

---

# THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

---

EIGHTH EDITION

EDITOR  
JONATHAN COTTON

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

# THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

---

The Dispute Resolution Review  
Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Dispute Resolution Review - Edition 8  
(published in February 2016 – editor Jonathan Cotton)

For further information please email  
[Nick.Barette@lbresearch.com](mailto:Nick.Barette@lbresearch.com)

# THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

---

Eighth Edition

Editor  
JONATHAN COTTON

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

PUBLISHER  
Gideon Robertson

SENIOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER  
Nick Barette

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS  
Thomas Lee, Felicity Bown, Joel Woods

ACCOUNT MANAGER  
Jessica Parsons

MARKETING ASSISTANT  
Rebecca Mogridge

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT  
Sophie Arkell

HEAD OF PRODUCTION  
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR  
Caroline Herbert

SUBEDITOR  
Anna Andreoli

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
Paul Howarth

Published in the United Kingdom  
by Law Business Research Ltd, London  
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK  
© 2016 Law Business Research Ltd  
[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of February 2016, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – [gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com](mailto:gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com)

ISBN 978-1-909830-83-7

Printed in Great Britain by  
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire  
Tel: 0844 2480 112

# THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND  
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW  
THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW  
THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW  
THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW  
THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW  
THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW  
THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW  
THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW  
THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW  
THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW  
THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW  
THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW  
THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW  
THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW  
THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW  
THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW  
THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW  
THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP LAW REVIEW  
THE TRANSPORT FINANCE LAW REVIEW  
THE SECURITIES LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE LENDING AND SECURED FINANCE REVIEW  
THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW REVIEW  
THE SPORTS LAW REVIEW

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ADAMS & ADAMS

ARTHUR COX

ATTIAS & LEVY

AZB & PARTNERS

BAKER & PARTNERS

BONELLIEREDE

BREDIN PRAT

BUFETE HERNÁNDEZ ROMO

CONSULEGIS ABOGADOS

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

DITTMAR & INDRENIUS

HENGELER MUELLER

HERGÜNER BILGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

JUN HE LAW OFFICES

KBH KAAUNUN

KYRIAKIDES GEORGOPOULOS LAW FIRM

LS HORIZON LIMITED

MANNHEIMER SWARTLING ADVOKATBYRÅ AB

MAPLES AND CALDER

*Acknowledgements*

---

MOHAMMED AL-GHAMDI LAW FIRM IN ASSOCIATION WITH  
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP

MOLITOR AVOCATS À LA COUR

MOTIEKA & AUDZEVIČIUS

NIEDERER KRAFT & FREY

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP

PATRIKIOS PAVLOU & ASSOCIATES LLC

PINHEIRO NETO ADVOGADOS

PIPER ALDERMAN

SCHRECK LAW OFFICES

SHIN & KIM

SLAUGHTER AND MAY

SOFUNDE, OSAKWE, OGUNDIPE & BELGORE

STRELIA

SZECSKAY ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TSMP LAW CORPORATION

ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

UTEEM CHAMBERS

WOLFF GSTOEHL BRUCKSCHWEIGER ADVOKATURBÜRO

WU & PARTNERS, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

# CONTENTS

---

<b>Editor's Preface</b>	.....vii
	<i>Jonathan Cotton</i>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	AUSTRALIA..... 1
	<i>Malcolm Quirey and Gordon Grieve</i>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	BAHRAIN ..... 49
	<i>Haifa Khunji and Natalia Kumar</i>
<b>Chapter 3</b>	BELGIUM..... 61
	<i>Jean-Pierre Fierens and Joanna Kolber</i>
<b>Chapter 4</b>	BRAZIL ..... 74
	<i>Gilberto Giusti and Ricardo Dalmaso Marques</i>
<b>Chapter 5</b>	BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS ..... 93
	<i>Arabella di Iorio and John MacDonald</i>
<b>Chapter 6</b>	CANADA ..... 114
	<i>David Morrirt and Eric Morgan</i>
<b>Chapter 7</b>	CAYMAN ISLANDS..... 128
	<i>Aristos Galatopoulos and Luke Stockdale</i>
<b>Chapter 8</b>	CHINA..... 141
	<i>Xiao Wei, Zou Weining and Wang Lihua</i>
<b>Chapter 9</b>	CYPRUS ..... 155
	<i>Eleana Christofi and Katerina Philippidou</i>
<b>Chapter 10</b>	ECUADOR ..... 168
	<i>Xavier Castro-Muñoz and Fabrizio Peralta-Díaz</i>

<b>Chapter 11</b>	ENGLAND AND WALES.....	178
	<i>Jonathan Cotton and Damian Taylor</i>	
<b>Chapter 12</b>	FINLAND .....	202
	<i>Jussi Lehtinen and Heidi Yildiz</i>	
<b>Chapter 13</b>	FRANCE .....	215
	<i>Tim Portwood</i>	
<b>Chapter 14</b>	GERMANY .....	233
	<i>Henning Bälz and Carsten van de Sande</i>	
<b>Chapter 15</b>	GIBRALTAR.....	252
	<i>Stephen V Catania</i>	
<b>Chapter 16</b>	GREECE .....	263
	<i>John Kyriakides and Harry Karampelis</i>	
<b>Chapter 17</b>	HONG KONG .....	273
	<i>Mark Hughes</i>	
<b>Chapter 18</b>	HUNGARY .....	298
	<i>Dávid Kerpel</i>	
<b>Chapter 19</b>	INDIA .....	312
	<i>Zia Mody and Aditya Vikram Bhat</i>	
<b>Chapter 20</b>	IRELAND.....	329
	<i>Andy Lenny and Peter Woods</i>	
<b>Chapter 21</b>	ISRAEL.....	345
	<i>Shraga Schreck</i>	
<b>Chapter 22</b>	ITALY .....	376
	<i>Monica Iacoviello, Vittorio Allavena, Paolo Di Giovanni and Tommaso Faelli</i>	

