

**SUPREME COURT  
OF CANADA**



**COUR SUPRÊME  
DU CANADA**

**BULLETIN OF  
PROCEEDINGS**

**BULLETIN DES  
PROCÉDURES**

*This Bulletin is published at the direction of the Registrar and is for general information only. It is not to be used as evidence of its content, which, if required, should be proved by Certificate of the Registrar under the Seal of the Court. While every effort is made to ensure accuracy, no responsibility is assumed for errors or omissions.*

*Ce Bulletin, publié sous l'autorité de la registraire, ne vise qu'à fournir des renseignements d'ordre général. Il ne peut servir de preuve de son contenu. Celle-ci s'établit par un certificat du registraire donné sous le sceau de la Cour. Rien n'est négligé pour assurer l'exactitude du contenu, mais la Cour décline toute responsabilité pour les erreurs ou omissions.*

*Subscriptions may be had at \$200 per year, payable in advance, in accordance with the Court tariff. During Court sessions it is usually issued weekly.*

*Le prix de l'abonnement, fixé dans le tarif de la Cour, est de 200 \$ l'an, payable d'avance. Le Bulletin paraît en principe toutes les semaines pendant les sessions de la Cour.*

*The Bulletin, being a factual report of recorded proceedings, is produced in the language of record. Where a judgment has been rendered, requests for copies should be made to the Registrar, with a remittance of \$10 for each set of reasons. All remittances should be made payable to the Receiver General for Canada.*

*Le Bulletin rassemble les procédures devant la Cour dans la langue du dossier. Quand un arrêt est rendu, on peut se procurer les motifs de jugement en adressant sa demande au registraire, accompagnée de 10 \$ par exemplaire. Le paiement doit être fait à l'ordre du Receveur général du Canada.*

## CONTENTS

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

---

Applications for leave to appeal filed	922-923	Demandes d'autorisation d'appel déposées
Applications for leave submitted to Court since last issue	924-928	Demandes soumises à la Cour depuis la dernière parution
Oral hearing ordered	-	Audience ordonnée
Oral hearing on applications for leave	-	Audience sur les demandes d'autorisation
Judgments on applications for leave	929-932	Jugements rendus sur les demandes d'autorisation
Judgment on motion	-	Jugement sur requête
Motions	933-934	Requêtes
Notice of reference	-	Avis de renvoi
Notices of appeal filed since last issue	935	Avis d'appel déposés depuis la dernière parution
Notices of intervention filed since last issue	-	Avis d'intervention déposés depuis la dernière parution
Notices of discontinuance filed since last issue	-	Avis de désistement déposés depuis la dernière parution
Appeals heard since last issue and disposition	-	Appels entendus depuis la dernière parution et résultat
Pronouncements of appeals reserved	-	Jugements rendus sur les appels en délibéré
Rehearing	-	Nouvelle audition
Headnotes of recent judgments	-	Sommaires des arrêts récents
Agenda	-	Calendrier
Summaries of the cases	-	Résumés des affaires
Notices to the Profession and Press Release	-	Avis aux avocats et communiqué de presse
Deadlines: Appeals	936	Délais: Appels
Judgments reported in S.C.R.	-	Jugements publiés au R.C.S.

**APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE TO  
APPEAL FILED**

**Keyvan Nourhaghighi**  
Keyvan Nourhaghighi  
  
v. (30350)

**Canadian Human Rights Commission, et al. (F.C.)**  
Andrea Wright  
Canadian Human Rights Commission

FILING DATE: 30.4.2004

---

**Sandra Buschau, et al.**  
John N. Laxton, Q.C.  
Laxton & Company  
  
v. (30331)

**Rogers Communications Incorporated (formerly  
known as Rogers Cablesystems Incorporated), et  
al. (B.C.)**  
Irwin G. Nathanson, Q.C.  
Nathanson, Schachter & Thompson

FILING DATE: 10.5.2004

---

**Ville de Québec**  
Roch Simard  
Boutin & Associés  
  
c. (30351)

**André Beaurivage, et autres (Qc)**  
Suzanne Gagné  
Létourneau & Gagné

DATE DE PRODUCTION : 13.5.2004

---

**Le Sous-ministre du Revenu du Québec**  
Alain-François Meunier  
Veillette & Associés  
  
c. (30347)

