

Index

AGUONIE V. GALION SOLID WASTE MATERIAL INC.

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCE-
DURE

Generally, § 1:5

ANDRZJEWESKI V. OTTAWA POLICE SERVICES BOARD

See also NEGLIGENT
INVESTIGATION AND REA-
SONABLE AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS

Generally, § 2:8

ARBITRAL AWARDS AND TALL SHIPS

Generally, § 4:1, § 4:15

Law before Tall Ships, § 4:2

Tall Ships Development Inc. v.
Brockville (City)

generally, § 4:3

arbitral decision, § 4:5 to § 4:8

court of appeal decision, § 4:13

facts, § 4:4

influence of decision, § 4:14

superior court decision, § 4:9 to
§ 4:12

BOOMERANG SUMMARY JUDGMENTS

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCE-
DURE

Generally, § 1:18

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

See FEDERAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESS-
MENT REGIMES

COMBINED AIR MECHANICAL SERVICES INC V. FLESCH

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCE-
DURE

Generally, § 1:8

Aftermath and leave application,
§ 1:10

Decision, § 1:9

CONVERSION OF APPLICATION INTO ACTION

See OPPRESSION APPLICA-
TIONS IN ONTARIO

CORE POLICY IMMUNITY ANALYSIS: A PROPOSED ADDITION TO NELSON V. MARCHI

Generally, § 8:1

Intermediate step

generally, § 8:5

justifications for, § 8:8, § 8:9

proposed intermediate step, § 8:7

unwritten constitutional
principles, § 8:6

Post-Nelson analysis

core policy decisions, defined,
§ 8:2

separation of powers rationale,
§ 8:3

two-step analysis, § 8:4

Practice considerations, § 8:10

DAMAGES, ASSESSMENT

See LAND DEVELOPMENT AND
THE ASSESSMENT OF
DAMAGES

**DAWSON V. REXCRAFT
STORAGE AND
WAREHOUSE INC.**

See also **HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

Generally, § 1:6

ETTINGER V. PETERS ET AL.

See also **NEGLIGENT
INVESTIGATION AND REASONABLE AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS**

Generally, § 2:8

**FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL
ASSESSMENT REGIMES**

Generally, § 9:1, § 9:26

Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (1992), § 9:1, § 9:3

Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012, § 9:1, § 9:4

Establishing environmental matters of national concern, § 9:17

Guidelines Order (1984), § 9:1, § 9:2

Impact Assessment Act (2019) generally, § 9:5

amendments, § 9:20

constitutional solution, § 9:25

effects within federal jurisdiction, § 9:21

federal-provincial cooperation, § 9:24

public interest decisions, § 9:23

screening decisions, § 9:22

constitutionality, § 9:6

future, § 9:26

post-reference re Impact Assessment Act, § 9:19 to § 9:26

reference re Impact Assessment Act, 2022, § 9:7

reference re Impact Assessment Act, 2023, § 9:10

Judicial review of administrative decisions, limitations, § 9:18

**FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL
ASSESSMENT REGIMES**

—Cont’d

Limits to federal legislative authority

generally, § 9:14

cooperative federalism, § 9:16

limits of double aspect doctrine, § 9:16

link to federal legislative authority, § 9:15

HILL V.

**HAMILTON-WENTWORTH
POLICE SERVICE**

See also **NEGLIGENT
INVESTIGATION AND REASONABLE AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS**

Generally, § 2:5

**HRYNIAK AND THE FUTURE OF
CIVIL PROCEDURE**

Generally, § 1:1, § 1:22

Combined Air Mechanical Services Inc. v. Flesch

generally, § 1:8

aftermath and leave application, § 1:10

decision, § 1:9

Common law trial, history

common law, § 1:13

equity, § 1:14

fusion of law and equity, § 1:15

Culture shift of Hryniak, § 1:1, § 1:11

Future of summary judgment

generally, § 1:20

civil justice reform, § 1:21

Post-Hryniak developments

generally, § 1:16

boomerang summary judgments, § 1:18

civil juries, § 1:17

partial summary judgment, § 1:19

**HRYNIAK AND THE FUTURE OF
CIVIL PROCEDURE—Cont'd**

Summary judgment
backlash in 1990s, § 1:4
early systems, § 1:2
Osborne report and 2010 amend-
ments, § 1:7
Pizza Pizza Ltd. v. Gillespie,
§ 1:3
rule 20, § 1:3

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

See FEDERAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESS-
MENT REGIMES

**LAND DEVELOPMENT AND
THE ASSESSMENT OF
DAMAGES**

Generally, § 6:1, § 6:5
Post-Rosseau decisions: lost profits,
loss of chance, § 6:4
Rosseau Group Inc. v. 2528061
Ontario Inc.
appeal decision, § 6:3
trial decision, § 6:2