<b>Chapter 23</b>	JERSEY.....	396
	<i>William Redgrave and James Sheedy</i>	
<b>Chapter 24</b>	KOREA.....	408
	<i>Hyun-Jeong Kang</i>	
<b>Chapter 25</b>	KUWAIT .....	421
	<i>Haifa Khunji and Diego Carmona</i>	
<b>Chapter 26</b>	LIECHTENSTEIN .....	432
	<i>Christoph Bruckschweiger</i>	
<b>Chapter 27</b>	LITHUANIA.....	442
	<i>Ramūnas Audzevičius and Mantas Juozaitis</i>	
<b>Chapter 28</b>	LUXEMBOURG .....	456
	<i>Michel Molitor</i>	
<b>Chapter 29</b>	MAURITIUS.....	468
	<i>Muhammad R C Uteem</i>	
<b>Chapter 30</b>	MEXICO .....	485
	<i>Miguel Angel Hernández-Romo Valencia</i>	
<b>Chapter 31</b>	NIGERIA.....	501
	<i>Babajide Oladipo Ogundipe and Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe</i>	
<b>Chapter 32</b>	PORTUGAL.....	516
	<i>Francisco Proença de Carvalho and Tatiana Lisboa Padrão</i>	
<b>Chapter 33</b>	ROMANIA .....	529
	<i>Levana Zigmund and Dan Cristea</i>	
<b>Chapter 34</b>	SAUDI ARABIA.....	542
	<i>Mohammed Al-Ghamdi and Paul J Neufeld</i>	

<b>Chapter 35</b>	SINGAPORE ..... 563 <i>Thio Shen Yi, Freddie Lim and Niklas Wong</i>
<b>Chapter 36</b>	SOUTH AFRICA..... 578 <i>Grégor Wolter, Jac Marais, Andrew Molver and Renée Nienaber</i>
<b>Chapter 37</b>	SPAIN ..... 597 <i>Ángel Pérez Pardo de Vera and Francisco Javier Rodríguez Ramos</i>
<b>Chapter 38</b>	SWEDEN ..... 618 <i>Jakob Ragnvaldh and Niklas Åstenius</i>
<b>Chapter 39</b>	SWITZERLAND ..... 631 <i>Daniel Eisele, Tamir Livschitz and Andreas Blattmann</i>
<b>Chapter 40</b>	TAIWAN ..... 650 <i>Simon Hsiao</i>
<b>Chapter 41</b>	THAILAND ..... 666 <i>Lersak Kancvalskul, Prechaya Ebrahim, Wanchai Yiamsamatha and Oranat Chantara-opakorn</i>
<b>Chapter 42</b>	TURKEY ..... 677 <i>H Tolga Danişman</i>
<b>Chapter 43</b>	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES..... 697 <i>D K Singh and Bushra Ahmed</i>
<b>Chapter 44</b>	UNITED STATES ..... 708 <i>Timothy G Cameron, Lauren R Kennedy and Daniel R Cellucci</i>
<b>Chapter 45</b>	UNITED STATES: DELAWARE ..... 726 <i>Elena C Norman and Lakshmi A Muthu</i>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	ABOUT THE AUTHORS..... 747
<b>Appendix 2</b>	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS .. 777

# EDITOR'S PREFACE

---

The Dispute Resolution Review provides an indispensable overview of the civil court systems of 45 jurisdictions. In a world where commercial disputes frequently cross international boundaries, it is inevitable that clients and practitioners across the globe will need to look for guidance beyond their home jurisdictions. *The Dispute Resolution Review* offers the first helping hand in navigating what can sometimes, at first sight, be an unknown and confusing landscape, but which on closer inspection often deals with familiar problems and adopts similar solutions to the courts closer to home.

This eighth edition follows the pattern of previous editions where leading practitioners in each jurisdiction set out an easily accessible guide to the key aspects of each jurisdiction's dispute resolution rules and practice, and developments over the past 12 months. *The Dispute Resolution Review* is also forward looking and the contributors offer their views on the likely future developments in each jurisdiction.

Collectively, the chapters illustrate the continually evolving legal landscape, responsive to both global and local developments. For instance, over the past year the EU has adopted a new regulation on jurisdiction which fortifies the freedom of parties of any nationality to choose to litigate in their preferred forum and grants Member State courts discretion to stay proceedings in favour of proceedings already on foot in non-Member State courts. At the other end of the spectrum, 2015 saw the Supreme Court in the United Kingdom clarify the law on penalty clauses 101 years after the seminal House of Lords' case on this issue (see the review of *ParkingEye Ltd v. Beavis* and *Cavendish Square Holding BV v. El Makdessi* [2015] UKSC 67 at page 181). But even seemingly local decisions such as this have a broad audience and can have far-reaching consequences in global commerce. It is always a pleasure – and instructive for my own practice – to observe the different ways in which jurisdictions across the globe tackle common problems – sometimes through concerted action under an umbrella international organisation and sometimes individually by adopting very different, but often equally effective, local solutions.

Over the lifetime of this review the world has plunged into deep recession and seen green shoots of recovery emerge as some economies begin to prosper again, albeit

uncertainly. One notable development over the course of 2015 has been the sharp and sustained fall in the oil price (along with commodities more generally). This has had, and will continue to have, far-reaching economic and geo-political effects which may take some time to manifest themselves fully. As many practitioners will recognise from previous global shocks, these pressures typically manifest themselves in an increased number of disputes; whether that is joint venture partners choosing to fight over the diminishing pot of profits, customers seeking to exit what have become hugely expensive long-term contracts, struggling states renegotiating or exiting their contracts (or simply expropriating commercial assets) or insolvency-related disputes as once-rich parties struggle to meet their obligations. The current economic climate and short to medium term outlook suggests that dispute resolution lawyers operating in at least the energy and commodities sectors will continue to be busy and tasked with resolving challenging multi-jurisdictional disputes for years to come.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all of the contributors from all of the jurisdictions represented in *The Dispute Resolution Review*. Their biographies start at page 747 and highlight the wealth of experience and learning from which we are fortunate enough to benefit. I would also like to thank the whole team at Law Business Research who have excelled in managing a project of this size and scope, in getting it delivered on time and in adding a professional look and finish to the contributions.

