canada, there is very little legal difference between marriage and a common-law relationship. So, if they had been married, it likely would have been similar

jm51 • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 04:10 PM

I meant if he was married to someone else, not her.

Side piece says 'I want palimony'. Legal wife says 'Too late, I was first.'

antifeminist3 • 2 points • 12 September, 2020 10:14 PM

If he was married to someone else, he likely would not have slept with the other women on most nights, and likely would not have given her money. But if he had, I do recall a case in Canada of an open relationship, whereby one guy had an agreed upon open relationship with two women. One sued for palimony; she lost. So Canadian courts only recognize one 'committed relationship', and open relationship are by definition not committed.

BitchesBrew\_MF • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 08:16 PM\*

You grabbed this from Better Bachelor didn't you? Lulz

- 1). More proof as to what happens if you play by Beta Bux rules....don't be the Beta Bux...
- 2). To those who don't know, read about Dave Foley's divorce. He goes into it in depth with Joe Rogan on one of his early podcasts. It's literally the scariest story about going through the divorce process in Canada....you Canadian RPer's take heed

[deleted] • 4 points • 12 September, 2020 02:07 AM

That's what he gets for simping so hard I mean he was asking for it can't feel bad for him

[deleted] 11 September, 2020 09:06 PM

[removed]

trollreign • 1 point • 13 September, 2020 01:50 PM

So if you had \$100 million, you'd rather spend 10 years of your finite life in prison than spend less than 6% of your money on a bitch? That's retarded.

dkod066 • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 04:32 PM

Jesus this is actually disturbing but unsurprising

ProjectImmortality[S] • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 04:34 PM

I mean we can see the decline but this is steep...

Virtusvitium • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 08:20 PM

Canada is fucking retarded and cucked

Liquor\_China • 3 points • 11 September, 2020 07:25 PM

One thing the courts in Canada consider is if you present yourself as a couple. Being together for that long and his social status I'm guessing she was on his arm at many social events thus presenting themselves as a couple.

skeptixon • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 06:40 PM

This may be downvoted, but from a contract point view, this ruling makes sense

It falls under 'damage to public interest' 'promissory estoppel' and reliance: if you are with a woman for 14 years, paying for her expenses and offering marriage constantly it is safe to assume you are very serious about life-long marriage and that she in reliance of your actions did not seek other mates- whether this is true or not is up to debate. These types of ruling happen very often in the business world and wouldn't be a surprise to me that it occurred in family court

This isn't me saying this is normal or good, but it makes sense and any red pill man should never fall in these pitfalls to begin with. Furthermore, read the laws of your country regarding interaction with everyone not just women.

dynospectrum7 • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 04:30 PM

In this day and age, ignorance is not an excuse.

-Radical\_Edward • 3 points • 15 September, 2020 04:58 PM

What mainstream source is teaching men the truth ? None

Galaxed14 • 1 point • 9 November, 2020 05:39 PM

Yo I have a question (14 M) So what does msm teach guys nowadays. Don't really pay attention to msm.

[deleted] • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 05:37 PM

Eventually things will get so bad that no man will want to date any women ever again. That coupled with women getting infinite attention on social media, dating will be a shadow of itself in the not so distant future.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 08:28 PM

you think that's something... in my country, if you live together with someone from the opposite sex for at least a year, you might as well be legally married in the eyes of the government

lordenki0 • 2 points • 16 September, 2020 09:50 PM

The ruling wasn't a one off as some have suggested or believe, this happened because in Canada if you live with a partner for more than two years your union is then considered what is referred to as Common Law.

As a common law partner, you are given all or at least most of the accommodations and benefits of two people who are married.

In this case, as his common law wife, she would have been entitled, after 14 years together, to continue being supported at the same standard of living she enjoyed while in the relationship.

In Canada, her refusal to accept his marriage proposals would carry no weight whatsoever.

Not having kids makes no difference either as she was awarded spousal support. Had there been children, he'd be paying spousal and child support.

Another thing that wouldn't have made a difference is if she had cheated on him along the way. Adultery in Canada isn't factored in to awards or settlements.

For the record, I haven't read the linked story about this couple. I am making comments based on what the OP wrote in his post.

blasted\_biscuits • 2 points • 18 September, 2020 03:30 AM

This is a perversion of justice and one of these appeal courts need to strike it down. But, imagine how insufferable he musta been for her to turn down his multiple offers of marriage though..

