


**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 du 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.

March 29, 1996

521 - 551

le 29 mars 1996

CONTENTS**TABLE DES MATIÈRES**

Applications for leave to appeal filed	521 - 523	Demandes d'autorisation d'appel déposées
Applications for leave submitted to Court since last issue	524 - 529	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	530 - 536	Jugements rendus sur les demandes d'autorisation
Motions	537 - 539	Requêtes
Notices of appeal filed since last issue	540	Avis d'appel déposés depuis la dernière parution
Notices of intervention filed since last issue	541	Avis d'intervention déposés depuis la dernière parution
Notices of discontinuance filed since last issue	542	Avis de désistement déposés depuis la dernière parution
Appeals heard since last issue and disposition	543 - 547	Appels entendus depuis la dernière parution et résultat
Pronouncements of appeals reserved	-	Jugements rendus sur les appels en délibéré
Headnotes of recent judgments	-	Sommaires des arrêts récents
Weekly agenda	548	Ordre du jour de la semaine
Summaries of the cases	-	Résumés des affaires
Cumulative Index - Leave	-	Index cumulatif - Autorisations
Cumulative Index - Appeals	-	Index cumulatif - Appels
Appeals inscribed - Session beginning	-	Appels inscrits - Session commençant le
Notices to the Profession and Press Release	-	Avis aux avocats et communiqué de presse
Deadlines: Motions before the Court	549	Délais: Requêtes devant la Cour
Deadlines: Appeals	550	Délais: Appels
Judgments reported in S.C.R.	551	Jugements publiés au R.C.S.

**APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE TO
APPEAL FILED**

Ghassan Sleiman
Teresa J. Glod
Turnbull Boyes

v. (25201)

Madeleine Sleiman (Alta.)
Laura Lee Grant

FILING DATE 13.3.1996

La Métropolitaine, compagnie d'assurance-vie
Marzia Frascadore
Lafleur Brown

c. (25202)

Raynald Meunier (Qué.)
André Champagne
Lapointe, Schachter, Champagne & Talbot

DATE DE PRODUCTION 15.3.1996

Her Majesty The Queen
D. James Rout, Q.C.
A.G. of Alberta

v. (25203)

Bank of Canada et al. (Alta.)
Robert M. Curtis
McCuaig Desrochers

FILING DATE 15.3.1996

Companhia Siderurgica Nacional
Melville O'Donohue, Q.C.
O'Donohue & O'Donohue

v. (25204)

**Canadian International Trade Tribunal et al.
(F.C.A.)(Ont.)**
Michael Granger

FILING DATE 15.3.1996

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

Miramichi Pulp & Paper Inc., (a body corporate)
Dennis R. O'Connor, Q.C.
Borden & Elliot

v. (25205)

Director of Assessment (N.B.)
C. Clyde Spinney
A.G. of New Brunswick

FILING DATE 18.3.1996

Craig William Ryback
Craig William Ryback

v. (25206)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(B.C.)
Cal Deedman
Min. of the Attorney General

FILING DATE 20.3.1996

Her Majesty The Queen
Elizabeth A. Bennett, Q.C.
Peck Tammen Bennett

v. (25207)

Rodger Dale Stolz (B.C.)
Brian Mason
Maitland & Co.

FILING DATE 13.3.1996

Andre D. Martel
Henry S. Brown, Q.C.
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson

v. (25209)

Her Majesty The Queen (Ont.)
A.G. of Ontario (Ont.)

FILING DATE 19.3.1996

Fording Coal Ltd.

Warren J. A. Mitchell, Q.C.
Thorsteinssons

v. (25057)

Her Majesty The Queen (F.C.A.)(B.C.)

Kathleen T. Lyons
Dept. of Justice

FILING DATE 21.3.1996

Royal Bank of Canada et al.

Colin L. Campbell, Q.C.
McCarthy Tétrault

v. (25216)

Bank of Canada et al. (Alta.)

Robert M. Curtis
McCuaig, Desrochers

FILING DATE 18.3.1996

Dennis Hahn

Glen Orris, Q.C.

v. (25217)

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

Richard C.C. Peck, Q.C.
Peck and Tammen

FILING DATE 20.3.1996

William Oppong

Ian Stewart
Rexdale Community Legal Clinic

v. (25218)

**The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
(F.C.A.)(Ont.)**

Kevin Lunney
Dept. of Justice

FILING DATE 18.3.1996

Maria Jackie Dasent

Ian Stewart
Rexdale Community Legal Clinic

v. (25219)

**The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
(F.C.A.)(Ont.)**

Kevin Lunney
Dept. of Justice

FILING DATE 18.3.1996

Myung Kap Kwon et al.

Harvey T. Strosberg
Gignac, Sutts

v. (25220)

Alec Cooper (Ont.)

Maxwell Steidman

FILING DATE 18.3.1996

Sa Majesté La Reine

Pierre Lévesque
Subs. du procureur général

c. (25221)

Michel Cogger (Qué.)

Raphaël Schachter
Lapointe, Schachter, Champagne & Talbot

DATE DE PRODUCTION 21.3.1996

Lionel George Russell

Gregory G. Walen
Hnatyshyn Singer Thorstad

v. (25222)

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

Daryl L. Rayner
Dept. of Justice

FILING DATE 20.3.1996

Dennis Ganpatt

R.S. Prithipaul
Gunn & Prithipaul

v. (25227)

Her Majesty The Queen (Alta.)

