

Man wins right to sue rape-accuser for defamation after he was cleared of rape charges.

February 13, 2015 | 1424 upvotes | by [Kelly_Gruber](#)

[article here](#)

Hope he wins a shitload of money and this leaves an impression on other women who try and pull the same shit.

The gossip was merciless and long-lasting, he claims, escalating into vandalism of his vehicle and threats of violence against himself and his friends. It became so bad Mr. Caron fled his home in Vanderhoof, B.C., to go into "hiding" in Prince George.

Fucking white knights

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

dw0r • 401 points • 13 February, 2015 08:10 PM

I think that there should be a new law formed named Simon's law that states that she needs to register in a database of false rape accusers and needs to disclose it immediately to any man she speaks to in a non-formal setting.

Then the world might take this seriously.

forgotmyothernames • 101 points • 13 February, 2015 09:48 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

yes, but the females who lie need to be found guilty of lying in a separate trial. Every female that doesnt get a rape conviction isnt a liar.

dw0r • 70 points • 13 February, 2015 09:52 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

Of course the standard of beyond a reasonable doubt would need to apply I agree.

[deleted] • 2 points • 3 June, 2015 11:52 PM

Problem is..that would be a civil matter where burden is preponderance of truth...i.e. more likely than not...i.e. over 50%

dw0r • 5 points • 4 June, 2015 12:03 AM

I'm saying I think it should be criminal given the damages it can cause.

idle_reception • 26 points • 14 February, 2015 01:28 AM

Doesn't matter. Long story short I'm facing legal issues because of a women who's filled two prior charges that she ended up recanting. One completely, in court, and dropping the second one once another women feced up her story was fabricated.

My lawyer thinks it's a joke they're even taking it serious.

cover20 • 8 points • 14 February, 2015 05:05 AM

Well if she testified that the charges were false, then she should be convicted of the false and malicious charge -- if you're lucky enough to be in a jurisdiction where that's a crime.

idle_reception • 14 points • 14 February, 2015 07:58 AM

She testified she may have said yes but said no half way through. No charges against her but it was enough to get that guy off the hook.

The second incident the other women came out and told detectives she lied to prevent her bf from thinking she cheated, this came out after the man was imprisoned for 4 months. Even more twisted she fucked two brothers, same night, same room but only claimed rape on then eldest. (he kicked her out in the morning)

Unfortunately I live in a state where this can all be accessed by a simple Google search. Try explaining first and second degree sexual assault charges along with two other felony charges that stemmed from these false allegations to friends, family, employers.

I live in a 75k+ town and still hear his name get thrown around as a rapist. No charges against either girl.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 February, 2015 05:34 AM

Technically any woman who either admits to, or is found to, have made a false rape accusation is guilty of falsifying a police report and perjury. They're liable civilly, too.

Unfortunately, as we all know, that would be terrible PR for a police department and local governments.

d4rkj4y • 20 points • 14 February, 2015 01:15 AM

Looks like I have found my next web-design project

[deleted] • 8 points • 14 February, 2015 05:16 AM

this is a great idea. please do it

Dopamine37 • 5 points • 14 February, 2015 01:44 AM

The closest i found was Paul Elams: Register-her

http://www.register-her.com/index.php?title=Main_Page

Gadnuk_ • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 09:04 PM

In many states If you commit perjury you are subject to the penalties of the crime you lied about. This should include mandatory minimum sentences of multiple years for people who lie about rape.

Unfortunately the pussy pass is recognized by most courts of law so 'justice' is served merely in finding the male innocent.

LewisSkolnick • 97 points • 13 February, 2015 04:58 PM

Whatever happens - this ruling is good news.

It's bad news for the ladies who just want to make shit up I guess...

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 05:04 PM

I agree, and you shouldn't have to "win" the right to sue someone for defamation, especially in something this serious. If you didn't actually rape the person who's accusing you, you have every right to receive compensation for your time, stress, and reputation loss.