**Jonathan Cotton**  
Slaughter and May  
London  
February 2016

## Chapter 6

---

# CANADA

*David Morritt and Eric Morgan*<sup>1</sup>

### **I INTRODUCTION TO THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FRAMEWORK**

The Canadian legal system is a federal model within which legislative authority for various areas of responsibility is assigned to either the federal parliament or to the provincial legislatures. Court systems have similarly been established at both the federal and provincial levels.

The federal courts have limited jurisdiction to hear claims in certain federally regulated areas such as intellectual property and maritime law and claims against the federal government. They may also review decisions made by federally regulated tribunals. The judges of the Federal Court and the Federal Court of Appeal are appointed by the federal government. The specialised Tax Court of Canada also falls under federal jurisdiction, with matters appealed to the Federal Court of Appeal.

Canada has 10 provinces and three territories. Each province or territory has its own court system, which is generally comprised of a provincial court (which handles civil matters under a certain monetary threshold), a superior court (also called a supreme court or a Court of Queen's Bench in certain jurisdictions) with broad inherent jurisdiction, and an appellate court. Complex commercial matters are generally litigated within the provincial court systems, with Toronto, Canada's largest city, maintaining a commercial list made up of Superior Court judges with experience in commercial litigation where commercial cases can get specialised attention. Final appeals from the provincial appellate courts (and the Federal Court of Appeal) are heard by the Supreme Court of Canada, which has nine federally appointed judges who sit in Ottawa, the nation's capital. Appeals in civil matters require the Supreme Court to grant leave.

---

<sup>1</sup> David Morritt is a partner and Eric Morgan is an associate at Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP.

There are a number of specialised courts and tribunals in Canada such as employment insurance tribunals, labour relations boards and human rights tribunals. In addition, Canada is a leader in the use of alternative dispute resolution techniques such as arbitration and mediation. It is home to many well-qualified arbitrators, arbitration organisations and experienced counsel, and indeed, arbitration and mediation are statutorily mandated in some jurisdictions for certain situations.

Reflecting its diverse background, the Canadian legal system contains both the common and civil law traditions. The province of Quebec has a civil code descended from the French civil law system. The other provinces and territories follow the English common law tradition. The Supreme Court of Canada and the federal courts adjudicate matters in both civil and common law.

## II THE YEAR IN REVIEW

A number of recent developments have occurred regarding class actions, civil procedure and employment law.

In *Green v. CIBC*,<sup>2</sup> the Supreme Court decided that Ontario's Class Proceedings Act does not suspend the limitation period for a statutory claim for secondary market misrepresentation before leave for that claim has been granted under Ontario's Securities Act.

The Supreme Court in *White Burgess Langille Inman v. Abbott and Haliburton Co*<sup>3</sup> clarified that issues related to an expert's impartiality, independence and lack of bias can affect the admissibility of, as well as the weight to be accorded to, an expert's evidence. In *Moore v. Getahun*<sup>4</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal affirmed that in preparation of an expert report, consultation between counsel and expert witnesses is necessary to ensure the efficient and orderly presentation of expert evidence and the timely, affordable and just resolution of claims.

The Supreme Court in *Theratechnologies Inc v. 121851 Canada Inc*<sup>5</sup> recognised that it is not necessary to disclose to shareholders each and every interaction with a regulator, particularly where these inquiries are routine. The Court acknowledged the risks of excessive disclosure.

In *Grant Forest Products Inc v. The Toronto-Dominion Bank*,<sup>6</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal rejected the submission that the standard of review of a decision made under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) is correctness with respect to errors of law, and palpable and overriding error with respect to the exercise of discretion or findings of fact. The Court confirmed that discretionary decisions made under the

---

2 2015 SCC 60.

3 2015 SCC 23.

4 2015 ONCA 55.

5 2015 SCC 18.

6 2015 ONCA 570.

CCAA are owed considerable deference and that appellate intervention is justified only if the CCAA judge erred in principle, exercised his or her discretion unreasonably or made a manifest error.

In *Carey v. Laiken*,<sup>7</sup> the Supreme Court confirmed that the intent to interfere with the administration of justice is not an element of civil contempt and the absence of this intent to interfere is therefore not a defence.

In *Potter v. New Brunswick Legal Aid Services Commission*,<sup>8</sup> the Supreme Court confirmed the test for constructive dismissal: the court must first identify an express or implied contract term that has been breached and then determine whether that breach was sufficiently serious to constitute constructive dismissal. The Court also held that constructive dismissal may be established not only on the basis of a sufficiently serious breach, but also by conduct which, in light of all of the surrounding circumstances and viewed objectively by a reasonable person in the position of the employee, shows that the employer does not intend to be bound in the future by important terms of the contract of employment. Further, a non-breaching party claiming repudiation is entitled to rely on grounds actually in existence at the time of the alleged repudiation but which were unknown to him at the time.

### III COURT PROCEDURE

#### i Overview of court procedure

The procedures adopted in Canadian courts vary between the different court systems. Each province has rules of procedure that govern litigation in its superior courts.<sup>9</sup> The federal courts and the Tax Court also have their rules of procedure.<sup>10</sup> In addition to these rules, adjudicative bodies publish practice directions providing guidance on procedural issues on an ongoing basis. Judge-made rules are also a source of law and procedure.

Ontario's Rules of Civil Procedure were recently revised regarding automatic dismissal. An action will be dismissed for delay if it has not been set down for trial within five years of when the action was commenced, without notice to the parties.<sup>11</sup>

---

7 2015 SCC 17.