Jack Watson, Q.C.
Dept. of Justice

FILING DATE 25.3.1996

**APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE
SUBMITTED TO COURT SINCE LAST
ISSUE**

**DEMANDES SOUMISES À LA COUR
DEPUIS LA DERNIÈRE PARUTION**

MARCH 22, 1996 / LE 22 MARS 1996

**CORAM: Chief Justice Lamer and Gonthier and Iacobucci JJ. /
Le juge en chef Lamer et les juges Gonthier et Iacobucci**

Michael Elkins

v. (25133)

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

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal law - Defence - Trial - Self-defence - Instruction to the jury - Did the Court of Appeal err in its conclusion that the s. 686(1)(b)(iii) *Criminal Code*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46 proviso should be applied, despite its holding that the trial judge had erred in his direction to the jury on the Applicant's defence of self-defence under s. 34(2) of the *Criminal Code* - Did the Court of Appeal err in finding that questions about the Applicant's subsequent lack of concern for the two men he shot were relevant to his state of mind at the time of the shooting - Did the Court of Appeal err in finding that the trial judge did not err in his direction to the jury regarding evidence of consciousness of guilt.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

June 26, 1992 Ontario Court (General Division) (Taliano J.)	Conviction: Second degree murder and attempted murder
October 3, 1995 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Brooke, Griffiths and Doherty JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed
February 2, 1996 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

Hercules Canada

v. (25012)

Mobil Oil Corporation and Mobil Chemical Canada, Ltd. (F.C.A.)(Ont.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Property law - Patents - Whether a reissued patent is for the same invention as the original patent - Whether the specification of the original and reissued patents must be considered objectively - Whether the Court of Appeal was under a duty to reconstrue the original patent.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

September 21, 1994
Federal Court Trial Division
(Wetston J.)

Reissue of patent was proper; claims 12, 13 and 15 of the reissued patent were invalid; substantial infringement of the invalid claims found; no infringement order issued.

September 27, 1995
Federal Court of Appeal
(Marceau, Stone, Strayer JJ.A)

Appeal allowed, cross-appeal dismissed

December 15, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada
(Major J.)

Application to strike out an affidavit allowed; time for perfecting application for leave to appeal extended twenty days for each party

January 4, 1996
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

**CORAM: La Forest, Cory and Major JJ. /
Les juges La Forest, Cory et Major**

**Paula LeeAnn Lewis and Shannon Lee Lewis,
Infants by their Guardian Ad Litem, Diana Holt,
and Leeland Gordon James Holt, Bobbi-Jo Holt,
and Shayne Calvert Holt, Infants by their Guardian
Ad Litem, Gail Nachbar, and the said Diana Holt
and Jeffrey David Holt**

v. (24999)

**Her Majesty The Queen
in Right of the Province of British Columbia (B.C.)**

NATURE OF THE CASE

Torts - Negligence - Vicarious Liability - Master/Servant - Vicarious or absolute nature of Crown liability for negligence of independent contractor who failed to remove a rock from the face of a cliff beside a provincial highway before it fell and killed a driver.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

February 11, 1994
Supreme Court of British Columbia (Smith J.)

Action allowed

September 18, 1995
Court of Appeal for British Columbia
(McEachern, Southin, and Ryan JJ.A.)

Appeal allowed

November 17, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

Renwick Day

v. (25032)

Her Majesty The Queen (F.C.A.)(B.C.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms- Civil rights - Pensions - Appeals - Contributions to Canada Pension Plan - Whether Federal Court of Appeal erred in striking out notice of appeal - Does the Canada Pension Plan discriminate on the basis of age and thereby violate section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which discrimination is not a reasonable limit that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society pursuant to section 1 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

January 27, 1995 Tax Court of Canada (Rowe J.)	Appeal struck out
October 17, 1995 Federal Court of Appeal (Isaac C.J. and Stone and McDonald JJ.A.)	Section 28 application dismissed
December 11, 1995 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

Roy Gould

v. (25033)

Her Majesty The Queen (F.C.A.)(B.C.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - Civil rights - Taxation - Pensions - Appeals - Contributions to Canada Pension Plan - Whether Federal Court of Appeal erred in striking out notice of appeal - Does the Canada Pension Plan discriminate on the basis of age and thereby violate section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which discrimination is not a reasonable limit that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society pursuant to section 1 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

January 27, 1995 Tax Court of Canada (Rowe J.)	Appeal struck out
October 17, 1995 Federal Court of Appeal (Isaac C.J. and Stone and McDonald JJ.A.)	Section 28 application dismissed
December 11, 1995 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

**CORAM: L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka and McLachlin JJ. /
Les juges L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka et McLachlin**

Sa Majesté la Reine

c. (25155)

Gérard Kingsley (Crim.)(Qué.)

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Droit criminel - Preuve - Meurtre - Complot de vol qualifié - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en considérant que la séquestration concomitante au vol qualifié commis par l'accusé et au cours duquel le meurtre est survenu ne tombait pas sous le coup de l'article 231(5)e) du *Code criminel*? - Compte tenu de la décision à laquelle elle est venue et du verdict du jury, la Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en ne substituant pas au verdict rendu en première instance un jugement de culpabilité de meurtre au deuxième degré, en application de l'article 686(1)b)i) et (3) du *Code criminel*?

HISTORIQUE PROCÉDURAL

Le 16 novembre 1989
Cour supérieure du Québec (Guérin j.c.s.)

Déclaration de culpabilité: meurtre au premier degré

Le 18 décembre 1995
Cour d'appel du Québec
(Bisson et Deschamps jj.c.a. et Philippon j.c.a. *ad hoc*)

Appel accueilli; ordonnance d'un nouveau procès sur une accusation de meurtre au deuxième degré

Le 19 février 1996
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

Ivor Bremer Hansen

v. (25130)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(Alta.)

