

**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	204-205	Demandes d'autorisation d'appel déposées
Applications for leave submitted to Court since last issue	206-212	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	213-220	Jugements rendus sur les demandes d'autorisation
Judgment on motion	-	Jugement sur requête
Motions	221-224	Requêtes
Notice of reference	-	Avis de renvoi
Notices of appeal filed since last issue	225	Avis d'appel déposés depuis la dernière parution
Notices of intervention filed since last issue	226	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	227	Délais: Appels
Judgments reported in S.C.R.	-	Jugements publiés au R.C.S.

**APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE TO
APPEAL FILED**

Kirk Morgan Pynn

Bob Buckingham
Bob Buckingham Law Offices

v. (30129)

Her Majesty the Queen (N.L.)

Kathleen Healey
Attorney General of Newfoundland and
Labrador

FILING DATE: 12.1.2004

Edward Robert Larwill

Chris G. Paliare
Paliare, Roland, Rosenberg, Rothstein

v. (30144)

Shane Lanham (B.C.)

Skorah Doyle
Mark M. Skorah

FILING DATE: 19.1.2004

Sydney Abrahams, et al.

Larry J. Levine, Q.C.
Levine, Sherkin, Boussidan

v. (30147)

Bank of Montreal (Ont.)

R. Bruce Smith
Gowling, Lafleur, Henderson

FILING DATE: 21.1.2004

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

The Ontario Judges' Association, et al.

C. Michael Mitchell
Sack, Goldblatt, Mitchell

v. (30148)

**Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province
of Ontario, as represented by the Chair of
Management Board (Ont.)**

Lori R. Sterling
Attorney General of Ontario

FILING DATE: 22.1.2004

Fullercon Limited

Martin Z. Black

v. (30135)

City of Ottawa, et al. (Ont.)

Daniel Leduc
Lang, Michener

FILING DATE: 19.1.2004

Darlene Yellow Old Woman

Priscilla E.S. Kennedy
Parlee, McLaws

v. (30019)

Her Majesty the Queen (Alta.)

Tudor A.H. Beattie, Q.C.
Attorney General of Alberta

FILING DATE: 21.1.2004

John Jauvin

Pierre Sylvestre
Sylvestre, Charbonneau, Fafard &
Associés

c. (30152)

Le Procureur général du Québec, et autres (Qc)

Mario Normandin
Bernard, Roy & Associés

DATE DE PRODUCTION : 23.1.2004

Antony Tsai

Antony Tsai

v. (30141)

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

Philippe Dufresne
Canadian Human Rights Commission

FILING DATE: 23.1.2004

Andrew Davis

Gil D. McKinnon, Q.C.

v. (30155)

Her Majesty the Queen (B.C.)

John M. Gordon
Attorney General of British Columbia

FILING DATE: 27.1.2004

Allan Arthur Dunbar

Gil D. McKinnon, Q.C.

v. (30156)

Her Majesty the Queen (B.C.)

Gregory J. Fitch
Attorney General of British Columbia

FILING DATE: 27.1.2004

Paramjit Singh Sodhi

James Lockyer
Lockyer, Campbell

v. (30154)

Her Majesty the Queen (Ont.)

David Finley
Attorney General of Ontario

FILING DATE: 30.1.2004

Luis Cornejo

Terry S. Guerriero
Terry S. Guerriero Law Office

v. (30158)

Her Majesty the Queen (Ont.)

Susan Chapman
Attorney General of Ontario

FILING DATE: 26.1.2004

Ka-Fai Ng

Brian A. Beresh
Beresh, DePoe, Cunningham

v. (30159)

Her Majesty the Queen (Alta.)

Arnold Schlayer
Attorney General of Alberta

FILING DATE: 26.1.2004

FEBRUARY 2, 2004 / LE 2 FÉVRIER 2004

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

Christiano Daniel Justin Paice

v. (30045)

Her Majesty the Queen (Crim.) (Sask.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Defence - Statutes - Interpretation - Whether there is a consent fight at all when the deceased as in this case, and contrary to the situation in *Jobidon* was the aggressor throughout and delivered the first blow - Whether the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal was in error when it held that because the Applicant consented to fight it was not open to him to say that he did not provoke the assault on him, a required element of the self defence provision of section 34(1) of the *Criminal Code* - Whether the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal was in error when it equated the trial judge's finding that when the Applicant delivered his blows he intended to cause serious bodily harm of more than a transient or trifling nature to an intention to cause grievous bodily harm, contrary to the express finding of the trial judge, such as to negate the self defence provision found in section 34(1) of the *Criminal Code*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

