

Publisher’s Note

An Update has Arrived in Your Library for:

Please circulate this notice to anyone in your office who may be interested in this publication. <i>Distribution List</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>DISCRIMINATION AND THE LAW</p> <p>Release No. 6, August 2025</p>

A comprehensive review of human rights issues, this valuable reference tool contains: a legal history of discrimination in Canada; definitions of discrimination and affirmative action; an exhaustive analysis of case law — from every board of inquiry, tribunal or court, including illuminating comparisons to British and American practice; and practical insights into the administration and enforcement of human rights legislation.

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.

What's New in this Update:

This release features updates to Chapter 9. Sex.

Highlights

Chapter 9 — IV. Pregnancy: A Special Case? — § 9:21 Introduction — In *Li v. CMR Kumra Medicine Professional Corporation*, 2025 HRTO 399, the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal found that a receptionist returning from maternity leave was discriminated against based on sex and family status when her employer increased her hours from 30 to 45 per week and reassigned her to a different office to keep her maternity leave replacement in her original role. The applicant resigned and filed a complaint, and the Tribunal awarded her lost wages and \$20,000 in damages for injury to her dignity, feelings, and self-respect. In *Noble v. 1461911 Ontario Inc. cob as Pasta Tree Smokehouse Restaurant*, 2025 HRTO 1003 (Ont. Human Rights Trib.), the Tribunal concluded that the applicant's pregnancy was a factor in the termination of her employment when that termination occurred one day after she had provided her employer with a doctor's note stating that she needed to be off work for medical issues related to her pregnancy (she had already informed the respondent that she was pregnant). That conclusion was bolstered by the fact that the respondent told the applicant, who was a server, that she was being terminated due to a shortage of work but then posted an employment search for servers on an employment search website.