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal law - Evidence - Sufficiency of trial judge's reasons - *R. v. Burns*, [1994] 1 S.C.R. 656 - Corroboration - Whether corroboration is required by common law in this case - Whether corroboration must specifically implicate the accused in a material particular or only confirm in a material way the testimony of a witness.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

May 25, 1995 Court of Queen's Bench for Alberta (Moore J.)	Conviction: sexual assault (2 counts); gross indecency (2 counts); attempted buggery
December 5, 1995 Court of Appeal of Alberta (Lieberman, Kerans and Fruman JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed
February 2, 1996 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

**Myrna Catherine Coburn and Colleen Gale
Robertson, Executrices of the Estate of Catherine
Mahaffey, also known as Catherina Mahaffey,
Deceased, and Myrna Catherine Coburn and Colleen Robertson**

v. (25025)

**Joseph Anthony Cavadini, Carl Rudolph
Cavadini, Randolph Ermese Cavadini and Erma Marcella Aikins (B.C.)**

NATURE OF THE CASE

Property law - Wills - Testator's moral duty to adult independent children - Whether lower courts erred in finding that the Testatrix failed in her moral duty towards the Respondents by failing to make adequate provision in her Will for their proper maintenance and support.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

August 29, 1994 Supreme Court of British Columbia (Coultas J.)	Application for variation of will allowed
October 5, 1995 Court of Appeal for British Columbia (Hinkson, Hollinrake, and Donald JJ.A)	Appeal dismissed
December 1, 1995 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

MARCH 26, 1996 / LE 26 MARS 1996

**CORAM: Chief Justice Lamer and Gonthier and Iacobucci JJ. /
Le juge en chef Lamer et les juges Gonthier et Iacobucci**

Andrew Sim Katz

v. (25014)

**Vancouver Stock Exchange, British Columbia Securities Commission
and Superintendent of Brokers (B.C.)**

NATURE OF THE CASE

Administrative Law - Jurisdiction - Reasonable apprehension of bias based on the institutional independence of a tribunal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

May 11, 1995
British Columbia Securities Commission

Application dismissed

September 28, 1995
British Columbia Court of Appeal
(Hollinrake, Rowles and Prowse JJ.A)

Appeal dismissed

November 24, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

MARCH 28, 1996 / LE 28 MARS 1996

24979 **SA MAJESTÉ LA REINE c. SADEK SADEK** (Crim.)(Qué.)

CORAM: Le juge en chef et les juges Gonthier et Iacobucci

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

NATURE DE LA CAUSE

Droit criminel - Jury - Réponse du juge du procès à une question du jury portant sur le meurtre au premier degré - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en droit en considérant la réponse du juge de première instance à une question du jury comme erronée, malgré le fait que la Cour, unanimement, a considéré l'ensemble des directives conformes, voire même "indiscutables"? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle erré en omettant de statuer sur l'application des dispositions curatives de l'article 686(1)b(iii) du *Code criminel* et en ne les appliquant pas dans cette cause? - Article 231(5) du *Code criminel*.

HISTORIQUE PROCÉDURAL

Le 17 janvier 1992
Cour supérieure, juridiction criminelle (Riopel j.c.s.)

Verdict: Intimé reconnu coupable de meurtre au premier degré, séquestration et voies de fait graves

Le 6 octobre 1995
Cour d'appel du Québec
(Vallerand, Baudouin et Robert jj.c.a.)

Appel accueilli; verdict cassé et nouveau procès sur l'accusation de meurtre au premier degré ordonné

Le 3 novembre 1995
Cour suprême du Canada

Demande d'autorisation d'appel déposée

24918 **HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN v. FIBRECO INC.; FIBRECO EXPORT INC.** (F.C.A.)

CORAM: The Chief Justice and Gonthier and Iacobucci JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée avec dépens.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Taxation - Statutes - Interpretation - The use of administrative practice and Parliamentary debates for interpretation - Income Tax Act s. 127(9).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

July 28, 1994
Federal Court of Canada Trial Division
(Muldoon J.)

Respondents' appeal from assessment dated April 3, 1989 allowed; matter referred back to the Minister of National Revenue for redetermination and reassessment of the Respondent's 1988 taxation year

June 15, 1995
Federal Court of Appeal
(Hugessen, Décary, McDonald JJA)

Appeal dismissed

October 16, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24991

CANSON ENTERPRISES LTD. and FEALTY ENTERPRISES LTD. v. BOUGHTON & COMPANY, RALPH R. WOLLEN, GEORGE O. TREIT, TREIT LAND CONSULTANTS INC., PACIFIC MORTGAGE CORPORATION LIMITED, GORDON BERT WILKINS, SUN-MARK DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND PEREGRINE VENTURES INC. (B.C.)

CORAM: The Chief Justice and Gonthier and Iacobucci JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée avec dépens.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Torts - Barristers and solicitors - Partnership - Breach of fiduciary duty - Liability to account for secret profits - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in ruling that in an action against a partnership, in order to establish the liability of one of the partners and thus the partnership, it is necessary to name the partner as an individual defendant in the style of cause - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in deciding the liability of a partnership to account for a secret profit taken by a third party with the assistance of the partners on the basis of the rationale for liability of a corporate director for a breach of trust by his company pursuant to *Air Canada v. M & L Travel*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 787 - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in ruling that subjective knowledge of a dishonest scheme was required of a partner before the partnership could be held liable to account for a secret profit taken by a third party with the assistance of a partner - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in not holding a law firm jointly liable with a secret profiteer to account for a secret profit in circumstances where the secret profit was paid out of trust funds contrary to the instructions of the client.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

July 31, 1992
Supreme Court of British Columbia
(Paris J.)

Action allowed: Applicants awarded compensation in the amount of secret profit but only as against Respondents who shared in secret profit

September 13, 1995
Court of Appeal for British Columbia
(Hinkson, Rowles and Donald JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

November 10, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24919 **CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY v. NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY AND NATIONAL GYPSUM (CANADA) LIMITED** (F.C.A.)