RedBigMan • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 05:57 PM

Especially considering all the extra-judicial punishment that comes with mere accusations. Like white knights vandalizing your car or losing your job, etc...

[deleted] • 49 points • 13 February, 2015 06:40 PM

This is a revolutionary day for true rape victims everywhere; the amount of frivolous and spite-driven allegations the legal system has to deal with will drop, if he wins.

putsch80 • 217 points • 13 February, 2015 04:55 PM **[recovered]**

He won't get shit from her. She will get on the stand and cry, saying how she felt trapped and used. And the jury will forgive her.

pl231 • 52 points • 13 February, 2015 07:48 PM **[recovered]**

trapped and used by who? I think the fact that he's been cleared makes it relatively likely he will get some

compensation

whoops_fap • 68 points • 13 February, 2015 08:46 PM [recovered]

~~Trapped and used by Pete.~~

~~No it was really Adam.~~

~~It all started with my father.~~

Trapped and used by society.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 04:39 PM [recovered] [recovered] [recovered]

It's scary how accurate this is.

ThePragmatist42 • 45 points • 13 February, 2015 10:19 PM

Um.. Have you ever actually met people? There are a significant number of women that don't like men in general. There are also a significant number of men that feel it's their job to 'protect' women from 'bad' men, despite the fact that their White Knighting is literally sexism at it's finest. Treating women differently because they are women.

I really wish this was hyperbole but there are plenty of cases that have proven what I've said to be true. Recent news of a man having his genitals cut off by his psychotic wife was met with posts of support for the WOMAN. Suggestions that the man deserved to have his genitals removed. Imagine the opposite of this happening. A man mutilating his wife because she did something to upset him. The outrage would be real.

Oh, I apologize to all the women I just verbally raped with my words of truth but you were asking for it by wearing those headphones.

TRPsn • 10 points • 14 February, 2015 06:52 AM

DUDE!! Just because they wear headphones doesnt mean they should have to hear everything that comes through those headphones. Thats victim blaming you verbal rape apologist!

Rooi_Aap • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 10:59 AM*

There are also a significant number of men that feel it's their job to 'protect' women from 'bad' men, despite the fact that their White Knighting is literally sexism at it's finest. Treating women differently because they are women.

Reminds me of that episode of Scrubs where Turk went up to a female lead surgeon and told her "he has her back", all proud of himself. She put him in his place sarcastically and told him that her needing "protection" is a major insult. That is feminism done right.

EDIT: S03E15 "My Tormented Mentor"

putsch80 • 69 points • 13 February, 2015 08:09 PM [recovered]

Trapped and used by some prior sexual encounter with him or some other man. Or confused/traumatized because she was raped by someone similar to this man. Don't underestimate the hamster, and remember there will be other hamsters on the jury.

solbrothers • 4 points • 14 February, 2015 06:33 AM [recovered]

I recently subscribed to /r/trp. I keep seeing this term, hamster. Can you elaborate on what that means?

TRPsn • 11 points • 14 February, 2015 06:50 AM

Look over to the right of your screen where it says "NEW HERE." I would read all of those just to get a better understanding of TRP, and you can form your own opinion about life as a man. As for hamsters, they just keep running in circles using the same bullshit to get away with the same bullshit because of feels. Im not very good with words so someone else can tag in and explain it way better than I.

solbrothers • 9 points • 14 February, 2015 06:58 AM

Thanks for your help. I will see myself over to the sidebar.

let_terror_reign • 12 points • 14 February, 2015 07:06 AM

I'll explain. What do hamsters do best? Run their damn wheel. They don't care about the world outside. They only care about the wheel. Such are women and 'feelings'. Women will do anything to preserve their feelings of indignation, however terribly rationalized it is. By hamster we mean rationalizing anything to make yourself feel better. The way a hamster would just run its wheel no matter what.

Guys hamster too. When they make up excuses they know aren't the real reason why they don't do something. Like saying nah I'm too comfortable in this chair I don't want to go talk to her. Reality? Anxiety to approach.