**Constructions Beauce Atlas Inc. (Qc)**  
Gérald Tremblay, c.r.  
Duval, Brochu, Tremblay & Associés

DATE DE PRODUCTION : 14.5.2004

---

**DEMANDES D'AUTORISATION  
D'APPEL DÉPOSÉES**

**Benoît Proulx**  
Pierre Fournier  
Fournier Associés  
  
c. (30346)

**Sa Majesté la Reine (C.F.)**  
Nadine Dupuis  
Direction des affaires fiscales

DATE DE PRODUCTION : 14.5.2004

---

**Eli Stewart Nicholas**  
Anil K. Kapoor  
  
v. (30337)

**Her Majesty the Queen (Ont.)**  
Joan Barrett  
Attorney General of Ontario

FILING DATE: 14.5.2004

---

**The Corporation of the Town of Hearst, et al.**  
Kirk F. Stevens  
Lerners  
  
v. (30353)

**Fabien Ouellette (Ont.)**  
Lorenzo Girones  
Girones & Associates

FILING DATE: 18.5.2004

---

**Matthew Benjamin Barsoum a.k.a. Michael Paul  
Barsoum**  
Catherine Glaister  
  
v. (30358)

**Her Majesty the Queen (Ont.)**  
Lucy Cecchetto  
Attorney General of Ontario

FILING DATE: 19.5.2004

---

**Antony Tsai**

Antony Tsai

v. (30318)

**Theodore Pochwalowski (Ont.)**

Leo Klug

FILING DATE: 26.4.2004

---

---

**MAY 31, 2004 / LE 31 MAI 2004**

**CORAM: Chief Justice McLachlin and Major and Fish JJ.  
La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Major et Fish**

**Lawrence Cecil Robbins**

**v. (30241)**

**Her Majesty the Queen (Crim.) (Ont.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Criminal law - Offences - Applicant convicted of mischief for tying up his MPP's facsimile machine - Whether *Criminal Code* offense of mischief to property applies to a citizen exercising his or her fundamental right to communicate with his or her elected representative in the legislative assembly of the province - Whether conviction of Applicant violated his rights under ss. 1, 2(b), 7 and 15(1) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

November 22, 2000  
Ontario Court of Justice  
(Eddy J.)

Conviction: mischief

July 17, 2003  
Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
(Dawson J.)

Summary conviction appeal dismissed

January 27, 2004  
Court of Appeal for Ontario  
(Sharpe, Armstrong and Blair JJ.A.)

Application for leave to appeal allowed;  
Appeal dismissed

March 29, 2004  
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**Executive Director of the British Columbia Securities Commission**

**v. (30205)**

**Carl Glen Anderson, Douglas Victor Montaldi (B.C.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Administrative law - Judicial review - Tribunals - Securities Commission - Standard of review - Whether Court of Appeal erred in failing to apply the pragmatic and functional test to determine the appropriate standard of review for the decision of the Securities Commission - Commercial law - Securities - Fraud - Failure to inform investors of true state of affairs of company invested in - Whether Respondents perpetrated a fraud on investors - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in its interpretation of section 57 of the *Securities Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c.418.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

February 14, 2003 British Columbia Securities Commission (Aitken, Alexander and Milbourne)	Respondents found to have traded and distributed securities without being registered contrary to s. 34 and 61 of <i>Securities Act</i> ; to have made misrepresentations contrary to s.50(1)(d) of <i>Securities Act</i> ; to have perpetrated a fraud contrary to s.57(b) of <i>Securities Act</i> ; and to have acted contrary to the public interest in contravention of ss. 188 and 135 of the <i>Company Act</i>
March 7, 2003 British Columbia Securities Commission (Aitken, Alexander and Milbourne)	Respondents prohibited from acting as directors or officers of an issuer; administrative penalty of \$200,000 imposed on each Respondent.
January 9, 2004 Court of Appeal for British Columbia (Southin, Braidwood and Mackenzie JJ.A.)	Appeal allowed; findings of fraud and misrepresentation set aside; issue of failure to act in public interest sent back to Commission; sanctions set aside; Commission to reconsider sanctions following reconsideration of failure to act in public interest
March 8, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**CORAM: Iacobucci, Binnie and Arbour JJ.**  
**Les juges Iacobucci, Binnie et Arbour**

**Richard Morin**

**v. (30250)**

**Gilles Tourigny, Commission scolaire des Mille-Îles, Commission scolaire des Manoirs, Commission scolaire de Laval, Commission scolaire des Affluents (Qc)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