CORAM: The Chief Justice and Gonthier and Iacobucci JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Commercial law - Constitutional law - Arbitration - Contracts - Respondent shipper applying to National Transportation Agency pursuant to s. 48 of the *National Transportation Act, 1987*, Chap. N-20.01, for Final Offer Arbitration in respect of the rate charged by Applicant carrier for the transportation of goods - Applicant carrier submitting that application For Final Offer Arbitration is null and void *ab initio* since the traffic to which it relates is governed by a confidential contract and should be dismissed and not referred to an arbitrator as it is contrary to subs. 120(6) of the *NTA, 1987* - Whether the National Transportation Agency erred in law or jurisdiction in deciding that the matter submitted by National Gypsum for final offer arbitration was not governed by a confidential contract within the meaning of section 120(6) of the *NTA, 1987*? - Whether the final offer arbitration provisions in sections 48 to 57 of the *NTA, 1987* are *ultra vires* the Parliament of Canada?

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

March 9, 1995
National Transportation Agency

Decision: Canadian National Railway Company's request to dismiss National Gypsum (Canada) Limited's application for Final Offer Arbitration denied

October 2, 1995
Federal Court of Appeal
(Isaac C.J. and Marceau and Roberston JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

Octobre 26, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24854 **KAMIL TRABULSEY v. HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN** (Crim.)(Ont.)

CORAM: La Forest, Cory and Major JJ.

The application for an extension of time is granted and the application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande de prorogation de délai est accordée et la demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal law - Trespass - Whether provincial trespass legislation can be used to restrict access to federally-owned civilian international airport.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

January 27, 1992
Ontario Court (Provincial Division) (Lane P.C.J.)

Convictions: escape lawful custody and trespass to property under the *Trespass to Property Act*

January 6, 1993
Ontario Court (General Division) (Langdon J.)

Summary conviction appeal allowed: convictions quashed

March 2, 1995
Ontario Court of Appeal
(Houlden, Labrosse and Doherty JJ.A.)

Appeal allowed: convictions restored

September 6, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal and for extension of time filed

24874 **WILLIAM JOHN DUBASZ v. HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN** (Crim.)(Alta.)

CORAM: La Forest, Cory and Major JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal law - Sentencing - Whether sentence of 12 years was fit sentence for manslaughter in circumstances of this case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

November 10, 1994
Supreme Court of Canada
(Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, Iacobucci and Major JJ.A.)

Crown's appeal as of right allowed: Applicant's conviction for manslaughter restored; matter remitted to Court of Appeal to deal with sentence appeal

May 25, 1995
Court of Appeal of Alberta
(Fraser C.J.A. and Bielby and Cairns JJ. [*ad hoc*])

Appeal from sentence of fifteen years imposed by trial judge allowed; sentence of twelve years imprisonment substituted

September 18, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24833 **CAROLE L. BARRONS v. HYUNDAI AUTO CANADA INC. ("HYUNDAI CANADA")** (Ont.)

CORAM: La Forest, Cory and Major JJ.

The application for an extension of time is granted and the application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.

La demande de prorogation de délai est accordée et la demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée avec dépens.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - Civil procedure - Costs - Litigant acting in person -Section 36 of the *Solicitors Act*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

August 31, 1992 Ontario Court of Justice (General Division) (Lovekin J.)	Action dismissed
October 7, 1993 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Galligan, Labrosse and Arbour JJ.A.)	Appeal dismissed; costs awarded to Hyundai Auto Canada Inc.
April 21, 1994 Supreme Court of Canada (La Forest, Sopinka and Major JJ.A.)	Application for leave to appeal dismissed
February 17, 1995 Assessment Officer (Fred W. Jewell)	Certificates of Assessment Issued
March 30, 1995 Court of Appeal for Ontario (McKinlay J.A.)	Appeal against assessments dismissed
July 17, 1995 Court of Appeal for Ontario (Houlden J.A.)	Application for leave to appeal October 7, 1993 decision as to costs dismissed
August 16, 1995 Supreme Court of Canada	Application for leave to appeal filed

24828

ASCENZA SCAMOLLA, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF VINCENZO SCAMOLLA, DECEASED, LOU SCAMOLLA, ANTONETTA SCAMOLLA AND VICTORIA ASHLEY SCAMOLLA, BY HER LITIGATION GUARDIAN, LOU SCAMOLLA v. TENAX LIMITED, ALEX DELIULIS, UNICRANE INC., BATTISTA DAMATTO, BURRELL ENGINEERING LTD., MICHAEL BURRELL, KROLL CRANES A/S, ASX 9472 A/S, KROLL GIANT CRANES A/S, THOMAS SCHMIDT A/S, BAGSVAERD AND AKTIESELSKABET VOELUND (Ont.)

CORAM: L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka and McLachlin JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Torts - Negligence - Damages - Whether the Court of Appeal erred in reducing the amounts of non-pecuniary general damages awarded by the jury following the trial of an action for wrongful death - Whether there should be a cap on non-pecuniary damage awards made to claimants under wrongful death legislation?

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

August 10, 1993
Ontario Court (General Division)
(Ewaschuk J.)

Jury assessment of non-pecuniary general damages following wrongful death trial: Applicant Ascenza Scamolla - \$373,031.00; Antonetta Scamolla - \$100,000.00 and Lou Scamolla - \$45,000.00

April 25, 1995
Court of Appeal for Ontario
(Goodman, Robins and Catzman JJ.A.)

Appeal allowed in part: reduction in non-pecuniary general damage award

August 8, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24982 **JOSEPH REED v. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA** (Crim.)(B.C.)

CORAM: L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka and McLachlin JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Canadian Charter - Criminal law - Prosecutorial discretion - Whether Crown obliged to formally charge Applicant and proceed with trial after arrest.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

January 31, 1995
Supreme Court of British Columbia (Fraser J.)

Petition for *mandamus* dismissed

September 12, 1995
Court of Appeal for British Columbia
(McEachern C.J., and Rowles and Donald JJ.A.)