November 18, 2002 Court of Queen's Bench of Saskatchewan (Kovach J.)	Applicant acquitted of a charge of manslaughter contrary to Section 236(b) of the <i>Criminal Code</i>
September 15, 2003 Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan (Gerwing, Sherstobitoff and Jackson JJ.A.)	Respondent's appeal allowed, acquittal set aside and a new trial ordered
November 14, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed
February 2, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada	Notice of oral hearing filed

Cecil Decorte

v. (30081)

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

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - Criminal - Police - Whether the Court of Appeal for Ontario erred in holding that members of the First Nations Anishinabek Police Service were police officers capable of undertaking a R.I.D.E. program not on reserve territory - Whether the Court of Appeal for Ontario erred in failing to hold that the evidence

obtained as a result of an unlawful stop and detention was not admissible as its admission offended section 7, 9 and 24 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

April 3, 2002 Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Zelinski J.)	Applicant convicted of failing to comply with recognizance contrary to s. 145(3) of the <i>Criminal Code</i> ; sentenced to 9 months imprisonment
September 12, 2003 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Catzman, Abella and Gillese JJ.A.)	Appeal against conviction and sentence dismissed
December 3, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal and motion to extend time filed

Hardeep Singh Bajwa

v. (30055)

Her Majesty the Queen (F.C.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Labour law - Unemployment insurance - Disqualification from receiving Employment Insurance benefits - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in determining the Applicant left his employment without just cause pursuant to ss. 29 and 30 of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 (the “*Act*”)

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

September 1, 2000 Regional Insurance Services of the Department of Human Resources Development Canada (“The Commission”)	Penalty of \$242.00 pursuant to s.38 of the <i>Act</i> imposed on the Applicant for false statements; Notice of violation pursuant to s.7.1 of the <i>Act</i> issued to the Applicant
September 21, 2000 Board of Referees - Employment Insurance (Philip, Chairperson, Weaver, Member, and Eliason [<i>dissenting</i>], Member)	Applicant’s appeal from the decisions of the Commission, dismissed
January 21, 2002 Office of the Umpire (Marin, Umpire)	Appeal dismissed
September 17, 2003 Federal Court of Appeal (Linden, Rothstein and Sexton JJ.A.)	Appeal on the issues of disqualification and Notice of Violation, dismissed; appeal on the issue of penalty for false statements, allowed; matter remitted to Chief Umpire to set aside penalty
October 14, 2003 Federal Court of Appeal (Linden, Rothstein and Sexton JJ.A.)	Order amended : appeal on the issue of disqualification, dismissed; appeal on the issues of Notice of Violation and penalty for false statements, allowed; matter

remitted to Chief Umpire to set aside penalty and Notice
of Violation

November 17, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal and motion for an
extension of time filed

Barbara Haight-Smith

v. (30112)

Attorney General of Canada (F.C.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Taxation - Administrative Law - Assessment - Appeal - Judicial review - Whether the Federal Court of Appeal erred in dismissing application for an extension of time to commence an application for judicial review - Whether the Tax Court of Canada erred in not addressing the 1999 taxation year in the appeal - Whether the Tax Court of Canada erred in the assessment of total expenses to be allowed pursuant to ss. 18(12) of the *Income Tax Act*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

September 6, 2002
Tax Court of Canada
(Little J.)

Applicant's appeals from assessments for 1997, 1998 and
1999 taxation years, allowed; assessments referred back to
Minister of National Revenue for reconsideration and
reassessment

October 28, 2003
Federal Court of Appeal
(Linden J.A.)

Motion for extension of time to file application for judicial
review, dismissed

December 29, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal and motion to extend time
filed

January 27, 2004
Supreme Court of Canada
(Major J.)

Motion for extension of time, granted

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

Richard Condo

v. (30042)

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

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Elements of Offence - Aggravated Assault - Sentencing - Long Term Offender Designation - Did the prosecutor fail to prove the elements of the offence of aggravated assault? - At a dangerous or long-term offender hearing can prior discreditable conduct be considered in determining whether an untried allegation of criminal offence has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt? - Did the Court err in its reliance on hearsay to prove untried allegations? - In cases where the sentencing judge has declined to make a dangerous offender designation, does the accused retain the right to be heard prior to the judge making a long-term offender designation? - How should "substantial risk" to re-offend be interpreted for purposes of determining whether a long-term offender designation should be made? - Is proof of a pattern of criminal behaviour necessary prior to designating an offender a long-term offender? - What are the factors to be considered in determining the length of a long-term supervision order? - When an accused has been designated a long-term offender, are the general principles of sentencing still applicable to the sentencing of the accused for the predicate offences? - Does a sentencing judge retain the duty to consider the aboriginal background of an offender in sentencing an accused who has been designated a long-term offender? - Did the Court err in refusing to give a two for one credit for pre-trial custody? - Are the general principles of sentencing applicable to the length of a long-term supervision order?

