

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>
☐
☐
☐
☐

THE ANNOTATED INSURANCE ACT OF ONTARIO

John P. Weir

Release No. 6, July 2026

This comprehensive four-volume service provides the entire *Insurance Act* of Ontario, with amendments, exhaustive case annotations, Schedules and Regulations as well as a wide range of annotated Related Statutes and Regulations. Other features include cross-referencing to legislation in other provinces, expert and informative commentaries, and bibliographies for selected key sections.

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

This release features the addition of recent Licence Appeal Tribunal decisions in Appendix C15.

The applicant argued that limiting compensation for family members to their demonstrated economic loss violates the *Ontario Human Rights Code* based on family status and disability. The Tribunal found that these provisions do not violate the Code as they apply universally to all service providers and do not discriminate based on the identified protected grounds. *Villella v. Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company*, 2025 CarswellOnt 18220.

The respondent filed a motion seeking to determine if the Tribunal possessed the jurisdiction to adjudicate an applicant's status within the Minor Injury Guideline (MIG) as a standalone issue. The Tribunal found that it does not have the jurisdiction to determine whether an applicant falls within the MIG in the absence of a related underlying dispute regarding a specific benefit or claim. *Cunningham v. Certas Home and Auto Insurance Company*, 2025 CarswellOnt 18226.

The applicant's key expert witness failed to respond to a summons to appear for the second time in two separate proceedings. Applying binding Divisional Court precedents in *Plante* and *Vivekanantham*, the Tribunal found that allowing the expert's reports to be entered into evidence unchallenged would be procedurally unfair to the respondent. As a result, the Tribunal ruled that the reports authored by that expert would be given no weight. *Mansuri v. The Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company*, 2025 CarswellOnt 19758.