Appeal dismissed

November 6, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24952 **PATRICK O'CONNOR v. HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN** (Crim.)(Ont.)

CORAM: L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka and McLachlin JJ.

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée.

NATURE OF THE CASE

Criminal Law - Evidence - Admissibility - Prior consistent statements - Expert evidence - Evidence of complainant's emotional state - Application of *Criminal Code* s. 686(1)(b)(iii).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

May 12, 1993
Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)
(Thomson J.)

Applicant convicted of touching a person under the age of 14 for a sexual purpose

July 12, 1995

Appeal dismissed

Court of Appeal for Ontario
(Goodman, Finlayson and Weiler JJ.A)

October 30, 1995
Supreme Court of Canada

Application for leave to appeal filed

24747 NURUL I. CHOUDHURY M.D. c. COUR SUPÉRIEURE, L'HONORABLE PIERRE VIAU, TRIBUNAL DES PROFESSIONS, L'HONORABLE JUGE JACQUES BIRON, DR. ROCK BERNIER, DR. AUGUSTIN ROY, DR. SUZANNE RICHER, DR. MICHEL LÉVEILLÉ, DR. JACQUES BRIÈRE ET DR. ANDRÉ LAPIERRE (Qué.)

CORAM: Le Juge en chef et les juges L'Heureux-Dubé et Gonthier

La demande de réexamen est rejetée avec dépens.

The motion for reconsideration is denied with costs.

21.3.1996

Before / Devant: McLACHLIN J.

Motion for leave to intervene

Requête en autorisation d'intervention

BY/PAR: Attorney General of B.C.

IN/DANS: Greenpeace Canada et al.

v. (24437)

MacMillan Bloedel Ltd. (B.C.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE

21.3.1996

Before / Devant: THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to file an intervenor's factum

Requête en prorogation du délai de dépôt du mémoire d'un intervenant

BY/PAR: Canadian Human Rights Commission

With the consent of the parties.

IN/DANS: Battlefords and District Co-operative Ltd.

v. (24342)

Betty-Lu Clara Gibbs (Sask.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to April 4, 1996.

21.3.1996

Before / Devant: THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to file the respondent's factum

Requête en prorogation du délai de dépôt du mémoire de l'intimée

William Goldhart

With the consent of the parties.

v. (24835)

Her Majesty The Queen (Ont.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to March 20, 1996.

26.3.1996

Before / Devant: THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to file the case on appeal and the appellant's factum

Requête en prorogation du délai de dépôt du dossier d'appel et du mémoire de l'appelante

Northeast Marine Services Ltd.

With the consent of the parties.

v. (24629)

Atlantic Pilotage Authority (N.S.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to May 17, 1996.

28.3.1996

Before / Devant: THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to file an intervenor's factum

Requête en prorogation du délai de dépôt du mémoire d'un intervenant

BY/PAR: A.G. of Manitoba

With the consent of the parties.

IN/DANS: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
v. (24305)

Attorney General for New Brunswick
et al. (N.B.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to March 18, 1996.

28.3.1996

Before / Devant: THE REGISTRAR

Motion to extend the time in which to file an intervenor's factum

Requête en prorogation du délai de dépôt du mémoire d'un intervenant

BY/PAR: A.G. of Saskatchewan

With the consent of the parties.

IN/DANS: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
v. (24305)

Attorney General for New Brunswick
et al. (N.B.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE Time extended to March 7, 1996.

28.3.1996

Before / Devant: LE JUGE McLACHLIN

Requête en prorogation du délai pour obtenir l'autorisation d'appel et requête en substitution de signification

Motion to extend the time in which to apply for leave to appeal and motion for substitutional service

Sa Majesté La Reine

c. (25215)

Terry C. Cobb et al. (Qué.)

ACCORDÉE / GRANTED

28.3.1996

Before / Devant: McLACHLIN J.

Motion to adduce new evidence

A.M.

v. (24612)

Requête pour déposer d'autres éléments de preuve

Clive Ryan et al. (B.C.)

GRANTED / ACCORDÉE

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED SINCE
LAST ISSUE**

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

26.3.1996

**Hercules Managements Ltd., Guardian Finance of
Canada Ltd. et al.**

v. (24882)

Friendly Family Farms Ltd. et al. (Man.)

20.3.1996

Henry Lewis Bramwell

v. (25211)

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

AS OF RIGHT

20.3.1996

Cameron Lee Russell

v. (25214)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(Alta.)

AS OF RIGHT

27.3.1996

Delmain Aiken Cuthbert

v. (25230)

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

AS OF RIGHT

27.3.1996

Emma Nieto Bablitz

v. (25239)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(Alta.)

AS OF RIGHT

27.3.1996

Damon Gregory Horne

v. (25240)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(Alta.)

AS OF RIGHT

**NOTICES OF INTERVENTION FILED
SINCE LAST ISSUE**

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

BY/PAR: Attorney General of British Columbia
Attorney General for Ontario

IN/DANS: Brant County Board of Education

v. (24668)

Carol Eaton et al. (Ont.)

**NOTICE OF DISCONTINUANCE
FILED SINCE LAST ISSUE**

**AVIS DE DÉSISTEMENT DÉPOSÉS
DEPUIS LA DERNIÈRE PARUTION**

22.3.1996

Selkirk Springs International Corp et al.

v. (24970)

Sawridge Manor Ltd. (B.C.)

(motion)

**APPEALS HEARD SINCE LAST ISSUE
AND DISPOSITION**

**APPELS ENTENDUS DEPUIS LA
DERNIÈRE PARUTION ET
RÉSULTAT**

21.3.1996

CORAM: Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin and Iacobucci JJ.

Adrian Franciscus Van Der AA

George A. Derwin, for the appellant.

v. (24692)

Her Majesty The Queen (Crim.)(Man.)

Richard A. Saull, for the respondent.

