



British Columbia
Human Rights
Tribunal



FORM 1.1 – INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINT

Use This Form to File Your Own Complaint

Case

Case Number: CS-018389

Date Received: 2026-03-20

Step 1 - Party Information

Who experienced discrimination (Complainant)?

Legal name – First name: Jessica

Legal name – Last name: Simpson

Preferred name – e.g. traditional name, nickname, alias:

Use my preferred name: When talking to me, When writing to me, In decision in addition to my legal name

Title: Ms.

Pronoun: She

Complainant's address for delivery

Mailing address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Cell: N/A

Fax: N/A

Email: [REDACTED]

Respondent contact information

I want to name the organization that discriminated against me: Yes

Name of the Respondent: CULTURE GUARD

Relationship to you (For example, your employer): None

Respondent Contact Email: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address:
[REDACTED]

Phone: N/A

Cell: N/A

Fax: N/A

Steps 2A - Areas of Discrimination & Step 2B -Grounds of Discrimination

Area: Publication

Ground

Gender Identity or Expression: The Respondent engaged in targeted, identity-based discriminatory conduct against me on the basis of my gender identity and expression as a transgender woman. In the impugned publication, the Respondent repeatedly and deliberately misgendered me, invoked my former name in a manner intended to undermine my affirmed identity, and asserted that I am “not a woman” but rather a “biological male,” framing my gender identity as a “fantasy” or product of ideological influence. These statements go beyond mere disagreement or expression of opinion; they constitute a categorical denial of my identity—what can properly be described as existential denialism—where my lived, legal, and socially recognized gender is repudiated outright. This conduct directly targets my gender identity and expression by denying its legitimacy and portraying it as inherently deceptive or pathological. The Respondent’s language positions me as fraudulent and unworthy of recognition, which serves to strip me of dignity and equal standing in public discourse. By publicly asserting that my identity is not real, the Respondent reinforces harmful stereotypes about transgender individuals and contributes to a broader social environment in which trans people are delegitimized, marginalized, and subjected to hostility. The discriminatory nature of this conduct is further aggravated by its publication on a widely accessible platform, where it invites amplification, ridicule, and harassment from others. The Respondent’s statements are not isolated or abstract; they are directed at me personally and are grounded explicitly in my gender identity. As such, they constitute adverse treatment that is inextricably linked to a protected characteristic under the Human Rights Code. This has caused significant harm to my dignity, sense of safety, and ability to participate equally in public life without being subjected to dehumanizing and identity-erasing rhetoric.

Sex: The Respondent's conduct also constitutes discrimination on the basis of sex, as it relies on rigid, essentialist, and exclusionary conceptions of sex to deny me recognition and equal treatment. In the impugned publication, the Respondent repeatedly characterizes me as a "biological male" and asserts that I am not, and cannot be, a woman. These statements are not neutral descriptions; they are deployed in a manner intended to invalidate my lived and legally recognized status as a woman and to exclude me from the social category of women altogether. By reducing sex to a fixed, immutable, and exclusively biological construct, the Respondent imposes a narrow and discriminatory framework that denies the legitimacy of transgender women as women. This approach has the effect of policing who is entitled to recognition as a woman and reinforces systemic barriers that transgender individuals face in accessing equal treatment. The Respondent's statements position me as inherently outside the scope of womanhood, thereby depriving me of the dignity, respect, and social recognition afforded to others on the basis of sex. This conduct is discriminatory because it treats me adversely in comparison to cisgender women, who are not subjected to having their identity publicly denied or delegitimized. It creates a distinction based on sex that has the effect of excluding me from equal participation in public life and exposes me to heightened scrutiny, hostility, and harm. The Respondent's framing is not merely descriptive but is used to justify the broader pattern of misgendering, dehumanization, and reputational attack directed at me. Accordingly, the harm I have experienced is directly connected to the protected ground of sex. The Respondent's conduct reinforces discriminatory norms that deny transgender women equal recognition as women and perpetuates inequality by treating my sex as something that can be publicly contested, invalidated, and weaponized against me.