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

April 14, 2000 Ontario Court of Justice (MacPhee J.)	Applicant convicted of criminal harassment, assault, breach of bail conditions, threatening to cause death, kidnapping and aggravated assault contrary respectively to ss. 264(1), 266, 145(3), 264.1, 279(1.1) and 268 of the <i>Criminal Code</i>
July 26, 2001 Ontario Court of Justice (MacPhee J.)	Applicant sentenced to 8 years of imprisonment pursuant to s. 753(5)(a)
September 9, 2003 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Catzman, Abella and Gillese JJ.A.)	Appeal against conviction dismissed; appeal against designation as long term offender dismissed; appeal against sentence dismissed
November 10, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed
January 5, 2004 Supreme Court of Canada (Iacobucci J.)	Applications for extension of time to file and serve leave application granted

Kwok Yung Chan

v. (30007)

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

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Narcotics - Possession for the purposes of trafficking - Attempted possession for the purposes of trafficking - Police conduct a "controlled delivery" of an intercepted shipment of heroin by replacing all but one gram of heroin with wooden blocks and a transmitter and tracing shipment - Whether use of a controlled delivery should only permit a conviction for lesser include offence of attempted possession for the purpose of trafficking.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

April 25, 2000	Applicant found guilty of possession of heroin for the
----------------	--

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
(Gans J.)

purpose of trafficking: sentenced to 10 years imprisonment

August 19, 2003
Court of Appeal for Ontario
(Simmons, Catzman and Feldman JJ.A.)

Applicant's appeals against conviction and sentence dismissed

October 20, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

Lily Elaine Burnett

v. (29987)

Workers' Compensation Board (B.C.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter – Civil – Workers compensation – Equality rights – Age discrimination – Widow of deceased worker with dependent child losing survivor pension when child no longer a dependent – Widow under age forty when pension terminated – British Columbia *Workers' Compensation Act* providing for continuation of monthly pension only where surviving spouse is disabled or over age 40 when child ceases to be dependent – Whether application raises issues of public importance in Canada involving the interpretation and application of s. 15(1) of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, such as to warrant leave to appeal – Whether B.C. Court of Appeal judgment inconsistent with decisions of courts in other jurisdictions across Canada – *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, s.15(1).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

July 25, 2002
Supreme Court of British Columbia
(Holmes J.)

Applicant's application for judicial review of a decision by the Respondent allowed: declaration that s.17(4) of the *Workers Compensation Act* and the decision of the Respondent both violate s.15 of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*

July 2, 2003
Court of Appeal of British Columbia
(Newbury, Braidwood and Levine JJ.A.)

Respondent's appeal allowed

October 1, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

December 15, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada
Fish, J.S.C.C.

Applicant's motion to extend time to file and / or to serve application for leave, granted

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

Pierre-Yves Deragon

v. (29972)

Sa Majesté la Reine (Crim.) (Qc)

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Droit criminel - Infractions - Preuve - Défense - Entrave à la justice - Fabrication et utilisation de faux - Divulgation de la preuve - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en droit en concluant que la narration policière, préparée par le demandeur à la demande de la poursuite, pouvait constituer un faux document au sens des art. 321 et 366 du *Code criminel*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-46? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en droit en concluant que l'absence de *mens rea* du demandeur, d'avoir tenté de contrecarrer le cours de la justice en cherchant à influencer son confrère, n'était pas incompatible avec le verdict de culpabilité d'avoir contrecarré la justice en altérant la preuve? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en droit dans son interprétation du privilège de non-divulgation de la preuve de documents, préparés par des avocats du poursuivant ("work product"), quant à l'opportunité de poursuivre une infraction lorsque l'accusation d'entrave à la justice concerne ladite infraction? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en droit en concluant que le juge de première instance était justifié, dans les circonstances, de donner des directives sur la défense d'erreur de faits?

HISTORIQUE DES PROCÉDURES

Le 22 décembre 1999
Cour supérieure du Québec
(Le juge Fréchette)

Verdict: Demandeur déclaré coupable de tentative d'entrave au cours de la justice, de fabrication de faux et d'usage de document contrefait contrairement aux art. 139(2), 367 et 368(1)a) et c) du *Code criminel*

Le 22 juin 2000
Cour supérieure du Québec
(Le juge Fréchette)

Peine: une année d'emprisonnement

Le 30 septembre 2003
Cour d'appel du Québec
(Les juges Gendreau, Mailhot et Dalphond)

Appel à l'encontre de la condamnation et de la peine rejeté

Le 21 novembre 2003
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

Christopher Carter et Gilles Dextrateur

c. (30060)

Louise Glegg

- et entre -

Smith & Nephew inc.

c. (30060)

Louise Glegg (Qc)

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Libertés publiques - Responsabilité civile - Secret professionnel - Droit au respect de la vie privée - Accès au dossier psychiatrique dans le cadre d'une poursuite en responsabilité civile alors que des dommages au titre d'un préjudice psychologique sont réclamés - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en ordonnant au juge de première instance de déterminer quelles parties du dossier psychiatrique de l'intimée devaient être communiquées aux demandeurs?