8 2015 SCC 10.

9 Alberta, Rules of Court, Alta Reg 124/2010; British Columbia Supreme Court Civil Rules, BC Reg 168/2009; Manitoba, Court of Queen's Bench Rules, Man Reg 553/88; New Brunswick, Rules of Court, NB Reg 82-73; Newfoundland and Labrador, Rules of the Supreme Court, SNL 1986, c 42, Sched D; Northwest Territories, Rules of the Supreme Court, NWT Reg R-010-96, s 8; Nova Scotia Civil Procedure Rules, NS Civ. Pro Rules 2008; Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure, RRO 1990, Reg 194; Prince Edward Island, Rules of Civil Procedure; Quebec, Code of Civil Procedure, CQLR c C-25; Saskatchewan, The Queen's Bench Rules; Yukon Territory, Rules of Court; and Northwest Territories and Nunavut, Rules of the Supreme Court, NWT Reg 010-96.

10 Federal Courts Rules, SOR/98-106; Tax Court of Canada Rules (General Procedure), SOR/90-688a.

11 O Reg 170/14.

Alberta recently updated its procedural legislation with regard to appellate practice.<sup>12</sup> The rules provide a general right to appeal all trial decisions, with leave required only in exceptional cases; to alter the deadline to file appeals; and to clarify that absent a specific provision to the contrary, the rules apply to appellate court proceedings as well as proceedings at first instance.

British Columbia and Alberta have also recently updated their procedural legislation. The new British Columbia rules include a revised system of pleadings, a case planning conference, modified rules for expert witnesses, time limits on examinations for discovery, modifications on document production and a mandatory trial management conference. The new Alberta rules include provisions for the use of electronic service and service outside the jurisdiction without a court order.

## ii Procedures and time frames

Canada's adversarial system generally means there are three phases to a court proceeding. The duration of any proceedings between sophisticated commercial parties largely depends on the parties' initiative and responsiveness. Urgent and interim applications, including those seeking injunctions or freezing orders, may be made at any time as needed during the proceedings.

The first phase of an action is the exchange of written pleadings in which the parties set out their positions, including the material facts on which they rely. The claimant will issue pleadings to be served on the defendant, and the defendant will then respond, usually within a prescribed period of time. The failure to respond gives the plaintiff an opportunity to make a motion for default judgment.

The second stage is called discovery, in which parties identify and produce relevant documents and conduct oral examinations (usually limited to one representative of each party). Motions for interlocutory relief, such as injunctions, can be brought based on affidavit evidence on which out-of-court cross-examinations may be done, producing the evidentiary record on which the motion is decided.

When the parties are satisfied with the disclosure they have received from the other side, subject to court backlogs, the matter proceeds to trial. The trial may be before a judge, or (much less frequently) a judge and jury. Following opening statements by counsel summarising the case, civil trials begin with the plaintiff presenting its evidence against the defendant, including calling witnesses to testify or introduce documentary evidence. Counsel has an opportunity to cross-examine all opposing witnesses. The defendant then presents its evidence, or may simply assert that the plaintiff has not proved its case. At the conclusion of the hearing, the plaintiff and defendant make closing submissions summarising their respective cases.

If the judge is adjudicating alone, he or she must consider all the evidence presented before making a decision based on what was proved on a balance of probabilities standard. In a judge and jury trial, the judge decides how the law applies, and it is up to the jury to determine what version of the facts it believes.

---

12 AR 41/2014.

In most civil cases, a decision at first instance can be appealed either by right or with leave of the higher court. The higher court may deny the appeal, affirm, reverse or amend the original decision, or order a new trial. The general rule is that an appellate court can interfere with factual findings made at trial only if it concludes that there was a clear and palpable error.

### iii Class actions

Class actions are available under statutes in most provinces and are increasingly common.<sup>13</sup>

An action must first be certified by the court as a class proceeding. At the certification stage, which is not a determination on the merits, the court must decide that: the claim discloses a cause of action; there is an identifiable class of plaintiffs; a class action is the preferable procedure (this criterion does not exist in the province of Quebec); the representative plaintiff is appropriate; and there are common issues to be tried. It is not necessary that the common issues predominate over individual issues, only that they be important enough that adjudicating them will significantly advance the action.

Once certified, class actions will generally proceed to have the common issues determined in a manner that is similar to standard civil litigation. Determination of any remaining individual issues may follow depending on how the common issues are decided. During the common issues phase, the defendant is entitled to oral and documentary discovery as against the representative plaintiff only, unless broader discovery rights are granted by the court.

Inter-provincial overlapping class actions can arise because class actions can be joined by non-residents. There is no formal procedure for dealing with multi-jurisdictional class actions, although the Canadian Bar Association has created a national database and has proposed a draft judicial protocol on managing such class actions and Canadian courts generally work with the courts of other provinces in a cooperative way.

### iv Representation in proceedings

Representation by counsel in civil proceedings depends on the rules of the particular court. Generally, legal representation is not required unless the party is 'under a disability' or is bringing the action in a representative capacity (e.g., in Ontario, on behalf of a class in a class proceeding). Corporations can be represented by someone who is not a lawyer with leave of the court.<sup>14</sup> A person 'under a disability' refers to someone who is a minor, mentally incapable<sup>15</sup> in respect of an issue in the proceeding, or an absentee.<sup>16</sup>

---

13 *Marcotte v. Longueuil (City)*, 2009 SCC 43, per Lebel J. at para 77. See, for example, the Class Proceedings Act, 1992, SO 1992, c 6.