SOPINKA J. (orally for the Court) -- This is an appeal as of right. Substantially for the reasons of Kroft J.A., we are all in agreement that the judgment at trial was not unreasonable. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

LE JUGE SOPINKA (oralement pour la Cour) -- Il s'agit d'un appel de plein droit. Nous sommes tous d'accord, essentiellement pour les motifs formulés par le juge Kroft de la Cour d'appel, que le jugement rendu au procès n'était pas déraisonnable. En conséquence, l'appel est rejeté.

21.3.1996

CORAM: L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin, Iacobucci and Major JJ.

Her Majesty The Queen

Kenneth W. Mackay, Q.C., for the appellant.

v. (24732)

Falah Saleh Majid (Crim.)(Sask.)

Richard W. Elson and Mark Brayford, Q.C., for the respondent.

L'HEUREUX-DUBÉ J. (orally for the Court) -- This is an appeal as of right. The majority of the Court is of the view that this appeal should be dismissed substantially for the reasons of Cameron J.A. in the Court of Appeal. Madame Justice L'Heureux-Dubé, dissenting, would have allowed the appeal substantially for the reasons of Gerwing J.A.

LE JUGE L'HEUREUX-DUBÉ (oralement au nom de la Cour) -- Il s'agit d'un appel de plein droit. La Cour à la majorité est d'avis de rejeter le présent appel, essentiellement pour les motifs formulés par le juge Cameron en Cour d'appel. Madame le juge L'Heureux-Dubé, dissidente, aurait accueilli le pourvoi, essentiellement pour les motifs du juge Gerwing de la Cour d'appel.

Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

En conséquence, l'appel est rejeté.

25.3.1996

CORAM: Le juge en chef Lamer et les juges La Forest, L'Heureux-Dubé, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin et Major

J.L.D.

Guy Bertrand, pour l'appelant.

Bernard Vézina, pour l'intimé René Vallée.

c. (24028)

Jean-Yves Bernard, pour l'intimé le procureur général du Québec.

René Vallée et al. (Qué.)

Marc-André Blanchard et Jacques R. McLaren, pour les intervenantes la Société Radio-Canada et al.

LE JUGE EN CHEF: (oralement) -- Le pourvoi à l'encontre de la décision de la Cour d'appel en révision du jugement de M. le juge Chouinard est rejeté sans frais. Il en est de même, vu l'absence de compétence, du pourvoi à l'encontre du jugement de M. le juge De Blois.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE -- The appeal from the decision of the Court of Appeal on a motion to revise the judgment of Chouinard J.A. is dismissed without costs. The same applies, given the lack of jurisdiction, to the appeal from the judgment of De Blois J.

Le pourvoi à l'encontre de la décision de M. le juge Chouinard est accueilli, et la Cour autorise la permission recherchée devant la Cour d'appel du Québec, aux motifs que le jugement de première instance soulève des questions d'importance et d'intérêt public qui justifient d'être examinées par la Cour d'appel.

The appeal from the decision of Chouinard J.A. is allowed, and the Court grants the leave sought in the Québec Court of Appeal, on the grounds that the judgment at first instance raises questions of public importance and interest that warrant consideration by the Court of Appeal.

Le sursis accordé par M. le juge Cory est maintenu en vigueur jusqu'à ce que la Cour d'appel se prononce au fond sur la requête, le tout avec dépens.

The stay granted by Cory J. shall remain in effect until the Court of Appeal rules on the merits of the motion, the whole with costs.

26.3.1996

CORAM: Chief Justice Lamer and La Forest, L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin, Iacobucci and Major JJ.

Boma Manufacturing Ltd. et al.

Bruce B. Clark, for the appellants.

v. (24520)

Keith E.W. Mitchell, for the respondent on appeal.

Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (B.C.)

H. Rhys Davies, for the appellant on cross-appeal.

Bruce B. Clark, for the respondents on cross-appeal.

RESERVED / EN DÉLIBÉRÉ

Nature of the case:

Commercial law - Bills of Exchange - Statutes - Interpretation - Fraud - Damages - Defence - Action against a collecting bank in conversion - Whether the cheques in question were made payable to a person considered a "fictitious or non-existing person" within the meaning of s. 20(5) of the *Bills of Exchange Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-4? - Whether the cheques in question were "delivered" to the Respondent Bank? - Whether the Respondent as a "collecting" bank prima facie liable to the Appellants in conversion so that the cheques had to be properly negotiated to them in order for it to obtain title to those cheques and thereby escape liability in conversion? - Whether the defence of contributory negligence is available to the Respondent, and if so, how should it be applied? - Whether the cheque must be deposited to the credit of its payee for s. 165(3) of the *Act* to apply - Whether the cheque must be endorsed before the bank can credit the person with the amount of the cheque? - Whether simply handing a cheque to the bank teller for deposit was sufficient for "delivery" to apply.

Nature de la cause:

Droit commercial - Lettres de change - Lois - Interprétation - Fraude - Dommages-intérêts - Défense - Action en appropriation illégale intentée contre une banque d'encaissement - Les chèques en question étaient-ils payables à une personne jugée «fictive ou qui n'existe pas» au sens du par. 20(5) de la *Loi sur les lettres de change*, L.R.C. (1985), ch. B-4? - Les chèques en question ont-ils été «livrés» à la banque intimée? - À titre de banque d'encaissement, l'intimée est-elle à première vue responsable envers les appelantes d'appropriation illégale, de sorte que les chèques devaient être régulièrement négociés à leur égard pour qu'elle en obtienne le titre et échappe ainsi à toute responsabilité en appropriation illégale? - L'intimée peut-elle invoquer en défense la négligence contributive et, dans l'affirmative, comment cette défense devrait-elle être appliquée? - Le chèque doit-il être déposé au compte de son preneur pour que le par. 165(3) de la *Loi* s'applique? - Le chèque doit-il être endossé avant que la banque puisse en porter le montant au compte de la personne? - Le simple fait de remettre un chèque à un caissier de banque pour dépôt est-il suffisant pour qu'il ait «livraison»?