*Canadian Charter-Civil Rights-Labour Law-Labour relations-Must Civil Law be interpreted in a manner which is consistent with Charter principles?-Can provincial lower courts in the province of Quebec arbitrarily decide to refuse to examine allegations that rights, guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and by the Québec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms were infringed and instead conclude that the individual's claim of Charter violations could be addressed by the provisions of civil law?-If an individual, who is in an untenured work position, exercises a Charter right, can a continuation of that employment be denied because he exercised that right?*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

September 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2001 Superior Court of Quebec (Tessier J.)	Applicant's action in damages for loss of income, prejudice to his reputation and punitive damages pursuant to s. 49 of the Quebec <i>Charter</i> , dismissed
February 17, 2004 Court of Appeal of Quebec (Delisle, Chamberland and Morissette JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed

---

April 5, 2004  
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**Her Majesty the Queen**

**v. (30290)**

**Canada Trustco Mortgage Company (F.C.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Taxation - Income tax - General anti-avoidance rule - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in law in failing to consider the substance of the avoidance transactions entered into by the Respondent in determining whether they resulted in a misuse of the provisions of the *Income Tax Act* or an abuse having regard to the provisions of the *Act* read as a whole, within the meaning of section 245(4) of the *Income Tax Act* - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in law in holding that the avoidance transactions entered into by the Respondent did not result in a misuse of the provisions of the *Income Tax Act* or an abuse having regard to the provisions of the *Act* read as a whole, within the meaning of subsection 245(4) of the *Income Tax Act*.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

May 7, 2003  
Tax Court of Canada  
(Miller J.)

Respondent's appeal from assessments of tax made under the *Income Tax Act* for the 1996 and 1997 taxation years, allowed; assessments referred back to Minister for reconsideration and reassessment

February 11, 2004  
Federal Court of Appeal  
(Rothstein, Evans and Pelletier JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

April 13, 2004  
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**CORAM: Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps JJ.  
Les juges Bastarache, LeBel et Deschamps**

**Leon's Furniture Limited**

**v. (30061)**

**1497777 Ontario Inc. (Ont.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Property law - Landlord tenant - Leases - Remedies - Relief from forfeiture - Subleases - Application of prior consent to sublease to new sublease - What is the extent to which parties to leases, and contracts generally, must perform their contractual obligations to each other, and exercise any remedies available to them pursuant to the contract or lease, in good faith? - Can a court invoke its general equitable jurisdiction to grant relief from forfeiture where another statutory provision appears to preclude equitable relief?

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

June 21, 2002 Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Rivard J.)	Respondent's application for declaration that lease was terminated by Applicant's actions dismissed
September 24, 2003 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Morden, Weiler and Charron JJ.A.)	Appeal allowed and a declaration that the lease was terminated was issued. A trial of the issue of the claim for relief from forfeiture was directed.
November 24, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed
April 26, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada (Fish J.)	Motion to extend the time to file and/or serve leave application granted

---

**Audrey Sero**

**v. (30206)**

**Her Majesty the Queen (F.C.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Native law - Taxation - Income tax - Statutes - Interpretation - Whether interest earned on investments deposited in bank branch located on reserve is exempt from taxation - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in finding that subsection 461(4) of the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46 was limited to the purposes of the *Bank Act* and did not override the "connecting factors" test in *Williams v. The Queen*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 877 in determining the *situs* of the interest income earned on the deposits for the purpose of the tax exemption in s. 87 of the *Indian Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-5 - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in its application of the "connecting factors" test by placing the greatest weight on the activities of the Royal Bank itself whose relationship with the Applicant was one of debtor-creditor.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

May 25, 2001 Tax Court of Canada (Hamlyn J.)	Applicant's appeal from the assessment made under the <i>Income Tax Act</i> for the 1995 taxation year, dismissed
January 12, 2004 Federal Court of Appeal (Stone, Rothstein and Sharlow JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed
March 12, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

---



**Cyril Frazer**

**v. (30216)**

**Her Majesty the Queen (F.C.)**

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Native law - Taxation - Income tax - Statutes - Interpretation - Whether interest earned on investments deposited in bank branch located on reserve is exempt from taxation - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in finding that subsection 461(4) of the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46 was limited to the purposes of the *Bank Act* and did not override the “connecting factors” test in *Williams v. The Queen*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 877 in determining the *situs* of the interest income earned on the deposits for the purpose of the tax exemption in s. 87 of the *Indian Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-5 - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in its application of the “connecting factors” test by placing the greatest weight on the activities of the Royal Bank itself whose relationship with the Applicant was one of debtor-creditor.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

May 25, 2001  
Tax Court of Canada  
(Hamlyn J.)

Applicant’s appeal from assessment made under the *Income Tax Act* for the 1996 taxation year, dismissed

January 12, 2004  
Federal Court of Appeal  
(Stone, Rothstein and Sharlow JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

March 12, 2004  
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**JUDGMENTS ON APPLICATIONS  
FOR LEAVE**

**JUGEMENTS RENDUS SUR LES  
DEMANDES D'AUTORISATION**

---

**JUNE 3, 2004 / LE 3 JUIN 2004**

**30142**            **James Thomas Johnston v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick** (N.B.) (Civil)  
(By Leave)

Coram:            Iacobucci, Binnie and Arbour JJ.

The application for an extension of time is granted and the application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of New Brunswick, Number 27/03/CA, dated November 12, 2003, is dismissed with costs.

La demande de prorogation de délai est accordée et la demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel du Nouveau-Brunswick, numéro 27/03/CA, daté du 12 novembre 2003, est rejetée avec dépens.

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Administrative law - Judicial review - Complaint regarding Applicant's competency to practice safe medicine - College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick suspend Applicant's medical license - Request for Applicant to undergo psychiatric assessment - License suspended until such assessment - Can the Respondent College refuse to obey their own Regulation Number Eleven and refuse notice to applicant who refuses a psychiatric exam pursuant to R Section 58.7(i) and or 58.7(ii) of Medical Act of New Brunswick - Can Respondent College refuse applicant *Audit Alterem Partems* - Can Respondent College deny the applicant natural justice.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

July 28, 1999 Executive Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick	Applicant's license to practice medicine suspended and matter referred to the Respondent's Review Committee
September, 1999 Review Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick	Review Committee request that the Applicant undergo a psychiatric assessment and recommend to Council that the license suspension remain until request is met
June 15, 2002 Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick	Review Committee's recommendation accepted
November 29, 2002 Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New Brunswick	Council's consensus was that the matter remain before the Review Committee
November 12, 2003 Court of Appeal of New Brunswick (Rice, Larlee and Robertson JJ.A.)	Applicant's appeal of Council's decision dismissed
February 4, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada (Bastarache J.)	Motion to extend time to file and/or serve the leave application granted
February 11, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

**30198**            **María Sokolowska v. Ottawa Police Services** (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave)

Coram:            Iacobucci, Binnie and Arbour JJ.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Number C40320, dated January 6, 2004, is dismissed without costs.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, numéro C40320, daté du 6 janvier 2004, est rejetée sans dépens.

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Property law - Judgments and orders - Summary judgment - Property law - Sheriff's notice to vacate - Whether individuals who are municipal employees may be held liable for their criminal actions, as ordinary citizens are - Whether summary judgment may be used by an adverse entity as means of evading responsibility for destruction it causes and costs it produces.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

June 19, 2003 Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Forget J.)	Respondent's motion for summary judgment granted; Applicant's action dismissed
January 6, 2004 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Doherty, MacPherson and Simmons JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed
March 5, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**30225**            **Ville de Trois-Rivières c. Réginald Caumartin, Marie B. Caumartin, Lyne Caumartin et Jean M. Caumartin** (Qc) (Civile) (Autorisation)

Coram:            Les juges Iacobucci, Binnie et Arbour

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel du Québec (Québec), numéro 200-09-004044-027, daté du 13 janvier 2004, est rejetée avec dépens.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Quebec), Number 200-09-004044-027, dated January 13, 2004, is dismissed with costs.

**NATURE DE LA CAUSE**

Droit municipal - Responsabilité civile - Dommages-intérêts - Refoulement d'égouts - Effet rétroactif d'un règlement - *Code de plomberie du Québec - Loi sur les cités et villes* - Le règlement 12 s'applique-t-il aux immeubles des intimés quoique construits avant l'entrée en vigueur de ce règlement?

**HISTORIQUE DES PROCÉDURES**

Le 17 avril 2002 Cour supérieure du Québec (Le juge Richard)	Demanderesse condamnée à payer dommages-intérêts suite à inondation des bâtiments des intimés
--	--

---

Le 13 janvier 2004  
Cour d'appel du Québec  
(Les juges Beauregard, Morin et Rayle)

Appel accueilli en partie

Le 15 mars 2004  
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

---

**30162**            **James Edward Brandon, Sr. v. Gordon Peter Brandon, Jr., in his personal capacity** (Ont.) (Civil)  
(By Leave)

Coram:            **Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps JJ.**

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Number C38071, dated November 28, 2003, is dismissed with costs.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, numéro C38071, daté du 28 novembre 2003, est rejetée avec dépens.

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

Property law - *Inter vivos* gift - Undue influence - Presumption - Rebutting presumption - Barristers and solicitors - Independent legal advice - Content of legal advice required to rebut presumption - What standard must a lawyer meet in providing independent legal advice in an undue influence situation - On what basis should a court interfere with the right of an individual to divest their property as they see fit - How and when should the courts apply the presumption of undue influence?

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

March 8, 2002  
Ontario Superior Court of Justice  
(Howden J.)

Two trust agreements, a deed and an assignment of a mortgage declared invalid due to undue influence and set aside; mortgage declared unenforceable; cash judgments to the Applicant and Clara Brandon

November 28, 2003  
Court of Appeal for Ontario  
(Catzman, Abella [*dissenting*] and Simmons JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

January 26, 2004  
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

---

**30249**            **Steve Vassilantopoulos c. Ville de Montréal** (Qc) (Civile) (Autorisation)

Coram:            **Les juges Bastarache, LeBel et Deschamps**

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel du Québec (Montréal), numéro 500-09-012659-025, daté du 5 février 2004, est rejetée avec dépens.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Montreal), Number 500-09-012659-025, dated February 5, 2004, is dismissed with costs.

**NATURE DE LA CAUSE**

Droit municipal - Réforme de l'organisation territoriale municipale - Validité des actes antérieurs à la réforme - Requête pour jugement déclaratoire et mandamus - Obligation de la nouvelle Ville de Montréal - Option d'achat - Résolution - Le fait que le Ministre des affaires municipales et de la Métropole n'ait pas autorisé l'option d'achat et/ou l'aliénation du terrain après la levée de l'option d'achat par le demandeur, le 18 décembre 2001, peut-il avoir pour effet de faire perdre des droits au demandeur?

**HISTORIQUE DES PROCÉDURES**

Le 31 juillet 2002  
Cour supérieure du Québec  
(Le juge Crêteau)

Requête du demandeur pour jugement déclaratoire et en mandamus, rejetée; contestation de l'intimée accueillie

Le 5 février 2004  
Cour d'appel du Québec  
(Les juges Nuss, Forget et Morin)

Appel rejeté

Le 2 avril 2004  
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

---

---

21.5.2004

Before / Devant : THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR

**Motion to extend the time in which to serve and file the appellant's factum and book of authorities**

**Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer les mémoires et recueil de sources de l'appelant**

Daryl Milland Clark

v. (29976)

Her Majesty the Queen (Crim.) (B.C.)

**GRANTED / ACCORDÉE** Time extended to June 15, 2004.

---

28.5.2004

Before / Devant : THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR

**Motion to extend the time in which to serve and file the response of the respondents, Corporate Cars, a limited partnership of Tracmount/Glojack Leasing Ltd., 1063179 Ontario Ltd. and 676490 Alberta Limited**

**Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer la réponse des intimés Corporate Cars, a limited partnership of Tracmount/Glojack Leasing Ltd., 1063179 Ontario Ltd. et 676490 Alberta Limited**

H.J. Pfaff Motors Inc.

v. (30278)

Corporate Cars, a limited partnership of Tracmount/Glojack Ltd., et al. (Ont.)

**GRANTED / ACCORDÉE** Time extended to May 14, 2004.

---

28.5.2004

Before / Devant : THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR

**Motion to extend the time in which to serve and file the applicant's reply and to serve and file the appellant's response to the motion to quash**

**Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer la réplique du demandeur, et pour signifier et déposer la réponse de l'appelant à la requête en annulation**

Francisco Batista Pires

v. (30151)

Her Majesty the Queen (Crim.) (B.C.)

**GRANTED / ACCORDÉE** Time extended to May 25, 2004.

---

---

28.5.2004

Before / Devant : THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR

**Motion to extend the time to serve and file the appellant's response to the motion to quash**

**Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer la réponse de l'appellant à la requête en annulation**

Ronaldo Lising

v. (30240)

Her Majesty the Queen (Crim.) (B.C.)

**GRANTED / ACCORDÉE** Time extended to May 25, 2004.

---

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED SINCE  
LAST ISSUE**

**AVIS D'APPEL DÉPOSÉS DEPUIS LA  
DERNIÈRE PARUTION**

---

28.5.2004

**Her Majesty the Queen *ex rel* Linda Merk**

**v. (30090)**

**International Association of Bridge, Structural  
Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers, Local  
771 (Sask.)**

---

31.5.2004

**Her Majesty the Queen**

**v. (30063)**

**Stephen Frederick Marshall, et al. (N.S.)**

---



## DEADLINES: APPEALS

The Spring Session of the Supreme Court of Canada started April 13, 2004.

Pursuant to the *Supreme Court Act* and *Rules*, the following requirements for filing must be complied with before an appeal can be heard:

**Appellant's record; appellant's factum; and appellant's book(s) of authorities** must be filed within 12 weeks of the filing of the notice of appeal or 12 weeks from decision on the motion to state a constitutional question.

**Respondent's record (if any); respondent's factum; and respondent's book(s) of authorities** must be filed within eight weeks after the service of the appellant's documents.

**Intervener's factum and intervener's book(s) of authorities**, (if any), must be filed within eight weeks of the order granting leave to intervene or within 20 weeks of the filing of a notice of intervention under subrule 61(4).

**Parties' condensed book**, if required, must be filed on the day of hearing of the appeal.

The Registrar shall enter the appeal on a list of cases to be heard after the respondent's factum is filed or at the end of the eight-week period referred to in Rule 36.

## DÉLAIS : APPELS

La session du printemps de la Cour suprême du Canada a commencé le 13 avril 2004.

Conformément à la *Loi sur la Cour suprême* et aux *Règles*, il faut se conformer aux exigences suivantes avant qu'un appel puisse être entendu:

**Le dossier de l'appelant, son mémoire et son recueil de jurisprudence et de doctrine** doivent être déposés dans les douze semaines du dépôt de l'avis d'appel ou douze semaines de la décision de la requête pour formulation d'une question constitutionnelle.

**Le dossier de l'intimé (le cas échéant), son mémoire et son recueil de jurisprudence et de doctrine** doivent être déposés dans les huit semaines suivant la signification des documents de l'appelant.

**Le mémoire de l'intervenant et son recueil de jurisprudence et de doctrine**, le cas échéant, doivent être déposés dans les huit semaines suivant l'ordonnance autorisant l'intervention ou dans les vingt semaines suivant le dépôt de l'avis d'intervention visé au paragraphe 61(4).

**Le recueil condensé des parties**, le cas échéant, doivent être déposés le jour de l'audition de l'appel.

Le registraire inscrit l'appel pour audition après le dépôt du mémoire de l'intimé ou à l'expiration du délai de huit semaines prévu à la règle 36.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA SCHEDULE  
CALENDRIER DE LA COUR SUPREME

- 2003 -

04-07-2002

OCTOBER - OCTOBRE						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
			1	2	3	4
5	M 6	7	8	9	10	11
12	H 13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

NOVEMBER - NOVEMBRE						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
						1
2	M 3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	H 11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23 30	24	25	26	27	28	29

DECEMBER - DECEMBRE						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
	M 1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	H 25	H 26	27
28	29	30	31			

- 2004 -

JANUARY - JANVIER						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
				H 1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	M 12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

FEBRUARY - FÉVRIER						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	M 9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29						

MARCH - MARS						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	M 15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

APRIL - AVRIL						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
				1	2	3
	5	6	7	8	H 9	10
11	H 12	13	14	15	16	17
18	M 19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

MAY - MAI						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	M 10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	H 24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

JUNE - JUIN						
S D	M L	T M	W M	T J	F V	S S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	M 7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

Sittings of the court:  
Séances de la cour:

Motions:  
Requêtes:

Holidays:  
Jours fériés:

M
H

**18 sitting weeks/semaines séances de la cour**  
**87 sitting days/journées séances de la cour**  
**9 motion and conference days/ journées requêtes.conférences**  
**3 holidays during sitting days/ jours fériés durant les sessions**