EnlaCitydelafuria • 2 points • 17 October, 2020 05:13 PM

His worst mistake was to give money to her.

He paid her to rob him.

TeddyMGTOW • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 04:29 PM

Yeah, the guy screwed but he sure was not on the Red Pill forum. Who spins a plate for 10 years? single mothers? nah!

ProjectImmortality[S] • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 04:32 PM

Ya at this point you should put an expiry date on your plates or they will cost in the future

Pezotecom • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 04:59 PM

This is like how they have high salaries on politicians or life-long payments on the basis of not downgrading their life style. And it makes some sense, given that you have compromised, you may have a hard time finding a job, etc.

But what in the fucking hell did you commit when you started a relationship? I see this man continued making hard money so... what a fucking world

zino193 • 2 points • 12 September, 2020 12:30 PM

So?

Learn that actions have consequences - real life consequences. First mistake - he lives in Canada.

If you live in a socialist state - you agree with the socialist social contract: those that have need to share with the have-nots.

Get that thought your thick skull.

Politics is not about fairness, it's about votes, and leechers are more numerous than productive middle class and up people in the western world. Especially for states that survive based on immigration policies and basically importing poor, socially dependent poor from other countries. (not saying conservatives are any more financially responsible with their jingoist fetishes)

I will repeat myself - regardless of your investment plan - if you live in a country where left leaning parties get more than 30% - none of your retirement plans will pan out. Stop being lazy and hedge your financial future.

universalmongologist • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 05:14 PM

Ever since Bill C-16 Canada has been lost. Has it btw affected any of your lives?

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 06:36 PM

The Canadian tax system disincentivises marriage by heavily taxing married couples. My aunt and uncle were together for over 30 years before actually tying the knot all for financial reasons.

DextroShade • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 11:55 PM

I would just leave the country.

Mysterious\_Thing • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 01:15 AM

50,000\$ a month? Somehow I don't believe this is true. If the amount was lower I might have believed it. So basically this woman supposedly will get what normal people earn in a year every month from one guy? Come on. Get real.

BossGro • 1 point • 13 September, 2020 06:06 PM

Look up the Dave Foley divorce story on the Joe Rogan show. It's insane.

Ranger\_Boi • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 05:35 AM

There are similar laws in the US. Look up common law marriages for your state. Most states require you to have presented the relationship as a marriage and by what the post says it would meet the requirements. So yay. They were married as far as the courts see it.

-Radical\_Edward • 1 point • 15 September, 2020 05:01 PM

The woman refused to marry

Ranger\_Boi • 1 point • 15 September, 2020 05:34 PM

Yes. But it's still a common law marriage. Google it.

retallator • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 07:06 AM

If you look at this from a meta perspective, judges are crazy. No discussion.

If you look at this in the contexts of gynocentric laws, it might make sense as this guy was acting as his husband the whole time and is definitely an idiot.

We live in ☐ ☐

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 01:01 PM

Same in India... She is even entitled to his inherited properties

mugatucrazypills • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 01:07 PM

It's just the next step. Too many men have caught on to the the inherent fraud that marriage has become.

So it's not longer going to be optional. You won't have the right to remain single. You'll be mandated to "man up" for your cuck obligations and pussy dues by the state.

Already extra taxes and fees and responsibilities for being born male-cis-opressor.

All thought you were so clever and going to be allowed to go MGTOW or be a Playboy ? The feminist-marxist state considers all it's human property.

The threshold for lasting obligation to the cow-humans will continue to drop untill you're just assigned no matter

what you do.

no\_regret20 • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 08:59 PM

NO, the lesson here is never go to fucking Canada.

RedEyeBlackEye1 • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 10:26 PM

50k/mth vs plane ticket another jurisdiction?

Hmmm.

HotConclusion0 • 1 point • 14 September, 2020 09:13 AM

If you're a self employed businessman or wealthy enough to pay yourself as this man clearly is then it's a priority to know how to hide your assets so that in the case of a divorce the only thing a spouse or the government will have access to is the family home, and that too will be difficult if you purchase it under an LLC as a loan. When you're in a position to protect yourself from vultures, never compromise or get complacent cause the consequences will hit you like a mack truck.

throwlaca • 1 point • 14 September, 2020 09:17 PM

>They dated for 14 years

That's not dating. However they didn't lived together so there is nothing to claim.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 September, 2020 01:48 PM

It's not a Canadian thing. That looks like a one-off with a bad ruling. Try to find other similar cases.

poppypopsicles • 1 point • 2 October, 2020 07:05 AM

Why wouldn't you just have the bitch killed at this point? Surely someone out there would kill a random woman for vastly less than the \$6,000,000 this guy has been ordered to pay out to his financial rapist...