The wheel keeps on turning to keep worldview consistent and feeling nice.

Women will rationalize and where any moderately self aware guy would feel guilty for rationalization, they will honestly believe their own bullshit.

lereditaccounts • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 01:59 PM

Google "Post-hoc rationalisation", that's basically what hamstering is

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 08:21 AM

Glossary on the right lazy boy.

Facha669 • 17 points • 14 February, 2015 12:38 AM

Nope. It will be claimed by every feminazi that to punish this helpless female will only prevent others from coming forward with legitimate claims. You all know the drill.

JovianTrainWreck • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 05:35 AM

Shit man, who knows what her hamster will come up with during the proceedings, but remember the hamster is a powerful beast.

I hate it, but putsch80 might be at least partially right. I see some reduced sentences and the like coming fourth, but you know what, I for one am going to celebrate this small victory. Where's my whiskey?

Here's to men's rights.

jerpta • 19 points • 13 February, 2015 08:41 PM

You're missing the bigger picture.

She's a minor. Not sure how Canadian law works, but were I to hazard a wild guess, she won't own a house or any other significant asset he can take.

BUT.... I can think of a few possible benefits. Legal precedent, demonstrating in a public forum that he's

innocent to name two.

Kelly_Gruber[S,□] • 24 points • 13 February, 2015 09:02 PM

Because she's a minor her parents will be held accountable for any payment to this man if he wins

TruthFromAnAsshole • 6 points • 14 February, 2015 05:44 AM

This is categorically false in Canada.

Vicarious liability does not apply to parents of minors in tort law.

rattamahatta • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 02:45 AM

But their parents didn't accuse anyone... her father would be just another victim of his daughter's insanity. He has rights, too.

hohndo • 16 points • 14 February, 2015 03:01 AM

And responsibilities..his daughter being one of them.

I'm pretty sure the parents had to be involved with the case so it's not like they weren't part of this ordeal.

getomc • 9 points • 14 February, 2015 07:01 AM

Just because women are a liability doesn't mean no one should be responsible for them.

rattamahatta • 0 points • 14 February, 2015 09:40 AM

Their fathers? So you think an innocent man should always be responsible for every stupid shit their little brat daughters pulls?

rattamahatta • 0 points • 14 February, 2015 09:38 AM

Do you have any evidence for their parents being involved? How are you "pretty sure".

hohndo • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 02:48 PM*

I don't know. All I know is she's a minor.

According to my research, under certain conditions a "independent" or "spouse" can sue without a representative that's over 18. There are a couple other reasons, but I'm sure those are the most common.

There were a bunch of terms they used for someone over 18 to be their representative and "guardian" was one of the first mentioned.

The situation doesn't affect me so I don't really give a shit. If this were in the US, I'd spend more time on it.

In the US, parents are responsible for their kids financially unless the kid proves to the court they are independent at some point before the case. So, if they are involved, or not, they have to pay up. They are the liable and responsible ones for their kin.

rattamahatta • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 06:57 PM

I don't know man, it seems wrong in this case. The father couldn't have possibly stopped his daughter from making a false accusation. You know who I think is liable for the damages? The court that doesn't seem to require evidence anymore.

TruthFromAnAsshole • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 05:49 AM

Don't worry, OP is talking out of their ass. Parents are not held liable for their children's tort in Canada.

In some cases, if the child is young enough, a court can find that the child isn't liable, but even for a toddler, the parent isn't held liable.

If she did something while performing working duties, while working for her parents, then possibly, but that's a totally different doctrine.

FeministOnABuffalo • 1 points • 14 February, 2015 11:41 AM **[recovered]**

How about the family being held liable for all the damages their son caused by setting off the sprinkler in his school?

Something like \$40,000 because their son was throwing scissors at it.

TruthFromAnAsshole • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 05:21 PM* **[recovered]**

That's a very special circumstance.