HISTORIQUE PROCÉDURAL

Le 27 février 2003 Cour supérieure du Québec (Le juge Baker)	Objection de l'intimée à la communication de son dossier psychiatrique rejetée
Le 26 septembre 2003 Cour d'appel du Québec (Les juges Baudouin, Forget et Biron [<i>ad hoc</i>])	Appel accueilli
Le 24 novembre 2003 Cour suprême du Canada	Première demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée
Le 25 novembre 2003 Cour suprême du Canada	Deuxième demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

Joanne Leonelli-Contino

v. (30100)

Joseph Contino (Ont.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Family law - Maintenance - *Child Support Guidelines* - Shared custody - Support payor paying Table amount for support of one child - Support payor increasing to 50 per cent his time with child - Impact on child support payments - Whether there is a presumption in favour of a child's entitlement to support in accordance with the Guidelines or the parent's entitlement to a reduction - Whether onus is on payor seeking deviation or on recipient - Whether all s. 9 factors are to be considered and given equal weight - Whether deviation from *Guideline* amount is discretionary if parental time exceeds 40 per cent - Whether evidence of child's actual needs, conditions and means required before deviation will be granted, or is a formula to be applied in the absence of evidence - *Federal Child Support Guidelines*, SOR/97-175, s. 9

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

May 16, 2001 Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Rogers J.)	Respondent's motion to reduce child support payments granted; Amount reduced to \$100 retroactive to September 2000
November 27, 2002 Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Divisional Court (Carnwath, Macdonald and Czutrin JJ.)	Appeal allowed; order set aside; Respondent ordered to pay \$688 per month in child support commencing September 1 st , 2000
October 28, 2003 Court of Appeal for Ontario (O'Connor A.C.J.O., Weiler and Rosenberg JJ.A.)	Appeal allowed; Divisional Court order set aside; Respondent ordered to pay child support in the amount of \$399.61 per month
December 24, 2003	Application for leave to appeal filed

Supreme Court of Canada

FEBRUARY 5, 2004 / LE 5 FÉVRIER 2004

29739 **Communauté urbaine de Montréal et Raoul Lacombe c. Alain André et Lorraine Drouin** (Qc)
(Civile) (Autorisation)

Coram: La juge en chef McLachlin et les juges Bastarache et Deschamps

La requête pour ajouter des affidavits additionnels est accordée et la requête en réexamen de la demande d'autorisation d'appel rejetée le 10 juillet 2003, est rejetée.

The motion to file supplementary affidavits is granted and the motion for reconsideration of the application for leave to appeal dismissed on July 10, 2003, is dismissed.

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Responsabilité civile - Dommages-intérêts - Responsabilité du Procureur général - Responsabilité des policiers - Poursuite abusive - Immunité - Quel est le critère de la responsabilité applicable partout au Canada à l'égard de la mise en œuvre par la police du processus criminel ? - Interprétation de *Nelles c. Ontario*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 170 et *Proulx c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 9.

HISTORIQUE PROCÉDURAL

Le 15 septembre 1999 Cour supérieure du Québec (Lefebvre j.c.s.)	Action en dommages de l'intimé André pour fausses accusations, poursuites criminelles abusives <i>et al</i> , accueillie; action de l'intimée Drouin pour atteinte à la réputation, perte de jouissance de la vie <i>et al</i> , accueillie; demandeurs et intervenants condamnés à payer 325 000\$ et 40 700\$ respectivement aux intimés André et Drouin
Le 27 février 2003 Cour d'appel du Québec (Baudouin, Proulx et Otis jj.c.a.)	Appel accueilli; action rejetée
Le 28 avril 2003 Cour suprême du Canada	Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

29693 **Her Majesty the Queen v. T.S.C.** (Ont.) (Criminal) (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 C36581, dated February 7, 2003, is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, numéro C36581, daté du 7 février 2003, est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Legislation - Interpretation - Sentencing - Sentence merger - Requirement to provide samples of bodily samples for forensic DNA analysis - Whether the Court of Appeal for Ontario erred in holding that the Respondent's

sentences did not merge pursuant to s. 139 of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* thus rendering him ineligible for the data bank pursuant to s. 487.055 of the *Criminal Code*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

October 26, 2000 Ontario Court of Justice (Payne J.)	Crown's <i>ex parte</i> application for authorization to take bodily samples for forensic DNA analysis dismissed for being brought out of time
June 18, 2001 Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Ferguson J.)	Applicant's application for an order of <i>certiorari</i> and <i>mandamus</i> dismissed
February 7, 2003 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Catzman Doherty and Cronk JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed
April 8, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

