

# Table of Contents

## CHAPTER 1. *HRYNIAK* TURNS 10: THE DEVIL, THE DETAILS, AND THE FUTURE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

### I. OVERVIEW

§ 1:1 Generally

### II. THE MODERN HISTORY OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT

§ 1:2 Early Systems of Summary Judgment

§ 1:3 Rule 20 Early Adoption of Summary Judgment

§ 1:4 The '90s and the First Backlash

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

§ 1:6 —*Dawson v. Rexcraft Storage and Warehouse Inc.*

§ 1:7 The Osborne Report and the 2010 Amendments

### III. COMBINED AIR AND THE SECOND BACKLASH

§ 1:8 The Occasion for Combined Air

§ 1:9 The Decision in *Combined Air*

§ 1:10 Aftermath and a Leave Application

### IV. *HRYNIAK* AND ITS “CULTURE SHIFT”

§ 1:11 Generally

### V. HISTORY OF THE COMMON LAW TRIAL

§ 1:12 Generally

§ 1:13 Common Law

§ 1:14 Equity

§ 1:15 Fusion of Law and Equity

### VI. POST-*HRYNIAK* DEVELOPMENTS

§ 1:16 Generally

§ 1:17 Civil Juries

§ 1:18 Boomerang Summary Judgments

§ 1:19 Partial Summary Judgment

## **VII. A WAY FORWARD**

§ 1:20 Green Eggs and Ham

§ 1:21 Civil Justice Reform

## **VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

§ 1:22 Generally

## **CHAPTER 2. IS THE ABSENCE OF REASONABLE AND PROBABLE GROUNDS AN ELEMENT OF THE TORT OF NEGLIGENT INVESTIGATION?**

§ 2:1 Introduction

§ 2:2 The Elements of the Tort of Negligent Investigation in Ontario Today

§ 2:3 Reasonable and Probable Grounds is a Low Standard That Focuses on the Information Police Actually Have

§ 2:4 Circumstantial Evidence of Reasonable and Probable Grounds

§ 2:5 What the Supreme Court Decided in *Hill*

§ 2:6 How Did Absence of Reasonable and Probable Grounds Become an Element of Negligent Investigation?

§ 2:7 What is the Impact of the Elevation of Absence of Reasonable and Probable Grounds into an Essential Element of the Tort?

§ 2:8 Hints of a More Thoughtful Approach?

§ 2:9 The Relevance of Causation

§ 2:10 Conclusion

## **CHAPTER 3. IS NON-PATIENT HARM A COMPENSABLE HARM?: A REVIEW OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE CLAIMS BY NON-PATIENT PLAINTIFFS**

§ 3:1 Introduction

§ 3:2 The UK Supreme Court: *Paul and another v. Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust*

§ 3:3 —Facts

§ 3:4 —Analysis

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:5 — —Claims for Nervous Shock after Witnessing an “Accident”
- § 3:6 — —Medical Negligence Actions are Generally “Non-Accidents”
- § 3:7 — —Physician’s Duty of Care Towards Patient’s Family Members
- § 3:8 Where Does Canadian Jurisprudence Stand on this Issue?
- § 3:9 What’s Next?

## **CHAPTER 4. TALL SHIPS CAST LONG SHADOWS: JUDICIAL SCRUTINY OF ARBITRAL AWARDS IN 2024 AND BEYOND**

- § 4:1 Introduction
- § 4:2 Before *Tall Ships*
- § 4:3 The *Tall Ships* Saga
- § 4:4 —The Facts
- § 4:5 —The Arbitrator’s Decision
- § 4:6 — —Remediation Costs Claim
- § 4:7 — —Additional Costs Claim
- § 4:8 — —Interest Claim
- § 4:9 —The Superior Court’s Decision
- § 4:10 — —Remediation Costs Claim
- § 4:11 — —Additional Costs Claim
- § 4:12 — —Interest Claim
- § 4:13 —The Court of Appeal’s Decision
- § 4:14 The Influence of *Tall Ships*
- § 4:15 Looking Ahead

## **CHAPTER 5. FAST, FAIR, OR FLEETING: THE EVOLUTION OF OPPRESSION APPLICATIONS IN ONTARIO**

### **I. OVERVIEW**

- § 5:1 Generally

### **II. PRE-PANDEMIC LANDSCAPE**

- § 5:2 Introduction

### **III. FULSOME APPROACH TO CONVERSION**

- § 5:3 Generally

#### **IV. CONVERSION IN TODAY’S OPPRESSION LANDSCAPE**

- § 5:4 The Hard Road—Trending Toward Conversion
- § 5:5 The Holdouts—Rejected Conversions
- § 5:6 The Mixed Signals—Appellate Oscillations
- § 5:7 — —*Justein v. DeFi Technologies*
- § 5:8 — —*Pereira v. TYLT Technologies Inc. (TYLTGO)*
- § 5:9 A “Middle Path”—Hybridization