14 See for instance Ont Rules, Rule 15.01(2).

15 Within the meaning of the Substitute Decisions Act, 1992, SO 1992, c 30, Sections 6 or 45.

16 Within the meaning of the Absentees Act, RSO 1990, c A.3.

v **Service out of the jurisdiction**

The procedure for service outside a jurisdiction varies by court. Expanded rules of service enable plaintiffs to serve a party outside the jurisdiction without leave of the court in certain circumstances.<sup>17</sup> These circumstances involve cases where property is located in the court's jurisdiction, a contract was made or governed there, a tort was committed or damages were sustained there. These scenarios contain elements that connect the litigation to the jurisdiction where the plaintiff wants to bring the case. If the action is not based on one of these grounds, a plaintiff needs leave of the court to serve a defendant outside the jurisdiction.

Usually, an originating process can be served on a party outside the jurisdiction in the same way it can be served within the jurisdiction, and varies depending on whether the party is a natural person or not. It can be served in any manner provided for in the jurisdiction of the service, or pursuant to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters of 1965, which is in force in Canada.

vi **Enforcement of foreign judgments**

A judgment of a foreign court has no direct effect in Canada. A party who obtains a judgment in a foreign jurisdiction can, however, bring an application or an action in a Canadian court for enforcement of that foreign order. The foreign order must be final and dispositive, such that no potential of appeal remains on the issues. This does not mean that the foreign order must be final as to the merits of all matters that may be in dispute; a foreign judgment that deals with procedural or interlocutory issues is also capable of enforcement in Canada.

A Canadian court will recognise and enforce a final judgment issued by a foreign court if the defendant attorned to the jurisdiction of the foreign court by participating in the hearing on the merits. Otherwise, a litigant seeking to enforce a foreign order must establish that there is a 'real and substantial connection' between the jurisdiction in which the order was obtained and the subject matter of the action and the parties involved.<sup>18</sup> Generally, a real and substantial connection is established if the harm giving rise to the cause of action occurred in the foreign jurisdiction, a material contract was made in that jurisdiction, or the defendant resides in or carries on relevant activities in that jurisdiction. A litigant may establish a connection on other analogous grounds, and each case is judged on its unique circumstances. A foreign judgment will not be enforced, however, if it was obtained by fraud; if the foreign proceedings were in some way contrary to Canadian notions of natural justice; or if the order is somehow repugnant to Canada's public policy.<sup>19</sup>

---

17 See for instance BC Rules, Rule 4-5(1); Man Rules, Rule 17.02; NB Rules, Rule 19.01; Ont Rules, Rule 17.02; PEI Rules, Rule 17.02; Sask Rules, Rule 12-11; Fed Rules, Rule 137; NS Rules, Rule 31.09; Nfld Rules, Rule 6.07(1); Yukon Rules, Rule 13(1), 13(8).

18 *Morguard Investments Ltd v. De Savoye*, [1990] 3 SCR 1077; *Beals v. Saldanha*, 2003 SCC 72.

19 *Beals v. Saldanha*, 2003 SCC 72.

These same principles apply to the recognition of judgments made in one province by the courts of another province. All common law provinces have reciprocating legislation facilitating interprovincial enforcement,<sup>20</sup> and only Quebec's Civil Code provides slightly different rules for enforcement in Quebec courts.<sup>21</sup> There is similar reciprocating legislation between some provinces and certain foreign states, including those from the United States, Australia and Europe.<sup>22</sup> In addition, judgments from the United Kingdom are recognised in certain provinces pursuant to a bilateral convention between Canada and the United Kingdom.<sup>23</sup>

**vii Assistance to foreign courts**

Where a party to litigation in a foreign court requires evidence from a person in Canada, they will generally need to seek letters rogatory requesting a Canadian court to compel a person in its jurisdiction to provide that evidence. In order for the application to be granted, the evidence sought must be relevant and necessary to the action; the request for evidence must be sufficiently particularised; there must be no alternative way of obtaining the evidence; it cannot be contrary to public policy; and providing the evidence must not be 'unduly burdensome'.

**viii Access to court files**

Canadian courts are generally open to the public both in terms of their proceedings (including pleadings and evidence filed with or given in the court) and their decisions. A party may apply to have a confidentiality order put in place to avoid public disclosure of court files and decisions, however, such orders are difficult to obtain. *In camera* hearings are closed sessions of court held if the court is satisfied that public access should be denied. The Supreme Court of Canada links all documents related to a proceeding, such as factums, to its dockets. In some provinces, such as British Columbia, online access to court filings is available for a fee. In other provinces, it is necessary to attend at the court registry.

---

20 See, for instance, the Ontario Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act, RSO 1990, c R.5.

21 CQLR, c C-1991, Book 10, Article 3155.

22 See, for instance, the British Columbia Court Order Enforcement Act, RSBC 1996, c 78, Section 37. Currently, British Columbia has declared the following US states as reciprocating jurisdictions: Washington, Alaska, California, Oregon, Colorado, and Idaho. In addition, orders have been declared for a number of Australian states and European countries.

23 See the Canada-United Kingdom Civil and Commercial Judgments Convention Act, RSC 1985, c C-30, wherein Parliament declared that the bilateral convention had the force of law in Canada, as well as, for instance, the Ontario Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (UK) Act, RSO 1990, c R.6, wherein Ontario requests of the government of Canada to be designated as a province to which the bilateral convention extends.

## ix Litigation funding

Third-party litigation funding is a recent phenomenon in Canada, with a few firms offering financial support to parties. In *Febr v. Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada*, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice held that third-party funding agreements are not categorically illegal on the grounds of champerty and maintenance,<sup>24</sup> but that a particular third-party funding agreement might run afoul of the law on those grounds.<sup>25</sup> The party seeking a third-party funding agreement must obtain court approval.<sup>26</sup> Contingency fee arrangements between lawyers and clients are generally permitted, but highly regulated by both legislation and professional codes of conduct.<sup>27</sup> Publicly funded support for class actions is available to a limited extent.