29836 **Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 38 v. Enmax Corporation, The Corporation of the City of Calgary and Alberta Labour Relations Board** (Alta.) (Civil) (By Leave)

Coram: Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps JJ.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Alberta (Calgary), Numbers 0301-0021AC and 0301-0026AC, dated April 22, 2003, is dismissed with costs to the Respondents, Enmax Corporation and The Corporation of the City of Calgary.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Alberta (Calgary), numéros 0301-0021AC et 0301-0026AC, daté du 22 avril 2003, est rejetée avec dépens en faveur des intimées, Enmax Corporation et The Corporation of the City of Calgary.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Labour law - Labour and employment - Bargaining rights - Successorship - Successor employer - Common law rights of employees - Transfer of employees without consent - Labour relations - *Labour Relations Code*, R.S.A. 2000, c. L-1 - Statutory interpretation - Whether the successorship provisions in the labour relations statutes have the effect of eliminating the fundamental common law right of unionized workers to choose their employer - Whether the common law has been usurped in a labour law context - Whether a power to transfer employees without their consent can be read into the successorship provisions of the labour relations statutes.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

April 11, 2001 Alberta Labour Relations Board (Asbell, Chair; Cooper and Halpen, Members)	Applicant's complaints of illegal lockout and interference with representation rights, dismissed
November 30, 2001 Alberta Labour Relations Board (Lucas, VChair; Daigle and Wevers, Members)	Application for reconsideration dismissed

December 20, 2002
Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
(Mason J.)

Applicant's request for judicial review granted; Respondent Board's decisions quashed

April 22, 2003
Court of Appeal of Alberta
(Conrad, Costigan and Wittmann JJ.A.)

Respondent's appeal allowed; judgment set aside; Respondent Board's Orders restored

June 17, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

29849 **Cabot Insurance Company Limited and Rex Gilbert Moore, deceased by his administratrix, Muriel Smith v. Peter Ryan** (N.L.) (Civil) (By Leave)

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

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Newfoundland and Labrador, Number 01/118, dated April 30, 2003, is granted with costs to the applicants in any event of the cause.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de Terre-Neuve et Labrador, numéro 01/118, daté du 30 avril 2003, est accordée avec dépens en faveur des demandeurs quelle que soit l'issue de l'appel.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Procedural law - Limitations of actions - Estoppel by convention - Settlement discussions - Whether estoppel in general, and estoppel by convention in particular, requires reliance by the party asserting the estoppel, and unconscionability on the part of the party sought to be estopped - Whether, if the Court of Appeal decision is allowed to stand, settlement claims prior to litigation would be discouraged, since they have at their basis the assumed truth of certain facts

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

October 22, 2001
Supreme Court of Newfoundland
(Orsborn J.)

Respondent's application to amend the statement of claim, granted; Applicant Cabot Insurance Company Limited's application for an order striking out the statement of claim, dismissed

April 30, 2003
Court of Appeal of Newfoundland & Labrador
(Wells C.J.N., Cameron [*dissenting*], Roberts, Welsh [*concurring in dissent*] JJ.A., and Russell J. [*ex officio*])

Appeal and cross-appeal allowed in part; amendment of the statement of claim allowed

June 26, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

30024 **Michael Barton Fargey v. Her Majesty the Queen** (Alta.) (Criminal) (By Leave)

Coram: **Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps 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 Alberta (Edmonton), Number 0303-0161-A, dated July 15, 2003, is dismissed.

La demande de prorogation du délai est accordée et la demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Alberta (Edmonton), numéro 0303-0161-A, daté du 15 juillet 2003, est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law (*Non-Charter*) - Offences - Care and control of a motor vehicle - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in concluding that the application for leave to appeal from the decision of the Summary Conviction Appeal Justice did not involve a question of law - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in concluding that if it did involve a question of law, it was not an issue of such importance as to warrant granting leave to appeal - Where it is established that the accused did not have the intention to drive, whether the potential that the accused might change his or her mind, can constitute the risk of danger that the vehicle will be put in motion and therefore establish care and control - Whether the offence of care and control can be proven by evidence of previous driving

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

September 23, 2002
Alberta Provincial Court
(Ketchum, P.C.J.)

Applicant was convicted of having care and control of a motor vehicle while impaired by alcohol or a drug contrary to s. 253(a) of the *Criminal Code*

April 30, 2003
Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
(Lee J.)

Applicant's appeal dismissed

July 15, 2003
Court of Appeal of Alberta
(Russell J.A.)

