

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. TEN YEARS AFTER *CARTER*: THE EVOLUTION OF A LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND SIGNIFICANT SHORTCOMINGS RELATED TO MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING (MAID) IN CANADA

I. OVERVIEW

§ 1:1 Introduction

II. MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING IN CANADA—A PRIMER

§ 1:2 From *Rodriguez to Carter*

§ 1:3 A Second Chance to Secure a Right to MAiD: *Carter v. Canada (Attorney General)*

§ 1:4 After *Carter*: A Brief, Interim Period: Extension and Exemptions from the Supreme Court

§ 1:5 After *Carter*: Parliament's Response

§ 1:6 *Truchon* Addresses Foreseeability of Death

§ 1:7 Legislative Revisions

III. DIVISION OF POWERS

§ 1:8 Generally

IV. PRESENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR MAID

§ 1:9 Today's *Criminal Code*

§ 1:10 —Who May Provide MAiD

§ 1:11 —Who May Receive MAiD—Reasonable Foreseeability of Death

§ 1:12 — —No Reasonable Foreseeability of Death

§ 1:13 —Who May Not Receive MAiD

§ 1:14 Provinces

§ 1:15 —Alberta

§ 1:16 —Ontario

§ 1:17 —Manitoba

**V. JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT—CASES SINCE
CARTER**

- § 1:18 Generally
- § 1:19 Nova Scotia’s Court of Appeal: *Sorenson v. Swinemar*
- § 1:20 Alberta Weighs In: *WV v. MV*
- § 1:21 Moving Forward: Is the Approval of MAiD Justiciable?

VI. SUMMARY OF MAiD

- § 1:22 Canada and MAiD Today
- § 1:23 The Role of Courts in MAiD
- § 1:24 Comparative Analysis Across Non-Canadian Jurisdictions

VII. FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

- § 1:25 Mental Health
- § 1:26 Alberta Government Engagement

VIII. CONCLUSION

- § 1:27 Generally

**CHAPTER 2. CIVIL RULES REVIEW—
PHASE 2 CONSULTATION PAPER: THE
LAW’S DELAY**

I. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

- § 2:1 Generally

II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF RULE AMENDMENTS

- § 2:2 Generally

**III. PART 1: THE CONSULTATION PAPER’S
INTRODUCTION**

- § 2:3 Generally

**IV. PART 2: THE CONSULTATION PAPER’S
OVERVIEW**

- § 2:4 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

V. PART 3: SETTING THE TONE—THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSULTATION PAPER

§ 2:5 Generally

VI. PART 4: THE WORKING GROUP'S PROPOSALS FOR CLAIMS

§ 2:6 Pre-Litigation Processes

§ 2:7 Commencing a Claim

§ 2:8 Assignment of the One Year Scheduling Conference

§ 2:9 Service

§ 2:10 Amending Pleadings

§ 2:11 Default Proceedings

§ 2:12 Discontinuing an Action

VII. PART 5: DISCOVERY AND THE WORKING GROUP'S UP-FRONT EVIDENCE MODEL

§ 2:13 Generally

VIII. PART 6: THE UP-FRONT EVIDENCE MODEL PROCESS

§ 2:14 Scheduling Conferences

§ 2:15 Direction Conferences

IX. PART 7: SUMMARY HEARINGS AND THE PAPER-RECORD+ PROCESS

§ 2:16 Presumptive Summary Hearings

§ 2:17 Non-presumptive Summary Hearings

X. PART 8: REFORMING MOTIONS PRACTICE

§ 2:18 Curbing Motions Practice

§ 2:19 A Proposed New Interlocutory Dispute Process

§ 2:20 Materials Filed When Seeking Interlocutory Relief

§ 2:21 Pleadings Motions

XI. PART 9: PRE-TRIAL AND TRIAL PROCEDURES

§ 2:22 Alternative Dispute Resolution

§ 2:23 Trial Management Conferences

XII. PART 10: EXPERT EVIDENCE

§ 2:24 Generally

XIII. PART 11: DELAYS AND COSTS

- § 2:25 Delay
- § 2:26 Costs

XIV. PART 12: POST-TRIAL PROCESSES

- § 2:27 Appeals
- § 2:28 Enforcement

XV. PART 13: MISCELLANEOUS

- § 2:29 Generally

XVI. CONCLUSION

- § 2:30 Generally

**CHAPTER 3. THE TIME HAS COME TO
MOVE ON FROM THE RULE IN *BROWNE
V. DUNN* IN CIVIL PROCEEDINGS IN
ONTARIO**

- § 3:1 Introduction
- § 3:2 Historical Background and Stated Purpose of the
Rule in *Browne v. Dunn*
- § 3:3 Recent Application of the Rule in *Browne v. Dunn*
- § 3:4 The Rule in *Browne v. Dunn* Should Go to Weight
and Not Exclusion
- § 3:5 Conclusion