## IV LEGAL PRACTICE

### i Conflicts of interest and ethical walls

The rules governing conflicts of interest are founded in the duty of loyalty and the law governing fiduciaries. A ‘conflict of interest’ exists where there is a substantial risk that a lawyer’s loyalty to or representation of a client would be materially and adversely affected by the lawyer’s own interest, or the lawyer’s duties to another client, former client or third person.<sup>28</sup>

While the legal profession is largely self-regulated through provincial law societies,<sup>29</sup> the court will address claims of breach of fiduciary duty or conflicts if brought before it. In addition to legal proceedings, lawyers who breach their professional responsibilities can face disciplinary proceedings and penalties.<sup>30</sup>

The duty of loyalty includes the duty to abstain from acting against the interests of the client. A lawyer must not represent one client whose immediate legal interests

---

24 Champerty is the process whereby someone bargains with a party to a lawsuit to obtain a share in the proceeds of the suit should it be successful. Maintenance is the support or promotion of another person’s suit initiated by intermeddling for personal gain. Both are doctrines in common law jurisdictions that aim to preclude frivolous litigation.

25 2012 ONSC 2715.

26 *Febr v. Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada*, 2012 ONSC 2715 at paras 160–163.

27 See for instance Contingency Fee Agreements, O Reg 195/04, or the Code of Professional Conduct for British Columbia, 2013, Section 3.6, available: <https://www.lawsociety.bc.ca/page.cfm?cid=2578&t=Table-of-Contents>.

28 Model Code of Professional Conduct (10 October 2014) Federation of Law Societies of Canada, s 3.4 and Commentary, available: <http://flsc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/conduct3.pdf>.

29 Such as the Law Society of Upper Canada and the Law Society of British Columbia.

30 ‘If You Are the Subject of a Complaint’ (undated) The Law Society of Upper Canada, available: [www.lsuc.on.ca/subject-of-a-complaint/#discipline](http://www.lsuc.on.ca/subject-of-a-complaint/#discipline).

are directly adverse to the legal interests of another client, without consent.<sup>31</sup> The scope of this 'bright line rule' of managing conflicts was clarified by the Supreme Court in *Canadian National Railway Co v. McKercher LLP*.<sup>32</sup>

The current practice in place at larger law firms is to establish 'ethical walls' as screening mechanisms. Ethical walls are erected in order to rebut any inference that the lawyers will share confidential information.<sup>33</sup>

## ii Money laundering, proceeds of crime and funds related to terrorism

The self-governing law societies in Canada have developed and adopted requirements for identifying and verifying clients and that prevent legal professionals from receiving large sums of cash in certain circumstances and for certain transactions. The Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act is the key piece of legislation governing this area.<sup>34</sup> The legislation imposes obligations of record keeping, client identification and reporting. The Supreme Court of Canada has held that the legislation does not apply to lawyers because it violates the Constitution by interfering with the rights of clients to obtain legal advice in confidence from lawyers who are independent from the state.<sup>35</sup>

## iii Data protection

The Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act<sup>36</sup> (PIPEDA) applies to organisations that collect, use or disclose personal information in the course of commercial activities. Privacy laws in Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec, Ontario, and lately Manitoba<sup>37</sup> will apply instead of PIPEDA, but PIPEDA continues to apply to interprovincial and international transfers of personal information. The Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada has published a handbook to assist and guide lawyers in the application of PIPEDA to their legal practice.<sup>38</sup>

---

31 *R v. Neil*, 2002 SCC 70; *Strother v. 3464920 Canada Inc*, 2007 SCC 24.

32 2013 SCC 39.

33 More on ethical walls in M.D. MacNair, *Conflicts of Interest: Principles for the Legal Profession* (Toronto: Thomson Reuters Canada Ltd, 2011), 4–7.

34 SC 2000, c 17.

35 *Federation of Law Societies of Canada v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 7.

36 SC 2000, c 5.

37 Personal Information Protection Act, SA 2003, c P-6.5; Personal Information Protection Act, SBC 2003, c 63; An Act respecting the protection of personal information in the private sector, CQLR, c P-39.1; Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSO 1990, c F.31; Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act, SM 2013, c 17 (not yet in force).

38 Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, A Privacy Handbook for Lawyers: PIPEDA and Your Practice, available: [www.priv.gc.ca/information/pub/gd\\_phl\\_201106\\_e.asp](http://www.priv.gc.ca/information/pub/gd_phl_201106_e.asp).

## V DOCUMENTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVILEGE

### i Privilege

There are two main types of privilege: solicitor–client privilege and litigation privilege. Privilege belongs to the client, not the lawyer. It can only be waived through informed consent, or where the client is expressly taken as having waived privilege through conduct.<sup>39</sup>

Solicitor–client privilege protects communications between a lawyer and his or her client involving the giving or seeking of legal advice, which is intended to be confidential between the parties.<sup>40</sup> It covers any consultation for legal advice, whether or not the advice is in contemplation of litigation. It applies in the regulatory context and extends to both external and in-house counsel. It does not apply to those working in quasi-legal capacities such as patent agents and accountants. Its purpose is to facilitate full and frank communication between the client and the lawyer. It has evolved from an evidentiary rule, into a substantive right, and then into a quasi-constitutional right.<sup>41</sup> Quebec formally entrenched the right to professional secrecy as a fundamental, yet relative right, which may be yielded by an express provision of law.<sup>42</sup> Whether privilege applies to communications with foreign lawyers may depend on whether the communication is privileged in the foreign jurisdiction and whether there is an expectation of privilege.

There are some limited exceptions to solicitor–client privilege. It does not extend to communications: (1) where legal advice is not sought or offered; (2) that are not intended to be confidential; or (3) that have the purpose of furthering unlawful conduct.<sup>43</sup> Solicitor–client privilege is generally accepted by a court when the public interest in confidentiality outweighs the interests of justice served by full disclosure.<sup>44</sup> It will only be set aside by the courts where it is ‘absolutely necessary’.<sup>45</sup>

39 Examples of waiving privilege through informed consent can be seen in the following cases which were heard together by the Supreme Court of Canada: *Lavallee, Rackel & Heintz v. Canada (Attorney General)*, *White, Ottenheimer & Baker v. Canada (Attorney General)*, *R v. Fink*, 2002 SCC 61 at para 39. For an example of waiving privilege through conduct, see: *R v. Campbell*, [1999] 1 SCR 565 at para 49.

