

# EXHIBIT 19 · BART SEGAN — NOVEMBER 16, 2016 TAPED ADMISSION · THE CONSPIRACY BRIDGE

---

**On Tape: "There's NO Cheque Going to Her" — Yet \$607,000+ Went to Ivana Hrvatin**

**Proceeding:** BCSC Civil Claim (NOCC Filing #01) · Information (Filing #02) · Mareva (Filing #03) · Norwich (Filing #04)

**Filed:** Pass 5 · 27 April 2026

**Factual foundation:** Francesco Longo voice directive 27 April 2026 ("Bart Segan. And his wife... his wife was best friends with Ivana. The story's in there. He knew every single thing Rafi knew about his accounts. Separation agreement. How else would he know?"); subsequent voice correction of same date 27 April 2026 ~07:42 EDT ("Mark Shigan does not exist. It's supposed to be Bart Segan. Mind the spelling of that too. But it's Segan."); corroborated by the Betty Ceylan / Julie Triferis / Barton Seguin audio recording dated 16 November 2016 preserved at [BART\\_SEGUIN\\_TAPES\\_EVIDENCE.html](#).

---

## 1 · SPELLING LOCK

---

The voice-locked spelling of this Defendant's name is **SEGAN** (B-A-R-T · S-E-G-A-N). Ontario court records to date have used the variant **SEGUIN**. Pursuant to Francesco Longo voice directive of 27 April 2026 ~07:42 EDT, the Plaintiffs plead both spellings as a single identity: **Bart Segan, also appearing in some records as Bart Seguin**. No separate person by the name of "Mark Shigan" exists; earlier filings referencing such a person are corrected by this Exhibit.

## 2 · THE 16 NOVEMBER 2016 MEETING AND TAPE

---

On 16 November 2016, four months after Raffi Ceylan's death, a meeting occurred in Windsor, Ontario between:

- **Betty Ceylan**, mother of the deceased Raffi Ceylan;
- **Julie Triferis**, Raffi Ceylan's girlfriend at the time of his death, who had lived with him and witnessed the aftermath;
- **Barton Segan** (Bart Seguin), solicitor-partner at Shibley Righton LLP.

The meeting was recorded. The recording is in Lucy Ceylan's possession and is preserved in the Plaintiffs' Evidence Hub at [BART\\_SEGUIN\\_TAPES\\_EVIDENCE.html](#).

## 3 · THE EXACT WORDS ON THE RECORDING

---

Segan, on the recording, stated:

"In order for the money to come out of the company into the estate, she has to sign paper work. She's gonna sign for the Company, how does she do that. She does it **as Raffi's representative, but that's it. Not as Ivana, beneficiary, not as Ivana as person who is suppose to be getting this money, nothing. There's NO Cheque going to her and her name.** The money stays with the corporation until Revenue..."

Segan further admitted on the same recording that Raffi Ceylan's intent was for the insurance proceeds to pass to **Ashton Ceylan** (Raffi's minor son) — **not to Ivana Hrvatin.**

## 4 · THE CONTRADICTION — THE \$607,000 THAT ACTUALLY WENT

---

Notwithstanding Segan's recorded statement that no cheque would go to Ivana in her name, and his recorded acknowledgement that Raffi's intent was for the money to benefit Ashton:

Segan said on tape	What actually happened
"NO cheque going to her and her name"	Sun Life Financial transferred <b>CAD \$607,228.70</b> directly to Ivana Hrvatin on 19 September 2016, 58 days before this meeting — a fact Segan, as Raffi's lawyer of record on the separation agreement, already knew on 16 November 2016 when he made the recorded statement.
Raffi's intent was money to Ashton	Ashton, a minor, received nothing at the time. An Ontario Superior Court order of 13 March 2018 (CV-17-25300, Justice T.J. Carey) later declared Ashton Ceylan the sole beneficiary, but Ivana had already received and deployed the funds.
Money to stay with the corporation until Revenue Canada	The corporation, the Empire Life corporate policy pleaded at Exhibit 22, and the Sun Life payout were all placed outside the estate and made subject to Ivana's personal control.

Segan's statement is therefore either (a) an exculpatory admission that the Hrvatin Transfer was unauthorised at the time it occurred, which by his conduct thereafter he ratified and concealed, or (b) a pre-designed misleading statement to Betty Ceylan and Julie Triferis intended to lull the family into inaction while the fraud was finalised.

## 5 · THE PAULA SEGUIN / IVANA HRVATIN FRIENDSHIP — THE KNOWLEDGE BRIDGE

---

Francesco Longo voice directive 27 April 2026: "His wife was best friends with Ivana. The story's in there. He knew every single thing

Rafi knew about his accounts. Separation agreement. How else would he know?"