27.3.1996

CORAM: Le juge en chef Lamer et les juges La Forest, L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin, Iacobucci et Major

Procureur général du Québec et al.

Jean-Yves Bernard et Benoit Belleau, pour les appelants.

c. (24309)

2747-4174 Québec Inc. (Qué.)

Simon Venne et Marie Paré, pour l'intimée.

EN DÉLIBÉRÉ / RESERVED

Nature de la cause:

Libertés publiques - Droit administratif - Portée de l'art. 23 de la *Charte des droits et libertés de la personne*, L.R.Q. 1977, ch. C-12, qui prévoit que toute personne a droit à une audition publique et impartiale de sa cause par un tribunal indépendant et qui ne soit pas préjugé - Régie des permis d'alcool du Québec cumulant des fonctions de réglementation, d'enquête et d'adjudication - Cour d'appel concluant à l'existence de liens très étroits entre les régisseurs, les policiers et les avocats de la Régie, lesquels dépendent tous du même ministre de la Sécurité publique - La Cour d'appel, à la majorité, a-t-elle erré en invalidant la référence à l'art. 75 contenue à l'art. 86(8) de la *Loi sur les permis d'alcool*, L.R.Q. 1977, ch. P-9.1, au motif que lorsque la Régie procède à la révocation ou suspension d'un permis pour cause d'atteinte à la tranquillité publique, sa structure institutionnelle n'offre pas les garanties d'impartialité et d'indépendance exigées par l'art. 23 de la *Charte*?
Public Security - Whether the majority of the Court of Appeal erred in striking down the reference to s. 75 in s. 86(8) of the *Act respecting liquor permits*, R.S.Q. 1977,

Nature of the case:

Civil rights - Administrative law - Scope of s. 23 of the *Charter of human rights and freedoms*, R.S.Q. 1977, c. C-12, which provides that every person has a right to a public and fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal - Régie des permis d'alcool du Québec having regulatory, investigative and adjudicative functions - Court of Appeal finding that there were very close ties among the commissioners, the police and the Régie's lawyers, who were all responsible to the Minister of

c. P-9.1, on the ground that when the Régie cancelled or suspended a permit because of a disturbance of public tranquillity, its institutional structure did not provide the

guarantees of impartiality and independence required by
s. 23 of the *Charter*.

27.3.1996

CORAM: Chief Justice Lamer and La Forest, L'Heureux-Dubé, Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin, Iacobucci
and Major JJ.

Her Majesty The Queen

Scott K. Fenton, for the appellant.

v. (24835)

William Goldhart (Crim.)(Ont.)

Timothy E. Breen, for the respondent.

RESERVED / EN DÉLIBÉRÉ

Nature of the case:

Criminal law - Evidence - Exclusion pursuant to s. 8 of
the *Charter* - Whether evidence of witness connected to
an illegal search in a manner that infringed
Respondent's *Charter* rights - Whether admission of
evidence of witness could bring administration of justice
into disrepute pursuant to s. 24(2).

Nature de la cause:

Droit criminel - Preuve - Exclusion conformément à
l'art. 8 de la *Charte* - La déposition d'un témoin est-elle
liée à une fouille illégale d'une façon qui porte atteinte
aux droits que la *Charte* garantit à l'intimé? -
L'utilisation de la déposition du témoin est-elle
susceptible de déconsidérer l'administration de la justice
aux termes du par. 24(2)?

28.3.1996

CORAM: Le juge en chef Lamer et les juges La Forest, L'Heureux-Dubé, Gonthier, Cory, McLachlin et Major

William Knox

Robert B. Carew, pour l'appelant.

c. (24690)

Sa Majesté La Reine (Crim.)(Qué.)

Martin Lamontagne, pour l'intimée.

EN DÉLIBÉRÉ / RESERVED

Nature of the case:

Criminal law - Impaired driving - Evidence - Taking of
blood sample - Section 254(4) of the Criminal Code -
Whether consent of accused essential element to be
proved by Crown - Whether Court of Appeal erred in
concluding sample demand by police officer did not
comply with s. 254(4) and decision in *R. v. Green*
,[1992] 1 S.C.R. 614 - Whether Court of Appeal erred in
concluding consent to provide sample need not be
proved by Crown, and that sample results should not be
excluded from evidence - Unreasonable delay in
advising Appellant of charges against him - Stay of
proceedings - Whether ss. 7, 11(a) and 11(d) *Charter*
rights violated.

Nature de la cause:

Droit criminel - Conduite avec facultés affaiblies -
Preuve - Prélèvement d'un échantillon de sang -
Paragraphe 254(4) du *Code criminel* - Le consentement
de l'accusé est-il un élément essentiel que le ministère
public doit prouver? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle commis
une erreur en concluant que la demande d'échantillon du
policier n'était pas conforme au par. 254(4) et à l'arrêt *R.*
c. Green, [1992] 1 R.C.S. 614? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle
commis une erreur en concluant que le consentement au
prélèvement de l'échantillon ne doit pas nécessairement
être prouvé par le ministère public, et que les résultats de
l'analyse de l'échantillon ne devraient pas être exclus de
la preuve? - Délai déraisonnable à informer l'appelant de
la nature des accusations portées contre lui - Arrêt des
procédures - Les droits garantis par l'art. 7 et les al. 11a)
et d) de la *Charte* ont-ils été violés?

28.3.1996

CORAM: Sopinka, Gonthier, Cory, Iacobucci and Major JJ.

Her Majesty The Queen

v. (24788)

Alfred Nicholas Richard (Crim.)(N.S.)