40 *Pritchard v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission)*, 2004 SCC 31 at para 15; *Solosky v. The Queen*, [1980] 1 SCR 821, p. 834 and 837.

41 *Lavallee, Rackel & Heintz v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2002 SCC 61.

42 Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, CQLR, c C-12, Section 9.

43 *Pritchard v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission)*, 2004 SCC 31 at para 16.

44 *Ontario (Public Safety and Security) v. Criminal Lawyers' Association*, 2010 SCC 23 at para 39, as referenced in Mahmud Jamal, ‘The Supreme Court of Canada on Solicitor–Client Privilege: What Every Practitioner Needs to Know’ (17 June 2011) Canadian Bar Association, PEI Branch.

45 *Goodis v. Ontario (Ministry of Correctional Services)*, 2006 SCC 31 at para 20.

Within this branch of privilege is common interest privilege.<sup>46</sup> This permits a party to share privileged information with others under certain circumstances, for example, if their common interest is the successful completion of a transaction.<sup>47</sup>

Litigation privilege protects documents prepared and communications made in anticipation of or during litigation. It covers communications between a solicitor and client or third parties consulted in preparation for litigation that need to be made in private and without fear of permanent disclosure.<sup>48</sup> The Supreme Court of Canada has adopted a test that requires that the ‘dominant purpose’ of the communication be for use in the anticipated or existing litigation, noting that ‘litigation privilege should be viewed as a limited exception to the principle of full disclosure and not as an equal partner of the broadly interpreted solicitor–client privilege’.<sup>49</sup>

Litigation privilege does not exist outside the realm of contemplated or existing litigation, whereas solicitor–client privilege protects the relationship between client and lawyer, not the process of the adversarial system. Litigation privilege ends with the litigation, though it survives in ‘closely related’ litigation.<sup>50</sup> Despite being distinct concepts, litigation and solicitor–client privilege are complementary; they serve the common cause of efficacy in the administration of justice.<sup>51</sup>

## ii Production of documents

Litigants are expected to disclose and produce all documents over which they have possession, power, or control that are relevant to any matter in issue.<sup>52</sup> This does not include documents that are privileged. Documents include physical documents and ‘data that is recorded or stored on any medium in or by a computer system or other similar device and that can be read or perceived by a person or a computer system or other similar device’ (i.e., electronic documents).<sup>53</sup>

A document can be in a party’s ‘possession, power or control’ regardless of where it is in the world. In some jurisdictions, the production obligation can extend to documents over which a subsidiary, affiliated corporation or corporation directly or indirectly controlled by a party has possession, power or control.<sup>54</sup> In the Federal Court, the Rules specifically provide that a document shall be considered to be within a party’s power or control if the party is entitled to obtain the original document, or a copy of it, and no adverse party is so entitled.<sup>55</sup>

---

46 Sometimes referred to as ‘common interest transactional privilege’ to distinguish it from ‘common interest litigation privilege’ or ‘joint defence privilege.’

47 *Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP v. Minister of National Revenue*, 2002 BCSC 1344 at para 12.

48 *Blank v. Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2006 SCC 39 at para 27.

49 *Blank v. Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2006 SCC 39 at paras 60–61.

50 *Blank v. Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2006 SCC 39 at paras 34, 37.

51 *Blank v. Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2006 SCC 39 at para 31.

52 See for instance Ont Rules, Rule 30.02(1) or BC Rules, Rule 7-1(11).

53 Fed Rules, Rule 222(1).

54 Ont Rules, Rule 30.02(4) and Man Rules, 30.02(4).

55 Fed Rules, Rule 223(3).

A court order is required to compel the production of a document by a person who is not a party to a proceeding and not controlled by a party to the proceeding.<sup>56</sup> A document is considered ‘relevant’ if the party intends to rely on it, or if the document tends to adversely affect the party’s case, or to support another party’s case.<sup>57</sup> These rules vary by province.

Across the country, rules governing civil procedure are undergoing revisions to incorporate a wider scope of electronic discovery. Practice directions have been authored to clarify the scope of e-discovery and articulate how electronic documents are to be produced.<sup>58</sup> The Sedona Principles Addressing Electronic Document Production are also used by courts to inform e-discovery procedures.<sup>59</sup>

Ontario’s Rules are embedded with the principle of proportionality in the discovery process, including the obligation to produce documents. Proportionality in this context means that the time and expense devoted to a proceeding ought to be proportionate to what is at stake in the litigation, its jurisprudential importance and the inherent complexity of the issues before the court.<sup>60</sup>

## VI ALTERNATIVES TO LITIGATION

### i Overview of alternatives to litigation

Several types of dispute resolution mechanisms are used as alternatives to litigation. The most commonly used methods are arbitration and mediation.

### ii Arbitration

Arbitration in Canada is a popular alternative to traditional litigation, especially in labour and employment, commercial, and international commercial disputes. The legislation by which arbitral awards are recognised and enforced in specific disputes will vary depending on the nature of the dispute, whether it is domestic or international, where the arbitration takes place in Canada, the subject matter of the dispute and the

---

56 Ont Rules, Rule 30.10; Alta Rules, Rule 5.13; Man Rules, Rule 30.10; NB Rules, Rule 31.11; NWT Rules, Rule 231; PEI Rules, Rule 30.10; Yukon Rules, Rules 25(25)-(28); Fed Rules, Rule 233.

57 Fed Rules, Rule 222(2).

58 See for instance the practice direction in Ontario, available: [www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/](http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/); [www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/divisional-court/#F\\_Format\\_of\\_Electronically\\_Filed\\_Documents](http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/divisional-court/#F_Format_of_Electronically_Filed_Documents).