Sexual Orientation: The Respondent's conduct also engages the protected ground of sexual orientation insofar as it relies upon, and reinforces, harmful stereotypes and prejudicial narratives historically directed at LGBTQ2S+ individuals, including the conflation of gender diversity with deviance, illegitimacy, or moral deficiency. In the impugned publication, the Respondent situates my identity within a broader framework of stigmatization that has long been used to marginalize individuals whose identities or expressions fall outside heteronormative expectations. While the statements are framed primarily in terms of gender identity, they operate in tandem with deeply embedded biases against LGBTQ2S+ communities, including assumptions that such identities are fraudulent, pathological, or socially dangerous. By portraying me as deceptive, unstable, or inherently illegitimate, the Respondent's statements reproduce narratives that have historically been weaponized against individuals perceived to be part of sexual minority groups. This includes the implicit suggestion that LGBTQ2S+ identities are incompatible with societal norms, and that individuals within these communities are undeserving of equal recognition or respect. Such rhetoric contributes to a broader climate in which LGBTQ2S+ individuals are subjected to suspicion, hostility, and exclusion. The Respondent's conduct therefore cannot be viewed in isolation as merely targeting gender identity; rather, it forms part of an interconnected system of discrimination that affects individuals across multiple protected grounds, including sexual orientation. The harm arises from the reinforcement of a stigmatizing framework that denies legitimacy to diverse identities and perpetuates systemic inequality. As a result, the Respondent's actions have caused harm to my dignity and sense of belonging, and have contributed to an environment that undermines the equal participation of LGBTQ2S+ individuals in public life.

Step 3 - Details of the Discrimination

Details of the Discrimination for each Respondent

Respondent Name: Culture Guard

Describe the harm you experienced in a few words: Public misgendering, identity erasure, reputational harm, and severe psychological distress.

Explain how the harm relates to the grounds you have selected before: The harm I experienced is directly connected to the protected grounds of gender identity or expression, sex, and sexual orientation because the Respondent's conduct explicitly targets and denies my identity as a transgender woman. The repeated misgendering, deadnaming, and assertions that I am "not a woman" constitute adverse treatment that is rooted in my gender identity and expression, as they seek to invalidate and erase that identity in a public forum. At the same time, by characterizing me as a "biological male" and excluding me from recognition as a woman, the Respondent imposes a rigid and discriminatory conception of sex that treats me differently from cisgender women, thereby engaging the ground of sex. Additionally, the broader framing of my identity as illegitimate, deceptive, or socially harmful reflects and reinforces longstanding stigmatizing narratives directed at LGBTQ2S+ individuals, which engages the ground of sexual orientation. The conduct is therefore not neutral or generalized; it is specifically directed at protected characteristics and results in harm to my dignity, psychological well-being, and equal participation in public life.

Describe what this Respondent did that harmed you.

Date: 2026-03-20

Conduct: The Respondent, Culture Guard, engaged in public, targeted, and discriminatory conduct against me through a social media post published on or about March 20, 2026. In that post, the Respondent republished and amplified content that explicitly referred to me using incorrect male pronouns and language, deliberately disregarding my identity as a transgender woman. The post further invoked my former name in a manner intended to undermine and delegitimize my affirmed identity. In addition to misgendering and deadnaming, the Respondent published statements asserting that I am "not a woman" and characterizing me as a "biological male," thereby denying the legitimacy of my gender identity. The Respondent framed my identity as fraudulent, ideological, or fabricated, which constitutes a form of existential denialism—where my identity is not merely criticized, but categorically rejected as invalid or unreal.

Date: 2026-03-20

Conduct: The post also included or amplified defamatory and stigmatizing allegations about me, presented as factual assertions, which further contributed to reputational harm and public targeting. By publishing this content on a widely accessible platform, the Respondent exposed me to broader harassment, ridicule, and hostility from third parties. This conduct was not incidental or neutral. It was deliberate, public-facing, and directly tied to my protected characteristics, including my gender identity and expression. The Respondent's actions form part of a broader pattern of online conduct that contributes to the marginalization and dehumanization of transgender individuals by denying their identity, encouraging public scrutiny, and legitimizing further discriminatory behavior by others.

Date: 2026-03-20

Conduct: Published at : <https://x.com/CultureGuard/status/2035049004594340114>

Step 4 – Time Limit to Make Complaint

Respondent Name: Culture Guard

What is the date of the most recent conduct that you listed as discrimination in the previous step?

2026-03-20

Did the most recent conduct happen in the last year? Yes

Did all of the conduct happen in the last year for all Respondents: Yes

Step 5 - Other Proceedings

Do you have another proceeding about the same events? No

Step 6 - Remedies

Select the kinds of remedies you want that are available under s. 37 of the Human Rights Code:

- **Order to stop the discrimination**
- **Declaration that the conduct is discrimination**
- **Steps or programs to address the discrimination (examples: training, policy)**
- **Compensation for injury to dignity, feelings, and self-respect**
- **Compensation for lost wages or other expenses such as moving expenses, photocopying, costs of attending the hearing (keep receipts)**

Step 7 - Mediation

Do you want to attend a mediation? Yes

Step 8 - Indigenous Peoples

I confirm I am First Nations, Métis or Inuit. I want an Indigenous Navigator to contact me about the process.