S. Ronald Fainstein, Q.C. and Paula Taylor, for the
appellant.

Warren K. Zimmer, for the respondent.

ALLOWED / ACCUEILLI

Nature of the case:

Criminal law - Search and seizure - Narcotics - Evidence
- Validity of warrant - Whether police had reasonable
grounds to conduct a warrantless search in the
circumstances - Whether real evidence admissible in
light of *Charter* violation - Whether Court of Appeal
erred in applying *Debot* and *Collins* criteria and tests -
Whether Court of Appeal erred in excluding evidence
pursuant to s. 24(2) of the *Charter* ?

Nature de la cause:

Droit criminel - Fouilles, saisies et perquisitions -
Stupéfiants - Preuve - Validité d'un mandat - La police
avait-elle des motifs raisonnables d'effectuer une fouille
sans mandat dans les circonstances? - La preuve
matérielle est-elle admissible compte tenu de la violation
de la *Charte*? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle commis une
erreur en appliquant les critères énoncés dans les arrêts
Debot et *Collins*? - La Cour d'appel a-t-elle commis une
erreur en écartant des éléments de preuve conformément
au par. 24(2) de la *Charte*?

WEEKLY AGENDA

ORDRE DU JOUR DE LA SEMAINE

AGENDA for the week beginning April 1, 1996.
ORDRE DU JOUR pour la semaine commençant le 1 avril 1996.

<u>Date of Hearing/ Date d'audition</u>	<u>Case Number and Name/ Numéro et nom de la cause</u>
01/04/96	Motions - Requêtes

NOTE:

This agenda is subject to change. Hearing dates should be confirmed with Process Registry staff at (613) 996-8666.

Cet ordre du jour est sujet à modification. Les dates d'audience devraient être confirmées auprès du personnel du greffe au (613) 996-8666.

BEFORE THE COURT:

Pursuant to Rule 23.1 of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*, the following deadlines must be met before a motion before the Court can be heard:

Motion day : **April 1, 1996**
Service : March 11, 1996
Filing : March 18, 1996
Respondent : March 25, 1996

Motion day : **May 6, 1996**
Service : April 15, 1996
Filing : April 22, 1996
Respondent : April 29, 1996

DEVANT LA COUR:

Conformément à l'article 23.1 des *Règles de la Cour suprême du Canada*, les délais suivants doivent être respectés pour qu'une requête soit entendue par la Cour:

Audience du : **1^{er} avril 1996**
Signification : 11 mars 1996
Dépôt : 18 mars 1996
Intimé : 25 mars 1996

Audience du : **6 mai 1996**
Signification : 15 avril 1996
Dépôt : 22 avril 1996
Intimé : 29 avril 1996

The spring session of the Supreme Court of Canada will commence April 22, 1996.

Pursuant to the *Supreme Court Act* and *Rules*, the following requirements for filing must be complied with before an appeal will be inscribed and set down for hearing:

Case on appeal must be filed within three months of the filing of the notice of appeal.

Appellant's factum must be filed within four months of the filing of the notice of appeal. For appeals in which the notice of appeal was filed before July 26, 1995, the factum must be filed within five months.

Respondent's factum must be filed within eight weeks of the date of service of the appellant's factum.

Intervener's factum must be filed within four weeks of the date of service of the respondent's factum. For appeals in which the notice of appeal was filed before July 26, 1995, the factum must be filed within two weeks.

The Registrar shall inscribe the appeal for hearing upon the filing of the respondent's factum or after the expiry of the time for filing the respondent's factum

La session de printemps de la Cour suprême du Canada commencera le 22 avril 1996.

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

Le dossier d'appel doit être déposé dans les trois mois du dépôt de l'avis d'appel.

Le mémoire de l'appelant doit être déposé dans les quatre mois du dépôt de l'avis d'appel. Pour les appels dont l'avis d'appel a été déposé avant le 26 juillet 1995, le mémoire doit être déposé dans les cinq mois.

Le mémoire de l'intimé doit être déposé dans les huit semaines suivant la signification de celui de l'appelant.

Le mémoire de l'intervenant doit être déposé dans les quatre semaines suivant la signification de celui de l'intimé. Pour les appels dont l'avis d'appel a été déposé avant le 26 juillet 1995, le mémoire doit être déposé dans les deux semaines.

Le registraire inscrit l'appel pour audition après le dépôt du mémoire de l'intimé ou à l'expiration du délai de signification du mémoire de l'intimé.

THE STYLES OF CAUSE IN THE PRESENT TABLE ARE THE STANDARDIZED STYLES OF CAUSE (AS EXPRESSED UNDER THE "INDEXED AS" ENTRY IN EACH CASE).

LES INTITULÉS UTILISÉS DANS CETTE TABLE SONT LES INTITULÉS NORMALISÉS DE LA RUBRIQUE "RÉPERTORIÉ" DANS CHAQUE ARRÊT.

Judgments reported in [1995] 4 S.C.R. Part 3

A. (L.L.) v. B. (A.), [1995] 4 S.C.R. 536

P. (M.) v. L.B. (G.), [1995] 4 S.C.R. 592

R. v. O'Connor, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 411

Jugements publiés dans [1995] 4 R.C.S. Partie 3

A. (L.L.) c. B. (A.), [1995] 4 R.C.S. 536

P. (M.) c. L.B. (G.), [1995] 4 R.C.S. 592

R. c. O'Connor, [1995] 4 R.C.S. 411

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA SCHEDULE
CALENDRIER DE LA COUR SUPRÊME DU CANADA

- 1996 -

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	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	M 5	6	7	8	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	M 4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	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
	M 1	2	3	4	H 5	H 6
H 7	H 8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	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	M 6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	H 20	21	22	23	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	M 3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

Hearing of appeal days:
Journée d'audition de pourvois:



Motion days:
Journées de requêtes:



Holidays:
Congés statutaires:

