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 *Civil procedure — Contempt of court — Required knowledge — Self-represented plaintiff failing to comply with case management orders and failing to attend case management meetings after having moved without filing change of address with court as required — Case management judge striking claim, finding plaintiff in contempt of court and awarding costs to defendants — Majority of Court of Appeal affirming decision — Dissenting judge finding that plaintiff’s failure to attend case management meetings not act of contempt and that costs award significantly disproportionate consequence for failing to file change of address — Actual knowledge of impugned orders necessary for plaintiff to be found in contempt — Action restored and costs award vacated — Alberta Rules of Court, Alta. Reg. 124/2010, r. 10.52(3)(a)(iii).*
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 APPEAL from a judgment of the Alberta Court of Appeal (Martin, McDonald and Veldhuis JJ.A.), 2016 ABCA 99, [2016] A.J. No. 432 (QL), 2016 CarswellAlta 772 (WL Can.), affirming a decision of the Court of Queen’s Bench (Kenny J.). Appeal allowed.
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 The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

1. Karakatsanis J. — The common law of civil contempt requires that the respondents prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Pintea had actual knowledge of the Orders for the case management meetings he failed to attend.
2. The case management judge failed to consider whether Mr. Pintea had actual knowledge of two of the three Orders upon which she based her decision. The respondents concede that the requirements of Rule 10.52(3)(a)(iii) of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta. Reg. 124/2010, were not met with respect to these two Orders.
3. As a result, the finding of contempt cannot stand.
4. We would add that we endorse the *Statement of Principles on Self-represented Litigants and Accused Persons* (2006) (online) established by the Canadian Judicial Council.
5. The appeal is allowed, the action is restored and the costs award vacated.

 Judgment accordingly.
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