**CHAPTER 4. A FEW THOUGHTS ON
LITIGATING INSURANCE COVERAGE
DISPUTES**

- § 4:1 Overview
- § 4:2 Introduction—Insurance and Commercial Insurance
in a Nutshell
- § 4:3 A Time and Preferred Procedure to Determine
Different Contract Rights
- § 4:4 —Pre-trial Rulings on Indemnity Are Almost Always
Premature
- § 4:5 —Duty to Defend Issues Are Only Between Insurer
and Policyholder
- § 4:6 —Is a Subrogation Waiver Defence Moot Absent a
Payment?
- § 4:7 Discussion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:8 —Indemnity Usually Awaits Trial or Settlement
- § 4:9 —An Insurer’s Duty to Defend Should Be Determined Early On
- § 4:10 —Waiver of Subrogation Defences Are Not Moot
- § 4:11 What About the House Fire . . .
- § 4:12 Concluding Remarks

**CHAPTER 5. BUT FIRST, CAUSATION:
TRACING THE RIPPLE EFFECTS OF
ARMSTRONG**

- § 5:1 Overview
- § 5:2 *Armstrong*—The Trial Decision
- § 5:3 —The Split Panel at the Court of Appeal
- § 5:4 —The Supreme Court Decision
- § 5:5 The Fall-Out From *Armstrong*
- § 5:6 *Knight v. Lawson*, 2023 ONSC 570 (Ont. S.C.J.)
- § 5:7 *Dallner v. Gladwell*, 2024 ONSC 6557 (Ont. S.C.J.)
- § 5:8 *Szeto v. Kives*, 2024 ONSC 7258 (Ont. S.C.J.)
- § 5:9 The Ripple Effects of *Armstrong*
- § 5:10 —The Return of *Res Ipsa Loquitur*?

**CHAPTER 6. SQUARE PEGS, ROUND
HOLES—CONVERSION’S POOR FIT WITH
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

I. OVERVIEW

- § 6:1 Introduction

**II. *TAR HEEL* AND *DEL GIUDICE*—THE SAME
RESULT, YET A GAP REMAINS**

- § 6:2 *Tar Heel*
- § 6:3 *Del Giudice*

**III. A PROPRIETY INTEREST IN
“CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION?”—THE
UNEASY FIT**

- § 6:4 Generally

**IV. OTHER TORTS ALREADY PROTECT THE
CONFIDENTIAL CHARACTER OF
INFORMATION**

- § 6:5 Generally

V. PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER—CONCEPTUAL CLARITY REQUIRED

§ 6:6 Generally

**CHAPTER 7. BACK TO *EARTHCO*:
LANDING ON THE LIMITS OF APPELLATE
INTERVENTION IN CONTRACTUAL
INTERPRETATION**

I. INTRODUCTION

§ 7:1 Generally

**II. *SATTVA* AND THE STANDARD OF REVIEW
FOR CONTRACTUAL INTERPRETATION:
“MIXED FACT AND LAW”**

§ 7:2 Traditional Descriptions of “Pure Questions of Law”

§ 7:3 The Modern Framework for Contractual
Interpretation

**III. *PINNACLE V. TORSTAR (ONSC)*: DECISION
AT FIRST INSTANCE**

§ 7:4 Background

§ 7:5 The Leased Premises: Office Tower and Open Air
Warehouse Space

§ 7:6 Assignment and Subletting Rights in the Pinnacle
Lease

§ 7:7 Torstar’s Sublease with Boreal

§ 7:8 Torstar’s Use of the Warehouse

§ 7:9 Pinnacle’s Allegation of “Profit” by Torstar

§ 7:10 Pinnacle’s Motion for Payment by Torstar of Net
“Profit”

§ 7:11 The Motion Judge’s Interpretation of Article 8.1 of
the Pinnacle Lease

**IV. *PINNACLE V. TORSTAR*: REVERSAL BY THE
ONTARIO COURT OF APPEAL**

§ 7:12 Appellate Standard of Review

§ 7:13 Interpretation of “Profits” and “Reasonable Costs”

§ 7:14 Governing Legal Principles Applied

§ 7:15 Factual Matrix of Surrounding Circumstances

§ 7:16 First Legal Error: Failure to Consider the Factual
Matrix

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:17 Second Legal Error: Failure to Consider the Boreal Sublease as a Whole
- § 7:18 Third Legal Error: Failure to Avoid a Commercially Absurd Result
- § 7:19 Disposition

V. PINNACLE V. TORSTAR (ONCA): BROWN JA'S DISSENTING OPINION

- § 7:20 Overview
- § 7:21 Revisiting *Sattva*
- § 7:22 Attending to *Earthco*
- § 7:23 No “Extricable Questions of Law”
- § 7:24 Concluding Comments

CHAPTER 8. FROM PRECEDENT TO PROCEDURE: THE EVOLUTION OF ONTARIO'S DISCLOSURE OBLIGATION FOR PARTIAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