#### **V. FARING FORWARD**

- § 5:10 Generally

#### **CHAPTER 6. DAMAGES IN DEVELOPMENT: THE ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGES IN BREACHED AGREEMENTS OF PURCHASE AND SALE FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT AND *THE ROSSEAU GROUP INC. V. 2528061 ONTARIO INC.*, 2023 ONCA 814**

- § 6:1 Introduction
- § 6:2 *The Rosseau Group Inc. v. 2528061 Ontario Inc.*: Trial Decision
- § 6:3 *The Rosseau Group Inc. v. 2528061 Ontario Inc.*: Appeal Decision
- § 6:4 Developments, Lost Profits, and the Loss of Chance
- § 6:5 Conclusion

#### **CHAPTER 7. *LUCAS V. SEMELHAGO*: IS IT OPEN SEASON FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE?**

- § 7:1 Introduction
- § 7:2 The Pre-*Semelhago* Categorical Approach
- § 7:3 Specific Performance of Contracts of Land
- § 7:4 Specific Performance for the Sale of Shares in Corporations
- § 7:5 Specific Performance in the Case of Negative Covenants
- § 7:6 Specific Performance for Contracts for the Sale of Goods
- § 7:7 Shifting Landscape Pre-*Semelhago*
- § 7:8 *Semelhago v. Paramadevan*: From Categories to Principles

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:9 *Semelhago*'s Progeny and the Tension Between its Intention and the Principled Approach
- § 7:10 The Continued Relevance of Equitable Factors
- § 7:11 The Impact of *Semelhago* on Specific Performance for Investment Properties
- § 7:12 *Matthew Brady Self Storage*: Ontario's Test for Uniqueness
- § 7:13 What of *Semelhago*? *Lucas* and the Current State of the Jurisprudence
- § 7:14 Uniqueness: Sometimes Sufficient, But Not Necessary?
- § 7:15 Inadequacy of Damages: Two Contrasting Approaches
- § 7:16 Opening the Door to Awarding Specific Performance for Investment Properties
- § 7:17 Conclusion: Towards a Consistent Test for Specific Performance

## **CHAPTER 8. THE POWER AT ISSUE: A PROPOSED ADDITION TO *NELSON V. MARCHI*'S CORE POLICY ANALYSIS**

### **I. OVERVIEW**

- § 8:1 Generally

### **II. THE "CORE POLICY" IMMUNITY ANALYSIS AFTER *NELSON***

- § 8:2 Defining "Core Policy" Decisions
- § 8:3 The Separation of Powers Rationale for "Core Policy" Immunity and the New Fundamental Question
- § 8:4 The Two-Step Analysis in *Nelson*

### **III. THE PROPOSED INTERMEDIATE STEP**

- § 8:5 Generally
- § 8:6 Three Other Related Unwritten Constitutional Principles
- § 8:7 The Proposed Intermediate Step

### **IV. TWO JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE INTERMEDIATE STEP**

- § 8:8 Expressly Considering the Power at Issue Enhances the Court's Analysis of the Fundamental Question
- § 8:9 Expressly Considering the Power at Issue Ensures

Compliance With Parliamentary Sovereignty and  
the Rule of Law

## **V. SOME RESULTING PRACTICE CONSIDERATIONS**

§ 8:10 Generally

## **CHAPTER 9. RIDING THE CONSTITUTIONAL WAVES: THE SUPREME COURT'S GUIDANCE ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PENDULUM**

### **I. OVERVIEW**

§ 9:1 Generally

### **II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REGIMES**

§ 9:2 The Guidelines Order (1984)

§ 9:3 *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (1992)

§ 9:4 *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (2012)

§ 9:5 *Impact Assessment Act* (2019)

### **III. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE IAA**

§ 9:6 Generally

§ 9:7 *Reference re Impact Assessment Act*, 2022 ABCA 165  
(C.A.)

§ 9:8 —Majority Opinion

§ 9:9 —Dissenting Opinion

§ 9:10 *Reference re Impact Assessment Act*, 2023 SCC 23  
(S.C.C.)

§ 9:11 —Majority Opinion

§ 9:12 —Dissenting Opinion

### **IV. KEY TAKEAWAYS FROM THE COURT'S DECISIONS**

§ 9:13 Generally

§ 9:14 Limits to Federal Legislative Authority

§ 9:15 —A Clear Link to Federal Legislative Authority

§ 9:16 —Limits of the Double Aspect Doctrine and  
Principle of Cooperative Federalism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9:17 Establishing Environmental Matters of National Concern
- § 9:18 Limitations of Case-Specific Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

**V. IMPLICATIONS POST-*IAA REFERENCE* AND  
THE NEW AMENDMENTS TO THE *IAA***

- § 9:19 Generally
- § 9:20 Amendments to the *IAA*
- § 9:21 —Effects within Federal Jurisdiction
- § 9:22 —Screening Decisions
- § 9:23 —Public Interest Decision
- § 9:24 —Federal-Provincial Cooperation
- § 9:25 —The Amendments: A Constitutional Solution or Temporary Bandage?
- § 9:26 Moving Forward

**Table of Cases**

**Index**