How would it not be worth \$1,000,000 to have a professional make it look like she OD'd on some heroin? Super satisfying, and you SAVE \$5,000,000.

No way does it cost more than \$1,000,000 to hire a legit hitman?

RAGNAR\_GZ • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 04:55 PM

Never feel bad for men like this. You know he was warned, knew the consequences, yet consciously made decisions that lead to this.

And you fucking know he liked supporting her like that.

Drakane1 • 12 points • 11 September, 2020 05:04 PM

how the fuck is he supposed to know

RAGNAR\_GZ • -4 points • 11 September, 2020 05:24 PM\*

Uhhh click the article and look up the guy. You don't think he has 7 lawyers?

This is not some normal average Joe lmao.

Drakane1 • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 06:25 PM

how are you supposed to know. which of the 7 lawyers is gonna tell him even if you dont get married

even if you dont cohabit-ate. even if you dont have a kid with this hoe the court can still fuck you over

randarrow • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 05:02 PM

It's called common law marriage guys, it's been a thing for a long time.

ProjectImmortality[S] • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 06:00 PM

I don't think you know what common law is man, they were most definitely not common law

HeftyNugs • 5 points • 11 September, 2020 07:10 PM

Actually there is a pretty good chance they were common law. I'm from Ontario and it doesn't take much to become common law. You can become common law even if you stay together intermittently. They lived together in a cottage for parts of the summer and vacationed in Florida together during the winter. In a 14 year relationship, they probably accumulated time together to equal cohabitation for 3 years.

[deleted] 11 September, 2020 06:38 PM

[removed]

Aerophage1771 • 6 points • 11 September, 2020 08:32 PM

Bruh chill. Sub is still on the chopping block.

hockeyaddict87 • 1 point • 11 September, 2020 06:46 PM

This seems like a very specific case and I think its wrong to make a conclusion like you did with your title

ToraChan23 • -1 points • 11 September, 2020 06:24 PM

The poor guy proposed **several times**

The poor chump gave her "thousands of dollars every month, a credit card, paid off her mortgage and showered her with expensive gifts"

Fuck this guy. He deserves everything he's getting.

RAlphaMale • 3 points • 11 September, 2020 11:36 PM

While I don't think he completely deserved it, she was a filthy parasite, he chose to be the BetaBux.

ToraChan23 • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 11:40 PM

I also don't think he deserved it. He was just insanely stupid, therefore I don't have sympathy for him.

Her being a filthy parasite is her nature. I don't think we can blame a parasite for being a parasite. You have to operate in order to not get caught slipping by one.

RAlphaMale • 4 points • 11 September, 2020 11:43 PM

You're not wrong, he was an idiot.

You can't blame a parasite for being a parasite, but you can restrict them from sucking your blood dry. No fault divorce needs to go ASAP, and get rid of alimony. I'm sure strong independent women can take care of themselves.

ToraChan23 • 6 points • 12 September, 2020 12:02 AM

Until the laws change (they won't, unless more and more career-women get taken to the cleaners), men need to stop worrying about what women will do if you tell them "no", and lay down terms that are the best for YOU. She doesn't like it? Let her walk and try to scam some other mark.

There are too many women out here for men to be putting themselves into compromising positions for parasite pussy.

RAlphaMale • 3 points • 12 September, 2020 12:04 AM

Women entering the workforce was a horrible mistake.

You're implying that he even got some, I bet BetaBux didn't even get to second base while the slut was getting railed by Chad Thundercock VIII every day.

ToraChan23 • 2 points • 12 September, 2020 12:07 AM

Nah, with the amount she was getting, and for how long she was getting it, I bet she was smart enough to parcel out some ass now and then in order to keep his dumbass on the hook.

She probably got some side that she actually liked, but she had to be putting in some work to keep him on the hook that deep.

Women entering the workforce was a horrible mistake.

For who?

Landing a woman with her own money, and giving her good dick so she buys YOU shit doesn't sound like a mistake to me.

RAlphaMale • 2 points • 12 September, 2020 12:10 AM

True, but for every time she gave him vanilla sex, she did 10 gangbangs for the chads. She was smart to keep him hooked, that is a very lethal parasite.

Society, it hurt working men, if you double the amount of labor in the workforce labor is worth less. Simple Supply and demand.

ToraChan23 • 2 points • 12 September, 2020 12:16 AM

True, but for every time she gave him vanilla sex, she did 10 gangbangs for the chads. She was smart to keep him hooked, that is a very lethal parasite.

Yep. Based on her nature, she did exactly what she was supposed to do.

Society, it hurt working men, if you double the amount of labor in the workforce labor is worth less. Simple Supply and demand.

Then men need to adapt. Women were going to join the workforce at some point anyway, so fighting against it was only going to delay the inevitable. Learning how to make the current status quo work for you is something men are supposed to do.

With automation increasing every year, men need to learn to adapt or die. Either a machine is going to do your job, an illegal immigrant, or a woman who they can supposedly pay less than they would pay you because they're more likely to accept less... not because of some wage gap bullshit.

RAlphaMale • 1 point • 12 September, 2020 12:23 AM



“Men need to adapt”

How? The system is against us, if it isn't divorce rape, they're importing millions of third world savages to take our wages, the only way out of this I can see is an authoritarian patriarchal government.

mr4kino • 0 points • 11 September, 2020 07:21 PM

Come on now, you sound like an FDS member.

ToraChan23 • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 08:30 PM

If a man is stupid enough to do all the shit this guy did, without thinking about the consequences or studying the laws in his country to avoid being taken to the cleaners, ESPECIALLY in an age where there are plenty examples of men being fucked over...

... he doesn't deserve any sympathy. At some point, us men need to wise up and stop being dumbasses and expecting people to be like "aww poor guy" whenever a man is too dumb to protect himself.

He financed the life of a GROWN ADULT, giving her things that she would never reciprocate. Fuck this guy for being so stupid, and fuck you for thinking not having sympathy for a complete dumbass makes me "sound like an FDS member".

mr4kino • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 08:38 PM

Regarding the "man", and him being a simp: it doesn't justify his money being stolen from him. Those are two distinct things.

If you want to be mad, be mad at the guys who made the laws, and are creating on a industrial scale SIMPs since three generations. That is the source of the issues. This guy is just a random number.

What needs to be done for a guy like him is to supervise his money spending (which can be done legally in some countries) but definitely not giving it to a crazy.

Also, breath, this is just Reddit.

ToraChan23 • 2 points • 11 September, 2020 08:48 PM

Regarding the "man", and him being a simp: it doesn't justify his money being stolen from him. Those are two distinct things.

I never said it was justified. I said I don't have an ounce of sympathy for him.

If I play in traffic, I don't deserve to die for doing something so stupid, but I don't deserve sympathy if I get hit by a car. There is no excuse for a man in this time period to be ignorant of what women are capable of when it comes to your money and the court system.

If you want to be mad, be mad at the guys who made the laws, and are creating on a industrial scale SIMPs since three generations. That is the source of the issues. This guy is just a random number.

I'm not "mad". I just don't feel sorry for this dumbass guy like others are in here.

The best way to fight a law like this is to not make yourself subject to it. Getting these laws changed would be damned near impossible, but the next best thing is to learn them and make sure nothing you do would allow those laws to be used against you.

What needs to be done for a guy like him is to supervise his money spending (which can be



done legally in some countries) but definitely not giving it to a crazy.

This is why I don't feel sorry for him. If he is able to earn enough money to give it to her in abundance, that means he has to have some amount of brain power and common sense to know how money works and how it can be used against him. Enough to know that what he is doing is stupid, or at least enough to be able to research laws in his own country.

Also, breath, this is just Reddit.

I know. People who can't handle dissenting opinions and being called out on their own opinion just love to pretend the other person is somehow "mad". If this is "just reddit", you wouldn't have such a problem with a stranger not feeling sorry for this guy.

Polengoldur • 0 points • 11 September, 2020 08:00 PM

They dated for 14 years

common law marriage. not a particularly common thing, but it does happen. even in the states.

ISeeThings404 • 0 points • 11 September, 2020 09:44 PM

Bro this isn't something that I feel is likely to happen to most normal people. The very fact that this is in the news means it's an anomaly. Sure the precedent setting might be icky but it seems like a case of extremes here

Quo210 • 0 points • 12 September, 2020 05:13 AM

Be glad it's another low SMV cuck out of order whom will additionally serve as an example