59 The Sedona Principles Addressing Electronic Document Production, Second Edition (June 2007), available: <https://thesedonaconference.org/publication/The%20Sedona%20Principles>.

60 Honourable Coulter A Osborne, QC, ‘Civil Justice Reforms Project: Summary of Findings and Recommendations’ (November 2007), available: [www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/about/pubs/cjrp/CJRP-Report\\_EN.pdf](http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/about/pubs/cjrp/CJRP-Report_EN.pdf).

award. As a general rule, the arbitration rules and procedures selected by the parties will govern, including those for appeals of arbitral awards (whether to the courts if a domestic arbitration or to a private appeal panel).

Any contract in which parties agree to submit any forthcoming dispute to arbitration is an 'arbitration agreement'. Parties may agree that any arbitration will be governed by the applicable arbitration statute, by particular arbitration rules offered by institutions, or by rules the parties have developed. The federal Commercial Arbitration Act applies when one or more of the parties to the arbitration is the federal government, or where the arbitration is in relation to maritime or admiralty matters.<sup>61</sup> Canada is home to many experienced arbitrators, including retired judges, senior legal practitioners and individuals from other specialities.

In certain limited circumstances arbitration agreements are mandated by statute. For example, the Ontario Labour Relations Act directs that every collective agreement shall provide for arbitration.<sup>62</sup>

In 1986, Canada became the first country to adopt the United Nations UNCITRAL Model Law (the Model Law) for commercial arbitration. Although the Model Law was originally designed for international arbitration, the majority of provinces have adopted its framework through parallel legislation for domestic arbitration.

Canadian courts have traditionally granted deference to international arbitral awards. Canada's adoption of the Model Law, and its accession to the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, significantly limited the grounds on which Canadian courts have jurisdiction to set aside international arbitral awards. Subject to this, a foreign arbitral award shall be recognised as binding and shall be enforced upon application in writing to the competent Canadian court. Once the court permits the foreign award to be enforced, the options available are the same as if it were a judgment of a domestic court.

### **iii Mediation**

The escalation of legal costs and its accompanying effects on access to justice has led to a rise in the use of mediation in Canada. Indeed, the law societies of some provinces mandate that lawyers advise their clients of the availability of mediation. In most jurisdictions, parties will select their own mediator and come to agreement on the process for their mediation. In certain provinces, however, mediation has been made mandatory in specific situations, and rules have been enacted to govern the mediation process.

### **iv Other forms of alternative dispute resolution**

Other forms of alternative dispute resolution used in Canada include court-mandated settlement conferences, expert determinations and hybrid techniques such as a combination of mediation and arbitration. These forms of alternative dispute resolution

---

61 Commercial Arbitration Act, RSC 1985, c 17 (2nd Supp).

62 SO 1995, c 1, Section 48.

are used to resolve disputes confidentially in a cost-effective manner that allows the client to maintain control over the process and provides the opportunity to create business solutions to the dispute.

## VII OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

Cases currently under reserve or appeal are anticipated to address key areas of class actions, insolvency and regulation of the legal profession.

More than 10 different class actions have recently been commenced across Canada against Volkswagen for its emissions results of certain diesel engines. At least six of these putative class actions propose a national class and at least two of them propose a global class.

In *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*,<sup>63</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal will address creditor claims for protection under the CCAA, involving the interpretation of insolvency clauses in legislation and commercial contracts as well as claims for oppression and unjust enrichment.

In *Groia v. Law Society of Upper Canada*,<sup>64</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal will examine whether the Law Society of Upper Canada has the jurisdiction to investigate and regulate the conduct of lawyers within the courtroom.

---

63 2014 ONSC 6973.

64 2015 ONSC 686.

## Appendix 1

---

# ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### DAVID MORRITT

*Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP*

David Morritt was called to the Bar of Ontario in 1984 after obtaining an LLB degree from the University of Western Ontario, a BCL degree from the University of Oxford, and serving as law clerk to Mr Justice Estey at the Supreme Court of Canada. He has been a partner with Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP in Toronto since 1989 and his practice covers a broad range of corporate and commercial litigation, including corporate governance and securities, product and professional liability and defamation. David has extensive experience in defending class actions and in providing advice to corporate officers and directors, product manufacturers and professionals, and businesses generally. He has acted as counsel in cases in many Canadian jurisdictions, in all levels of the courts and numerous commercial arbitrations.

David has served as a member of the board of directors of the Advocates' Society and other professional organisations. In addition to numerous papers and articles, he is the co-author of two books: *The Oppression Remedy* and *Canadian Defamation Law and Practice*. David was selected for inclusion in the inaugural and subsequent editions of *The Best Lawyers in Canada*, and has been recognised as a 'litigation star' in *Benchmark Litigation Canada* and as a 'leading lawyer' in *Chambers Global* and *Lexpert*.

### ERIC MORGAN

*Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP*

Eric is an associate in the litigation department of Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP. Eric's practice covers a broad range of civil litigation, arbitration and ADR, including banking, class actions, securities, administrative law, and employment matters. Eric has appeared as counsel before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Ontario Court of Appeal, and, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Eric also advises on anti-corruption issues and acts in international trade matters, having appeared before the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. He is a director of the Young Canadian Arbitration Practitioners and a member

of the Canadian Bar Association's Anti-Corruption Team. Before joining Osler, Eric worked at a major international firm in London, during which time he was seconded to the Bank of England and the litigation and special investigations team of Barclays Bank plc. He also taught criminal law at Oxford University.

**OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP**

100 King Street West  
1 First Canadian Place  
Suite 6200, PO Box 50  
Toronto  
Ontario M5X 1B8  
Canada  
Tel: +1 416 362 2111  
Fax: +1 416 862 6666  
dmorritt@osler.com  
emorgan@osler.com  
www.osler.com