- § 8:1 Introduction
- § 8:2 Types of Partial Settlement Agreements
- § 8:3 —Pierringer Agreements
- § 8:4 —Mary Carter Agreements
- § 8:5 —Other Types of Agreements
- § 8:6 Duty to Disclose: Development of the Common Law
- § 8:7 —The Rationale for Disclosure
- § 8:8 —Test on a Motion
- § 8:9 —Continued Application of the Test
- § 8:10 —Other Approaches
- § 8:11 Duty to Disclose: Development of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*
- § 8:12 —Rule 49.14
- § 8:13 Rule 49.14—Before the Court
- § 8:14 New Ontario *Rules of Civil Procedure*
- § 8:15 Conclusion

CHAPTER 9. PREFERABLY PREDOMINANT: A REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE PREFERABILITY ANALYSIS FOR ONTARIO CLASS PROCEEDINGS

- § 9:1 Generally

- § 9:2 Introduction to Ontario Class Proceedings and the Preferability Analysis
- § 9:3 The 2020 Amendments to Ontario’s Preferability Criterion—The Law Commission Class Actions Report and Bill 161
- § 9:4 Ontario Courts’ Application of the Amendments—The First Application: *Banman v. Ontario*, 2023 ONSC 6187
- § 9:5 —Interpreting *Banman*: Other Applications of the New Preferability Analysis
- § 9:6 Preferability in Ontario Going Forward: The Likely Application of *Banman*

CHAPTER 10. IS IT TOO LATE NOW TO SAY SORRY? PREVENTING CLASS ACTION DELAY VERSUS JUSTIFYING IT: THE ONTARIO COURT OF APPEAL WEIGHS IN

- § 10:1 Introduction
- § 10:2 Class Actions Post-*Hyrniak*
- § 10:3 Combating Delay in Class Actions: *Tataryn* and *Barbiero* Court of Appeal Decisions
- § 10:4 Jurisprudence Based on Section 29.1(1) of the CPA
- § 10:5 —Stricter Application of Section 29.1(1) of the CPA
- § 10:6 —A More Contextual Approach to Section 29.1(1) of the CPA
- § 10:7 *Tataryn v. Diamond & Diamond LLP* Motion Decision
- § 10:8 *Tataryn v. Diamond & Diamond LLP* Court of Appeal Decision
- § 10:9 *Barbiero v. Pollack* Motion Decision
- § 10:10 *Barbiero v. Pollack* Court of Appeal Decision
- § 10:11 Where Are We Headed?

CHAPTER 11. WHEN WORLDS COLLIDE: INDIGENOUS RIGHTS V. CHARTER RIGHTS—CASE COMMENT ON *DICKSON V. VUNTUT GWITCHIN FIRST NATION*

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 11:1 Generally

II. BACKGROUND

- § 11:2 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:3 Indigenous Peoples and Canada’s Modern Constitution
- § 11:4 The Vuntut Gwitchin
- § 11:5 The VGFN’s Land Claims Settlement and Self-Government Agreement

III. CASE HISTORY

- § 11:6 Generally
- § 11:7 Facts
- § 11:8 Supreme Court of Yukon
- § 11:9 Court of Appeal of Yukon
- § 11:10 —Justice Newbury, for the Majority
- § 11:11 —Justice Frankel, Dissenting in Part
- § 11:12 Supreme Court of Canada
- § 11:13 —Justices Kasirer and Jamal, for the Majority
- § 11:14 —Justices Martin and O’Bonsawin, Dissenting
- § 11:15 —Justice Rowe, Concurring in the Result

IV. DISCUSSION

- § 11:16 Generally
- § 11:17 Section 32: Does the *Charter* Apply to Self-Governing Indigenous Nations?
- § 11:18 —Indigenous Rights of Self-Government
- § 11:19 —The Majority’s Approach: Delegated Authority from Parliament
- § 11:20 —The Concurring and Dissenting Judgments: Implications of Recognizing an Inherent Right
- § 11:21 Section 25: When Will Aboriginal Rights Prevail Over *Charter* Rights?
- § 11:22 —Comparing Aboriginal Rights and *Charter* Rights
- § 11:23 —“Shield” or “Interpretive Prism” (and Does It Matter)?
- § 11:24 —Justice Rowe’s View: Section 25 Relieves Federal and Provincial Action from *Charter* Review
- § 11:25 —The Majority and Dissenting Justices: “Indigenous Difference” and Applying Section 25

V. CONCLUSION

- § 11:26 Generally

CHAPTER 12. NATIONAL SECURITY DISCLOSURE CONTROLS IN CIVIL LITIGATION: AN UNEASY UNION

- § 12:1 Overview

ANNUAL REVIEW OF CIVIL LITIGATION

- § 12:2 *Sakab Saudi Holding Company v. Canada (Attorney General)*
- § 12:3 The Tripartite Test
- § 12:4 The Impact of Privilege
- § 12:5 Weighing the Public Interest
- § 12:6 In Conclusion: What Matters in Civil Claims

Table of Cases

Index