

[1] Supreme Court of Canada

- Unsupported generalizations are inappropriate.¹
- “the trial judge left the jury equipped with a charge that, in critical sections, is not comprehensible to a legally trained reader, let alone to a layperson juror”²
- “the zone of unfairness”³

Access

“ Access to justice depends on the efficient and responsible use of court resources. Frivolous lawsuits, endless procedural delays, and unnecessary appeals increase the time and expense of litigation and waste these resources. To preserve meaningful access, courts must ensure that their resources remain available to the litigants who need them most — namely, those who advance meritorious and justiciable claims that warrant judicial attention. ”

– *British Columbia (Attorney General) v Council of Canadians with Disabilities*, 2022 SCC 27 at para 1

[2] Cour d’appel fédérale

- ‘Le rôle de la Cour est plutôt de s’assurer que la décision contestée, et la justification qui la sous-tend, possèdent les « attributs de la raisonnabilité » (*Vavilov* au para 86, citant *Dunsmuir* au para 47). Elle doit ainsi s’intéresser à la fois au résultat obtenu et au raisonnement qui a mené à ce résultat. Comme la Cour suprême le rappelait dans *Vavilov*, la décision raisonnable est celle qui est « fondée sur une analyse intrinsèquement cohérente et rationnelle et [qui] est justifiée au regard des contraintes juridiques et factuelles auxquelles le décideur est assujetti » (*Vavilov* aux para 85-90).’⁴

[1] In a valiant but ultimately futile effort to bring proportionality to this action, I heard what I had hoped would be an attenuated refusals motion in which the parties might focus on what was truly needed to

¹*BJT v JD*, 2022 SCC 24 at para 108 <CanLII>.

²*R v Goforth*, 2022 SCC 25 at para 67, [2021] SCJ No 103 (QL), <CanLII>.

³*Canada (Attorney General) v Collins Family Trust*, 2022 SCC 26 at para 93 <CanLII>.

⁴*Guidara c Canada (Procureur général)*, 2022 CAF 122 au para 15 <CanLII>.

get the case to trial. It is apparent that the parties have much more on their respective plates than just this one piece of litigation. So their positions are driven by far wider considerations. Unless or until the court determines that the parties have consumed more than their fair share of scarce public resources, their battles appear to be destined to continue as unrelenting as the 500 year war between Eminiari VII and Vendikar.^a – *Apotex Inc v Eli Lilly and Company*, 2017 ONSC 7204

^a“A Taste of Armageddon,” *Star Trek*, Season 1, Episode 23, NBC, February 23, 1967.

[3] Federal Court of Appeal

- No action for status review if no reviewable error⁵
- ‘In its written submissions, the appellant also alleges that the Federal Court is in a conflict of interest with the respondent as the latter is a federally created organization. The appellant’s allegations are serious, unsubstantiated, without merit and ought not have been made.’⁶
- removal of vaccination requirement mootizes action to suspend requirement: ‘We are all of the view that. this appeal is now moot, as the Policy that the appellants seek to suspend is no longer in force’⁷
- “No Fishing” at discovery stage even though standard of relevance is lower than at trial⁸
- ‘Construction of a patent is a question of law, reviewable for correctness: *Whirlpool* at paras 61, 76. However, the first instance court is entitled to deference in its appreciation of the evidence that bears on construction. This includes, in particular, expert evidence as to how the skilled reader would understand the claim language.’⁹
- ‘the patent specification is not addressed to grammarians, etymologists or to the public generally, but to skilled individuals sufficiently versed in the art to which the patent relates to enable them on a technical level to appreciate the nature and description of the invention: H G Fox, *The Canadian Law and Practice Relating to Letters Patent for Inventions* (4th ed. 1969), at p. 185.’¹⁰
- ‘transparency, intelligibility and justification ...The reasons explain how and why the decision was made ...The ...Board Decision was based on an internally coherent and rational chain of analysis that was justified

⁵*Nova-Biorubber Green Technologies Inc v Sustainable Development Technology Canada*, 2022 FCA 121 at para 6 <CanLII>.

⁶*Nova-Biorubber*, *supra* note 5 at para 9.

⁷*Wojdan v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 FCA 120 at para 4 <CanLII>.

⁸*Canada v Thompson*, 2022 FCA 119 at paras 43, 46 <CanLII>.

⁹*Swist v MEG Energy Corp*, 2022 FCA 118 at para 18 <CanLII>.

¹⁰*Whirlpool*, 2000 SCC 67 at para 53, [2000] 2 SCR 1067, [2000] ACS no 68, [2000] SCJ No 68 (QL), 9 CPR (4th) 129, 186 FTR 268, 194 DLR (4th) 193, 263 NR 88. <CanLII>.

in relation to the facts and the law that constrained its functions as a reconsideration panel. ^{'11}

– “On April 18, 2016, the Appellant, while off-duty, ordered a cheese-burger at a McDonald’s restaurant. When he received it he believed the patty was raw. The Appellant became upset and raised his voice and used profanities. As he was attempting to photograph the patty, ...”¹²

¹¹*Thomson v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 FCA 97 at para 41 <CanLII>.

¹²*Canada (Attorney General) v Muller*, 2022 FCA 99 at para 12 <CanLII>.

Bibliography

Jurisprudence

- BJT v JD*, 2022 SCC 24 <CanLII>.
- British Columbia (Attorney General) v Council of Canadians with Disabilities*, 2022 SCC 27 <CanLII>.
- Canada v Thompson*, 2022 FCA 119 <CanLII>.
- Canada (Attorney General) v Collins Family Trust*, 2022 SCC 26 <CanLII>.
- Canada (Attorney General) v Muller*, 2022 FCA 99 <CanLII>.
- Canada (Ministre de la Citoyenneté et de l'Immigration) c Vavilov*, 2019 CSC 65, [2019] 4 RCS 653, [2019] ACS no 65, [2019] SCJ No 65 (QL), [2019] CarswellNat 7883, EYB 2019-335761, 59 Admin LR (6th) 1, 69 RJ imm (4th) 1, [2020] EXP 27, AZ-51654335, 312 ACWS (3d) 460, 441 DLR (4th) 1. <CanLII>.
- Dunsmuir c Nouveau-Brunswick*, 2008 CSC 9, [2008] 1 RCS 190, [2008] ACS no 9, [2008] SCJ No 9 (QL), [2008] CarswellNB 124, EYB 2008-130674, JE 2008-547, 170 LAC (4th) 1, 64 RCDT (3d) 1, 69 Admin LR (4th) 1, 69 RJ imm (3d) 1, 95 LCR 65, DTE 2008T-223, 844 APR 1, AZ-50478101, 164 ACWS (3d) 727, 291 DLR (4th) 577, 372 NR 1, 329 RNB (2d) 1. <CanLII>.
- Guidara c Canada (Procureur général)*, 2022 CAF 122 <CanLII>.
- Nova-Biorubber Green Technologies Inc v Sustainable Development Technology Canada*, 2022 FCA 121 <CanLII>.
- R v Goforth*, 2022 SCC 25, [2021] SCJ No 103 (QL), <CanLII>.
- Swist v MEG Energy Corp*, 2022 FCA 118 <CanLII>.
- Thomson v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 FCA 97 <CanLII>.
- Whirlpool Corp v Camco Inc*, 2000 SCC 67, [2000] 2 SCR 1067, [2000] ACS no 68, [2000] SCJ No 68 (QL), 9 CPR (4th) 129, 186 FTR 268, 194 DLR (4th) 193, 263 NR 88. <CanLII>.
- Wojdan v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 FCA 120 <CanLII>.

Secondary Materials: Monographs

- Fox, H G. *The Canadian Law and Practice Relating to Letters Patent for Inventions*. 4th ed. 1969.