Application for leave to appeal, dismissed

November 3, 2003
Supreme Court of Canada

Applications for extension of time and leave to appeal filed

30027 **Marcel Gauthier c. Donald Caron, Sa Majesté du Chef du Québec et Carole Joly** (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 500-09-013538-038, daté du 8 septembre 2003, est rejetée avec dépens en faveur de l'intimée, Sa Majesté du Chef du Québec.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Montreal), Number 500-09-013538-038, dated September 8, 2003, is dismissed with costs to the Respondent, Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Quebec.

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Procédure – Procédure civile – Chose jugée – Intérêt juridique – Requête en autorisation d'appel – La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erronément refusé la permission d'appel? – Les instances inférieures étaient-elles justifiées de conclure à l'existence de la chose jugée et à l'absence d'intérêt du demandeur?

HISTORIQUE PROCÉDURAL

Le 21 mai 1997 Cour supérieure du Québec (Le juge Landry)	Requête de l'intimé Caron en bornage accueillie; ligne séparative établie
Le 21 novembre 2000 Cour d'appel du Québec (Les juges Beauregard, Rousseau-Houle et Nuss)	Appel rejeté
Le 4 novembre 2002 Cour supérieure du Québec (Le juge Isabelle)	Plan préparé par l'arpenteur-géomètre homologué
Le 28 mai 2003 Cour du Québec (Le juge Laurin)	Avis de dénonciation de l'intimé Caron d'un moyen de non-recevabilité pour chose jugée partiellement accueillie; requête de l'intimée Sa Majesté du Chef du Québec en irrecevabilité accueillie; requête introductive d'instance du demandeur rejetée
Le 8 septembre 2003 Cour d'appel du Québec (Le juge Chamberland)	Requête du demandeur pour permission d'en appeler rejetée
Le 7 novembre 2003 Cour suprême du Canada	Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

30033 **Rocky Blaine Bohnet v. Her Majesty the Queen** (Alta.) (Criminal) (By Leave)

Coram: Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps JJ.

The application for an extension of time is granted, the application to file an amended memorandum of argument and the application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Alberta (Calgary), Number 0201-0137-A, dated June 25, 2003, are dismissed without costs.

La demande de prorogation du délai est accordée, la demande pour produire un mémoire amendé et la demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Alberta (Calgary), numéro 0201-0137-A, daté du 25 juin 2003, sont rejetées sans dépens

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - Criminal Law - Right to Silence - Right to Counsel - What is the extent of disclosure that the state must provide a detained suspect in order for the suspect to exercise the right to counsel in a meaningful way - Is the obligation of disclosure that the state must provide a suspect in order for the suspect to exercise the right to counsel in a meaningful way different under ss. 10(a) and 10(b) of the *Charter* - Should the right to counsel be restated or another opportunity to contact counsel be allowed, when a detained suspect admits to committing offences beyond what he was arrested for or what the police were originally questioning him about

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

March 27, 2002 Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta (Hart J.)	Applicant found guilty of first degree murder contrary to s. 235(1) of the <i>Criminal Code</i> : sentenced to life imprisonment without eligibility of parole until 25 years and weapons prohibition for life
June 25, 2003 Court of Appeal of Alberta (Hunt, Wittmann and Paperny JJ.A.)	Applicant's appeal from conviction dismissed
November 4, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for extension of time, leave to file amended memorandum of argument and leave to appeal filed

30037 **Carl Roy c. Sa Majesté la Reine** (Qc) (Criminelle) (Autorisation)

Coram: Les juges Bastarache, LeBel et Deschamps

La demande d'autorisation d'appel de l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel du Québec (Québec), numéro 200-10-001260-012, daté du 11 septembre 2003, est rejetée.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Quebec), Number 200-10-001260-012, dated September 11, 2003, is dismissed.

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Charte canadienne - Droit criminel - Preuve - Stupéfiants - Autorisation d'écoute électronique - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle commis une erreur de droit en maintenant la déclaration de culpabilité prononcée contre le demandeur malgré l'absence totale de motifs au soutien des demandes d'autorisation d'écoute électronique qui ont constitué la totalité de la preuve invoquée contre le demandeur? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle commis une erreur en droit en ne rejetant pas la preuve ainsi constituée en vertu de l'article 24(2) de la *Charte*, puisque toute la preuve recueillie l'a été en contravention de l'article 8 de la *Charte*?

HISTORIQUE DES PROCÉDURES

Le 6 septembre 2001 Cour du Québec (Le juge Verdon)	Demandeur déclaré coupable d'avoir fait le trafic de la cocaïne contrairement à l'art. 5(1)(3)a) de la <i>Loi réglementant certaines drogues et autres substances</i>
Le 11 septembre 2003 Cour d'appel du Québec (Les juges Otis, Rochette et Morissette)	Appel rejeté
Le 10 novembre 2003 Cour suprême du Canada	Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

30053 **Michel Drapeau c. François Girard, Gaétan Gravel, Niv Fichman, Rhombus Média Inc., Carbone 14, Gilles Maheu et Danièle de Fontenay** (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 500-09-009594-003, daté du 19 septembre 2003, est rejetée avec dépens.

The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Montreal), Number 500-09-009594-003, dated September 19, 2003, is dismissed with costs.

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Droit des biens - Droit d'auteur - Législation - Interprétation - "Oeuvre créée en collaboration" au sens de l'art. 2 de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-42 - Quelle est la nature de la contribution du demandeur à l'oeuvre "Le Dortoir"? - La contribution fournie par le demandeur est-elle, en soi, suffisante pour lui conférer le statut de coauteur de l'oeuvre considérée dans son ensemble, à la lumière des dispositions législatives applicables et de leur interprétation par les tribunaux? - Dans l'affirmative, quelle est la nature du préjudice subi par le demandeur en raison de la mutilation, l'adaptation, la diffusion, la reproduction et la représentation en public non autorisée de son oeuvre, et quelle serait la réparation monétaire appropriée que le tribunal devrait accorder le cas échéant?

HISTORIQUE DES PROCÉDURES

Le 5 avril 2000
Cour supérieure du Québec
(Le juge Guthrie)

Action du demandeur en injonction, en reddition de compte et en dommages-intérêts rejetée

Le 19 septembre 2003
Cour d'appel du Québec
(Les juges Baudouin, Forget et Morin)

Appel du demandeur rejeté

Le 17 novembre 2003
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

29996 **Mike Barker, carrying on business as Mike Barker Auto Sales v. Zurich Insurance Company** (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave)

Coram: Bastarache, LeBel and Deschamps JJ.

The application for an extension of time to apply for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Number C30786, dated February 7, 2001, is dismissed with costs. In any event, had such application been granted, the application for leave to appeal from the said judgment would have been dismissed.

La demande de prorogation du délai pour le dépôt d'une demande d'autorisation d'appel contre l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, numéro C30786, daté du 7 février 2001, est rejetée avec dépens. Quoiqu'il en soit, même si la demande de prorogation avait été accueillie, la demande d'autorisation d'appel aurait été rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Commercial law - Damages - Evidence - Insurance - Claim refused - Verdict by jury - Insurer found liable - Punitive damages awarded - Court of Appeal finds jury's award of punitive damages unfounded - Punitive damages set aside - Does a Court of Appeal have power to set aside a verdict of a jury when the verdict found is undeniably founded and could

not be founded otherwise than solely by reason that the jury refused to accord any credibility whatsoever to the witnesses for the defendant?

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

September 30, 1998 Ontario Court of Justice (Crane J.)	Applicant's action for refusal of insurance claim under his automobile insurance policy, granted; Applicant awarded \$200,000 in punitive damages
February 7, 2001 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Charron, Carthy and Sharpe JJ.A.)	Appeal allowed
October 3, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal and motion to extend time filed

29957 **Sean Miguel Currie v. Her Majesty the Queen** (Ont.) (Crim.) (By Leave)

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

The application for an extension of time to apply for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Number C32981, dated June 5, 2002, is dismissed. In any event, had such application been granted, the application for leave to appeal from the said judgment would have been dismissed.

La demande de prorogation du délai pour le dépôt d'une demande d'autorisation d'appel contre l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, numéro C32981, daté du 5 juin 2002, est rejetée. Quoiqu'il en soit, même si la demande de prorogation avait été accueillie, la demande d'autorisation d'appel aurait été rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Defences - Trial - Bias - Whether trial judge erred in refusing to charge the jury on the defence of self-defence - Whether the trial judge's actions in the case at bar give rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

April 12, 1999 Superior Court of Ontario (General Division) (Humphrey J.)	Conviction: attempted murder
June 5, 2002 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Weiler, Charron and Sharpe JJ.A.)	Appeal against conviction dismissed.
September 24, 2003 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal and motion for extension of time filed

26.1.2004

Before / Devant : MAJOR J.

Further order on motion for leave to intervene

Autre ordonnance sur une requête en autorisation d'intervention

BY / PAR : Canadian Aids Society

IN / DANS : The Minister of Human Resources
Development Canada

v. (29351)

Betty Hodge (F.C.)

UPON APPLICATION by the Canadian Aids Society for leave to intervene in the above appeal and pursuant to the order of November 13, 2003;

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED THAT the said intervener shall not be entitled to oral representation at the hearing of the appeal.

26.1.2004

Before / Devant : THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to serve and file the applicant's reply

Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer la réplique du demandeur

Dennis Reid

v. (30057)

The Owners, Strata Plan LMS 2503 (B.C.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to January 5, 2004.

26.1.2004

Before / Devant : THE REGISTRAR

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

Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier et déposer les dossier, mémoire et recueil de sources et de doctrine de l'appelant

Justin Lance Perrier

v. (30002)

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

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to January 20, 2004.