His parents were able to be held liable for that because of Section 10 the School Act (British Columbia) which states that if *school property* is damaged by a *student* the parents can be held jointly liable.

So in the case you're referring to (Nanaimo-Ladysmith school district no. 68 V. Dean) the trial judge was bound by the School Act, and the precedent from Coquitlam School District V. Clement.

In fact, the judge actually stated she disagreed with this act, despite being bound by it.

17 As an initial observation, I agree with the submissions of both counsel that this provision appears to be "draconian", in the sense that it could have a disastrous financial effect on a young person and his or her parents. Mr. Justice Esson said as much in Clement at para. 16: The section has the capacity to inflict upon parents, by imposing liability quite irrespective of fault on their part, a harsh and perhaps unjust burden of potentially ruinous dimensions. In this case damages of some \$3 million are alleged. These, however, are matters for the legislature. It may be that the legislature will consider whether the section now serves a social purpose sufficient to justify the hardships which it can create.

To answer your question, we still don't have vicarious liability to parents as a concept in our legal system, but that particular action had a statutory law that applied to specific circumstance.

For the case at hand, even if she defamed him at school, this isn't a crime against the school's property, and that statute wouldn't apply.

Kelly_Gruber[S,□] • 0 points • 14 February, 2015 04:51 AM

Play stupid games win stupid prizes, parents are held accountable for their children. Sad but that's the way it is when underage kids are protected by law.

rattamahatta • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 09:38 AM

Two different topics. Children being protected from liability is one thing, their parents being held liable for something that is not a result of their actions is another. But if you have the law

handy, point me to it.

putsch80 • 7 points • 13 February, 2015 08:44 PM [recovered]

The downside of this is if he loses, it validates her claims. Don't assume that the truth will set him free; this isn't hollywood.

Glenwalk • 11 points • 13 February, 2015 09:03 PM [recovered]

He won't lose. He just needs to show 51% that she was lying. His records of where he was + her statements to the police/social media do just that.

TruthFromAnAsshole • 6 points • 14 February, 2015 05:37 AM

He just needs to show 51% that she was lying.

This is a Canadian case, so this is mistaken... but in a good way.

In Canada, in a defamation case the defendant has to prove that what they published is true. (Published can mean pretty much anything, including saying it to just one other person).

He has to prove she did say it, and has to prove damages caused by her actions (damage to reputation counts). But, once he's shown she said it, she may prove it's true.

Edit: in Canada, for civil law, it is balance of probabilities as well, not beyond reasonable doubt.

[deleted] • 1 points • 14 February, 2015 09:28 AM

[permanently deleted]

TruthFromAnAsshole • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 10:11 AM

She will pay. Parents are not vacariously liable for their children's actions. There are some cases where a very young child committed a tort, and even then, parents aren't vacariously liable (interestingly enough, the children can be too young, and so no one is found liable; but the wouldn't apply here).

So she will almost certainly be found liable, and it will be her responsible for paying it. We almost never assess punitive damages in Canada, so it likely won't be all that much (she's also gonna have to pay a shit ton in legal fees). If she doesn't have the money to pay now, there are a number of alternatives. A successful plaintiff can seize property to cover it (so say the girl's parents bought her a nice set of diamond earrings dude can take them) or garnishment, any job I'm the future, he can get a portion of her wage until the debt is settled.

Of course, her parents, friends other family etc... can chose to pay for her. Tort law is meant to help the plaintiff recover their loss, not punish the defendant.

Glenwalk • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 07:33 PM

Ah right, I mixed up the onus on that one.

tk421awol • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 04:04 AM

As much as I wish you were correct, I'm too busy in sales to point out why you are not. Would you be more interested in Arizona oceanfront or shares of the Brooklyn Bridge?

wetfartz • 3 points • 13 February, 2015 07:58 PM

Not sure where abouts ur from but my understanding is that for civil case such as when you sue someone it usually would be in front of a judge rather than a jury

putsch80 • 8 points • 13 February, 2015 08:06 PM [recovered]

I'm a licensed attorney in Oklahoma and Texas. In both of those states, either party would have the right to request a jury trial.