LUCAS V. SEMELHAGO

See SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
AND LUCAS v.
SEMELHAGO

**MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND
NON-PATIENT HARM**

Generally, § 3:1, § 3:9
Canadian caselaw
Alafi v. Lindenbach, § 3:8
Lavery v. Community Living
British Columbia, § 3:8
UK caselaw: Paul and another v.
Royal Wolverhampton NHS
Trust
claims for nervous shock after
witnessing accident, § 3:5
facts, § 3:3
medical negligence actions are
non-accidents, § 3:6

**MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND
NON-PATIENT HARM**

—Cont'd

UK caselaw: Paul and another v.
Royal Wolverhampton NHS
Trust—Cont'd
physician's duty of care towards
patient's family, § 3:7

**NEGLIGENT INVESTIGATION
AND REASONABLE AND
PROBABLE GROUNDS**

Generally, § 2:1, § 2:10
Absence of reasonable and probable
grounds as element of tort,
§ 2:6; § 2:7
Andrzejewski v. Ottawa Police Ser-
vices Board, § 2:8
Causation, relevance of, § 2:9
Circumstantial evidence of reason-
able and probable grounds,
§ 2:4
Elements of tort, § 2:2
Ettinger v. Peters et al., § 2:8
Focus on information police have,
§ 2:3
Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Police
Service, § 2:5
SR v. Edmonton (Police Service),
§ 2:8

NELSON V. MARCHI

See CORE POLICY IMMUNITY
ANALYSIS

**OPPRESSION APPLICATIONS IN
ONTARIO**

Generally, § 5:1, § 5:10
Conversion
appellate decisions, § 5:6 to § 5:8
hybridization, § 5:9
rejected, § 5:5
test for, § 5:3
trend towards, § 5:4
Pre-pandemic situation, § 5:2

OSBORNE REPORT

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Generally, § 1:7

PIZZA PIZZA LTD. V. GILLESPIE

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Generally, § 1:3

**PUBLIC AUTHORITIES’
IMMUNITY FROM
LIABILITY IN
NEGLIGENCE**

See CORE POLICY IMMUNITY
ANALYSIS

**REASONABLE AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS**

See NEGLIGENT INVESTIGATION
AND REASONABLE
AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS

**REFERENCE RE IMPACT
ASSESSMENT ACT**

See FEDERAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REGIMES

**SATTVA CAPITAL CORP. V.
CRESTON MOLY CORP.,
ARBITRAL AWARDS AND**

Generally, § 4:2, § 4:14, § 4:15

**SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE AND
LUCAS V. SEMELHAGO**

Generally, § 7:1, § 7:17

Contracts for sale of goods, § 7:6

Contracts of land, § 7:3

Equitable factors, relevance of,
§ 7:10

Inadequacy of damages, § 7:15

Investment properties, impact of
Semelhago, § 7:11, § 7:16

Lucas v. 1858793 Ontario Inc.
(Howard Park), § 7:13

**SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE AND
LUCAS V. SEMELHAGO**

—Cont’d

Matthew Brady Self Storage
Corporation v. InStorage
Limited Partnership, § 7:12

Negative covenants, § 7:5

Post-Semelhago approach, § 7:9,
§ 7:13

Pre-Semelhago categorical
approach, § 7:2, § 7:7

Sale of shares in corporations, § 7:4

Semelhago v. Paramadevan decision,
§ 7:8

Uniqueness

Lucas v. 1858793 Ontario Inc.
(Howard Park), § 7:13

Matthew Brady Self Storage
Corporation v. InStorage
Limited Partnership, § 7:12

sufficient, but not necessary,
§ 7:14

**SR V. EDMONTON (POLICE
SERVICE)**

See also NEGLIGENT
INVESTIGATION AND REASONABLE
AND PROBABLE
GROUNDS

Generally, § 2:8

SUMMARY JUDGMENT

See also HRYNIAK AND THE
FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Backlash in the 1990s

Aguonie v. Galion Solid Waste
Material Inc., § 1:5

Dawson v. Rexcraft Storage
Warehouse Inc., § 1:6

Boomerang summary judgments,
§ 1:18

Early systems, § 1:2

Osborne Report and 2010 amendments,
§ 1:7

Partial summary judgment, § 1:19

Rule 20, § 1:3

**TALL SHIPS DEVELOPMENT
INC. V. BROCKVILLE (CITY)**

See ARBITRAL AWARDS AND
TALL SHIPS

**THE ROSSEAU GROUP INC. V.
2528061 ONTARIO INC.**

See LAND DEVELOPMENT AND
THE ASSESSMENT OF
DAMAGES