## **Publisher's Note**

An Update has Arrived in Your Library for:

Please circulate this notice to anyone in your office who may b interested in this publication Distribution List	ı.
	Ī
	ī

## COMMENTARIES ON ONTARIO CORPORATE LAW

Wayne D. Gray Release No. 7, September 2025

Gray's Commentaries on Ontario Corporate Law provides a current and comprehensive overview of the law and includes full annotations of the Ontario Business Corporations Act, the Business Names Act, the Corporate Information Act, the Co-operative Corporations Act and the Extra-Provincial Corporations Act, including all the regulations and prescribed forms for these statutes, as well as pertinent government publications.

## What's New in This Release

This release features updates to commentary in Chapter 13, Partnerships Act.

THOMSON REUTERS® Customer Support

1-416-609-3800 (Toronto & International)
1-800-387-5164 (Toll Free Canada & U.S.)
E-mail CustomerSupport.LegalTaxCanada@TR.com

This publisher's note may be scanned electronically and photocopied for the purpose of circulating copies within your organization.

## **Highlights**

- Partnerships Act Nature of Partnership Defining Characteristics of a Partnership Carrying on Business The House of Lords held that parties to a planned restaurant business became partners as soon as they performed part of the joint enterprise in this case, after the premises were acquired and fitted out but before the restaurant opened to the public: Khan v. Miah, 2000 WL 1544769, [2000] 11 WLUK 80 (H.L.).
- Partnerships Act Nature of Partnership Partnership vs. Joint Venture A useful summary of the distinction between joint ventures and partnership is set out in the Canada Revenue's GST/HST Policy Statement P-171R. The distinction is important under Part IX of the Excise Tax Act because only persons are permitted to register for the GST/HST under s. 240 of the ETA and, while a partners.
- Partnerships Act Section 15 (Liability for Holding Out and Post-Mortem) Holding-out as Partner The English Court of Appeal held that it was insufficient for a client to claim that a lawyer in the firm was a partner simply because his name appeared in the firm name whereas, in fact, the defendant was only an employee of the firm. While the client relied on a negligent title report, it did not establish that it relied on the representation that the defendant was a partner: Nationwide Anglia Building Society v. Lewis, 1998 WL 1044017, [1998] WLUK 522 (C.A.).