GrizzlyGareBear • 2 points • 13 February, 2015 08:26 PM [recovered]

This is taking place in Canada

putsch80 • 9 points • 13 February, 2015 08:51 PM [recovered]

Doesn't matter. Canadian provinces allow jury trials in defamation cases. Check out p.134 of this article. http://www.blg.com/en/NewsAndPublications/Documents/publication_1528.pdf

As stated in that article, the court rules in British Columbia normally allow juries to be waived, but that exception doesn't apply in a defamation case.

GrizzlyGareBear • 2 points • 13 February, 2015 09:18 PM [recovered]

Gotcha, thanks for the link and explanation

boinko03 • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 04:31 AM

Thats where "a jury of your peers" comes in. Put 12 men on the jury and see what happens, a mixed jury though and i see your point

Dyalibya • 4 points • 13 February, 2015 08:52 PM

Unless we get a RP on the jury, spread them pills people

humanmeat • 1 point • 13 February, 2015 08:56 PM

In Canada civil cases don't use juries but one judge... so should be objective, free of emotional bias

robot_tingles • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 06:16 AM

Not if there are any women on the jury.

Heriion • 1 point • 15 February, 2015 07:26 PM

Excellent observation. The more I read TRP, the more I realize that people won't change. To be honest, we won't ever vote logic or truth into office. If we want our freedom as men, we can't vote for it, we must **take it**.

tedted8888 • -2 points • 13 February, 2015 09:07 PM

Maybe if he was a quitted. It's my understanding he was found innocent which means he didn't do it rather than there was insufficient evidence

tk421awol • 8 points • 14 February, 2015 04:08 AM

(A) The word is acquitted.

(B) There is no such thing as a finding of innocent.

(C) This never went to trial, so there was no verdict either way.

(D) He was never charged. He was investigated and showed the complaint to be bullshit. Now he wants to sue the lying POS who accused him, and for once we're seeing justice in a court of law.

TruthFromAnAsshole • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 05:15 AM

(B) There absolutely is. It's known as Actual Innocence.

Gere101 • 1 points • 14 February, 2015 06:49 PM [recovered]

No, you're wrong.

At least in the US, you can only be found "not guilty" of a crime; a court will never rule "innocent" because failing to convict you means the prosecution wasn't able to prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

If you understand statistical hypothesis testing, it's quite simple. The court presents a null hypothesis that you are guilty and then assesses the evidence to see if the results support the claim at a certain significance level. It's not as mathematically clear cut as that, but the important thing to understand is that the court will only prove or disprove that you are guilty; and that being "not guilty" != being "innocent."

Actual innocence is a state you can claim, but it can never be proven by a court.

TruthFromAnAsshole • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 07:07 PM [recovered]

On appeal, you don't get presumption of innocence.

So if you appeal you basically have two avenues, you can argue that the trial judge erred in law at some point, or you can argue that you are actually innocent.

If you proceed with the latter and win your appeal, winning your appeal is known as a finding of actual innocence. Depending on jurisdiction of course.

So yes, you can be found innocent in a court of law.

TekkomanKingz • 77 points • 13 February, 2015 06:00 PM

A direct strike to the heartland of Feminism.

Truly heart warming. If this guy gets money we can celebrate.

jb_trp • 18 points • 13 February, 2015 07:37 PM*

"Alright, Black knights, I've got missiles on lock."

"Fire when ready, Mr. Caron."

TheLife_ • 6 points • 14 February, 2015 02:50 AM

If he get's money, I'm moving to Canada.

vengefully_yours • 27 points • 13 February, 2015 09:38 PM

Of course it's not in the USA. God forbid we hold a girl accountable for lying, it's only the guys life she ruined.