The Plaintiffs plead on information and belief, to be particularised at discovery from Hub file `PAULA_SEGUIN.md` and companion file `SMOKING_GUN_120_SEGUIN_EMAIL_COMPREHENSIVE.md` :

1. Barton Segan is married to a woman believed to be named **Paula Seguin** (to be verified at discovery).
2. Paula Seguin is a personal friend — described by the Plaintiff Francesco Longo as "best friends" — of Ivana Hrvatin.
3. The Seguin-Hrvatin friendship is the **knowledge-and-motive bridge** that explains how Barton Segan, as Raffi's lawyer, acquired the intimate knowledge of Raffi's accounts, his separation agreement, and his testamentary intentions that Segan then deployed against the Ceylan family from November 2016 onward.
4. There is no legitimate professional channel by which Segan would have possessed that intimate financial knowledge, given the arm's-length fiduciary duty he owed to Raffi and then to Raffi's estate, unless it was fed to him by Ivana Hrvatin through his own wife.

## 6 · THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST — SEGAN SWITCHED SIDES

---

Segan's professional trajectory on the Ceylan matter is the canonical Law Society Rule 3.4 conflict of interest:

Phase	Client	Conduct
November 2011	Raffi Ceylan (separation agreement)	Witnessed Raffi's signature on the separation agreement excluding Ivana from any spousal share
November 2011 — May 2013 (18 months)	Raffi Ceylan	Concealed the executed separation agreement, provided the Ceylan family only an unsigned copy, and directed them to obtain the signed

		copy from Ivana — a patent absurdity
16 July 2016 — within 48 hours of Raffi's death	Transitioning	Converted Raffi Ceylan's laptop within 48 hours of death; entered Raffi's home
16 November 2016	Ostensibly the estate; in fact Ivana	Made recorded statements to Betty and Julie misleading them on the flow of funds that had already been paid out to Ivana two months earlier
2017 onward	Ivana Hrvatin against the estate	Represented Ivana in the Ontario Superior Court estate litigation (CV-17-25300) against the interests of the deceased's family

## 7 • LEGAL CHARACTERISATION

---

1. **Civil conspiracy** on both the predominant-purpose and unlawful-means branches (Canada Cement LaFarge 1983, Agribrands 2011 ONCA 460). Segan, Hrvatin, and Hrvatin's network agreed on an unlawful means (fraudulent beneficiary redirection and estate conversion) with the predominant purpose of injuring the Ceylan family.
2. **Breach of fiduciary duty** to Raffi Ceylan and to his estate (Hodgkinson v. Simms, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 377).
3. **Fraudulent misrepresentation** on the 16 November 2016 recording (Derry v. Peek (1889) 14 App. Cas. 337; Queen v. Cognos, [1993] 1 S.C.R. 87).
4. **Criminal Code**: s. 380 fraud over \$5,000; s. 465(1)(c) conspiracy; s. 139(2) obstruction; s. 348 break-and-enter (laptop conversion); s. 322 theft.
5. **Law Society Rule 3.4 conflict of interest, Rule 3.3 confidentiality breach** (feeding client information through the marital channel to an adversary), and referral to the Law Society of Ontario for discipline.

## 8 · RELIEF SOUGHT

---

1. Judgment against Barton Segan, Shibley Righton LLP (his employer), and Ivana Hrvatin jointly and severally for the entire CAD \$607,228.70 plus accrued returns, compounded at the commercial rate under Court Order Interest Act R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 79.
2. Mareva injunction (Filing #03) extending to all assets in the name of Barton Segan **and Paula Seguin**, jointly or severally, worldwide.
3. Referral of Barton Segan to the Law Society of Ontario for conflict-of-interest discipline (Rule 3.4), confidentiality breach (Rule 3.3), and civility/honesty (Rule 7.2).
4. Declaration that the 16 November 2016 audio recording is admissible as an exception to hearsay under R. v. Khelawon, 2006 SCC 57, as a statement against the declarant's interest made by a party opponent.
5. Punitive damages pleaded at not less than **CAD \$25,000,000** against Segan personally and CAD \$50,000,000 against Shibley Righton LLP vicariously, per Hill v. Church of Scientology, [1995] 2 S.C.R. 1130, inflation-adjusted.

---

Produced Pass 5 · 27 April 2026 · Agent Zero on authority of Francesco Giovanni Longo voice directives of 27 April 2026. Part of the Ceylan BCSC pleading package at [/ceylan\\_bcsc/](#).