27.1.2004

Before / Devant : IACOBUCCI J.

Further order on motions for leave to intervene

Autre ordonnance sur des requêtes en autorisation d'intervention

BY / PAR : Attorney General of Canada;
National Trust Company;
Nicole Lacroix;
R.M. Smallhorn, D.G. Halsall, S.J.
Galbraith and S.W. (Bud) Wesley;
Canadian Labour Congress and the
Ontario Federation of Labour;

IN / DANS : Monsanto Canada Inc., et al.

v. (29586)

Superintendent of Financial Services,
et al. (Ont.)

UPON APPLICATIONS by the Attorney General of Canada, the National Trust Company, Nicole Lacroix , R.M. Smallhorn, D.G. Halsall, S.J. Galbraith and S.W. (Bud) Wesley and Canadian Labour Congress and the Ontario Federation of Labour for leave to intervene in the above appeal and pursuant to the orders of January 5 and 19, 2004;

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED THAT the said interveners are each granted permission to present oral argument not exceeding ten (10) minutes at the hearing of the appeal.

27.1.2004

Before / Devant : MAJOR J.

Motion to extend the time in which to serve the application for leave

Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour signifier la demande d'autorisation

Barbara Haight-Smith

v. (30112)

Attorney General of Canada (F.C.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE

UPON APPLICATION by the applicant for an order extending the time to serve an application for leave to appeal to December 30, 2003;

AND HAVING READ the material filed;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The application for an order extending the time to serve an application for leave to appeal to December 30, 2003, is granted.

28.1.2004

Before / Devant : MAJOR J.

Motions to adduce new evidence

Requêtes visant à produire de nouveaux éléments de preuve

Edwidge Casimir

v. (29297)

Attorney General of Quebec (Que.)

- and between -

Roger Gosselin, et al.

v. (29298)

Attorney General of Quebec (Que.)

REFERRED / RÉFÉRÉES

UPON APPLICATIONS by the appellants, Edwidge Casimir and Roger Gosselin, et al. and the respondents, the Attorney General of Quebec and the Minister of Education for an order permitting the filing of additional evidence;

AND HAVING READ the material filed;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1) The applications permitting the filing of additional evidence be deferred to the hearing of the appeal.
- 2) It is further ordered that should the appellants and respondents proceed with the applications, the time used in so doing will be considered as part of the time allocated to counsel for the appellants and respondents at the hearing of the appeal.

À LA SUITE DES DEMANDES des appelants Edwidge Casimir et Roger Gosselin, et al. et des intimés le procureur général du Québec et le ministre de l'éducation visant à obtenir une ordonnance pour la production d'éléments de preuve supplémentaires;

APRÈS AVOIR PRIS CONNAISSANCE de la documentation déposée;

IL EST PAR LA PRÉSENTE ORDONNÉ CE QUI SUIT:

- 1) Les demandes relatives à la production d'éléments de preuve supplémentaires seront entendues lors de l'audition de l'appel.
 - 2) Il est ordonné que le temps consacré par les appelants et les intimés à la présentation des demandes, s'ils y donnaient suite, soit retranché au temps qui leur a été attribué pour la présentation de leurs arguments lors de l'audition de l'appel.
-

27.1.2004

Before / Devant : THE REGISTRAR

**Motion to file a lengthy memorandum of argument
and to waive the filing fees**

**Requête en vue de déposer un mémoire qui excède
le nombre de pages permis et en dispense des droits
de dépôt**

Phillip Chukwuma Ofume, et al.

v. (30054)

CIBC Mortgage Corporation (N.S.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉES

UPON APPLICATIONS by the applicants for an order permitting the filing of a lengthy memorandum of argument and for an order waiving the filing fees;

AND HAVING READ the material filed;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The motions are granted.

30.1.2004

Before / Devant : MAJOR J.

**Motion to extend the time in which to serve and file
the application for leave**

**Requête en prorogation du délai imparti pour
signifier et déposer la demande d'autorisation**

Cosmas Rowel

v. (30149)

Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders
Union, Local 206, et al. (Man.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to April 8, 2004.

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED SINCE
LAST ISSUE**

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

8.1.2004

Glen Thomas Saunders

v. (30128)

Her Majesty the Queen (N.L.)

(As of Right)

23.1.2004

Daryl Milland Clark

v. (29976)

Her Majesty the Queen (B.C.)

2.2.2004

BY / PAR : Attorney General of Prince Edward Island

IN/DANS: **The Attorney General of British Columbia, et al.**

v. (29508)

Connor Auton, an Infant, by his Guardian Ad Litem, Michelle Auton, et al. (B.C.)

DEADLINES: APPEALS

The Spring Session of the Supreme Court of Canada will start 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 commencera 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'appellant, 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'appellant.

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