[deleted] • 11 points • 13 February, 2015 10:33 PM

once she gets sued her name will be in the media... on the internet... every man will know

HeinousFu_kery • 6 points • 13 February, 2015 06:47 PM

This will be worth watching and will likely not produce a global sea-change in the way that these false allegations are handled since the accuser is a minor, and the evidential procedures are a bit tangled. Definitely a step in the right direction, though.

SemperFiWashout • 7 points • 13 February, 2015 10:32 PM [recovered]

I hate to be so cynical, but she will cry in court, he will lose, and she will countersue (and win) for emotional distress.

beerthroway • 6 points • 13 February, 2015 11:44 PM

The similarities between rape culture and the Salem witch trials are astounding. We act like our culture is above that nonsensical "accusation -> instant guilt" paradigm, but we play right into it. Women running around pointing fingers and everyone killing that person without question.

I hope the day comes soon when it's over.

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 10:28 AM

Well it isn't. They've closed ranks around Mattress Girl and even Jackie from UVA. God help you if you doubt the word of a woman - if the feminists don't get you, the white knight orbiters will.

suloco • 3 points • 20 February, 2015 11:02 AM

Bring back ancient China. If you made an accusation which was then proven to be false, you were sentenced with the same punishment that would have befallen the convicted party. That would be a fresh thing to see nowadays..

Edit: logic

SeekingTheWay • 2 points • 26 March, 2015 12:59 PM

omg yes please. we need this.

Elatea • 3 points • 13 February, 2015 06:28 PM

This is very good news for any man with these accusations in the future

ChairBorneMGTOw • 2 points • 13 February, 2015 06:52 PM

Does legal precedent in British Columbia apply to the rest of Canada? What about the Commonwealth? I'm not very familiar with that sort of legal / jurisdictional questions. Tried googling and couldn't find a straightfoward answer that I could understand...

Glenwalk • 3 points • 13 February, 2015 09:08 PM

I'm not a lawyer, and I'm not certain about this but:

It's the BC Court of Appeal, so it will be pretty much binding on all trial judges across Canada. Courts of Appeal in Canada won't be bound by it, but it will carry weight.

In countries where this issue of privilege has not yet been decided, (UK, AUS, NZ) it will be considered and may be adopted. There's probably already existing case law on this issue in the states, so the courts there will find that more relevant than in BC.

ChairBorneMGTOw • 3 points • 14 February, 2015 12:34 AM

Cheers, thanks amigo! I know a dude in Ontario who was JUST found not guilty about 2 weeks ago, of an alleged sexual assault. This could help get him some financial compensation for 18 months of

uncertainty whether he was going to live free or in a cage, and having his name dragged through the mud.

Glenwalk • 5 points • 14 February, 2015 01:13 AM

Unless he actually has proof she lied, it won't help him much. If it's just a he said /she said thing he's probably out of luck.

alecesne • 2 points • 13 February, 2015 07:59 PM

Check out this article about an unbalanced relationship degenerating into rape accusations and vengeful spear campaign. None of the parties was particularly wise, but this highlights the increasing power of pointing the finger in contemporary public discourse.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/15/magazine/the-stanford-undergraduate-and-the-mentor.html>

cover20 • 2 points • 14 February, 2015 05:09 AM

This legal debate isn't about rape at all. It's about whether ANY police report can be subpoenaed into evidence. So it could have been a false charge of a burglary or a murder, not rape. Or a police report about one thing that affects a trial about a different thing.

I think Canada must already have the law to prosecute false rape accusations. But if the guy could not get to the police report, then he couldn't press his case against the bitch.

_FASTLIKETREE • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 04:19 PM*

Winning rights makes perfect sense in USA 21st century where up is down and black is white. I need one of those memes "rights, you keep using that word but I don't think it means what you think it means"

Doomsday_ • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 04:25 PM

Unfortunately the guy's life is probably still ruined.

socio_j • 1 point • 14 February, 2015 04:47 PM

Bravo! A small victory in the battle against feminism, but these women must learn that their actions have consequences.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 February, 2015 03:28 AM

This is why I wouldn't ever live in Canada.