

e-document-6	A-203-24-ID 1	
F I L E D	FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL COUR D'APPEL FÉDÉRALE June 14, 2024 14 juin 2024 Janelle Wong	D É P O S É
TOR		1

Court File No.:

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

Appellant

- and -

**MANDY EASTER AND
DOMINIC SHALE ALEXANDER**

Respondents

NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Section 27 of the *Federal Courts Act* and Rule 337 of the *Federal Courts Rules*)

TO THE RESPONDENT:

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the appellant. The relief claimed by the appellant appears on the following pages.

THIS APPEAL will be heard by the Court at a time and place to be fixed by the Judicial Administrator. Unless the Court directs otherwise, the place of hearing will be as requested by the appellant. The appellant requests that this appeal be heard at the Federal Court Building in Toronto.

IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPEAL, to receive notice of any step in the appeal or to be served with any documents in the appeal, you or a solicitor acting for you must prepare a notice of appearance in Form 341 prescribed by the *Federal Courts Rules* and serve it on the appellant's solicitor, or where the appellant is self-represented, on the appellant, **WITHIN 10 DAYS** of being served with this notice of appeal.

IF YOU INTEND TO SEEK A DIFFERENT DISPOSITION of the order appealed from, you must serve and file a notice of cross-appeal in Form 341 prescribed by the *Federal Courts Rules* instead of serving and filing a notice of appearance.

Copies of the *Federal Courts Rules* information concerning the local offices of the Court and other necessary information may be obtained on request to the Administrator of this Court at Ottawa (telephone 613-992-4238) or at any local office.

**IF YOU FAIL TO OPPOSE THIS APPEAL, JUDGMENT MAY BE
GIVEN IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU.**

June 14, 2024

Issued by: _____
(Registry Officer)

**TO: GAERTNER BARON PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION**

Barristers and Solicitors
604-119 Spadina Ave.
Toronto, ON M5V 2L1
Fax: (416) 260-2700

**Per: Arie Gaertner / Karen Sanchez /
Maija Pluto**
Tel: (416) 260-2100

Emails: Arie@gaertnerbaron.com;
Karen@gaertnerbaron.com;
Maija@gaertnerbaron.com

Counsel for the Respondent

AND TO: DOMINIC SHALE ALEXANDER
20 Deerfield Drive , Unit 1505
Nepean, ON K2G 4L2

The Respondent

NOTICE OF APPEAL

THE APPELLANT APPEALS to the Federal Court of Appeal from the Order of Madam Justice Fuhrer (“Motion Judge”) dated June 5, 2024, in Court File T-925-19 (“Order”), by which she dismissed the Appellant’s motion to amend the Statement of Defence and Cross-claim to plead ss. 269 and 270 of the *National Defence Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. N-5 (“Act”).

THE APPELLANT ASKS:

1. That the Order be set aside;
2. That the Appellant be granted leave to amend the Statement of Defence and Cross-claim (“Statement of Defence”) to plead the limitation period set out in s. 269 and the statutory bar set out in s. 270 of the *Act*;
3. That this Appeal be consolidated, or heard together with or immediately after, the appeal in Court File No. A-150-24;
4. That this Appeal and the appeal in Court File No. A-150-24 be heard on an expedited basis; and
5. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may deem just in the circumstances.

THE GROUNDS OF APPEAL are as follows:

1. The co-defendant in the action, Dominic Alexander is a former member of the Canadian Armed Forces (“CAF”). The Plaintiff alleges that Mr. Alexander, abused her physically, emotionally, sexually, and psychologically during the course of their relationship, which ended in mid-January 2006.
2. In June 2019, the Plaintiff brought an action against Mr. Alexander and the Appellant. In her action, the Plaintiff alleges that the CAF is liable to her in negligence, under the *Occupiers Liability Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.2, for breach of s. 7 of the *Charter*, and for breach of fiduciary duty.

3. Rule 75(1) of the *Federal Courts Rules*, SOR/98-106 (“*Rules*”) provides that a Court may, on a motion, at any time, allow a party to amend a document on such terms that will protect the rights of all parties.
4. In March 2024, the Appellant brought a motion for leave to amend the Statement of Defence pursuant to Rule 75 of the *Rules* to plead the limitation period in s. 269 and the statutory bar in s. 270 of the *Act*.
5. The Motion Judge dismissed the Appellant’s motion in large part on the ground that the Plaintiff would suffer an injustice non-compensable in costs if the amendments to plead these defences were allowed because the Plaintiff would be denied the opportunity to conduct discoveries prior to trial. The trial was then scheduled to begin on April 29, 2024, for ten days.
6. On April 24, 2024, the Federal Court adjourned the trial to begin December 2, 2024, for 15 days, following a motion brought by the Plaintiff.
7. With the trial date having been adjourned for 7 months, the Appellant brought a fresh motion for leave to amend the Statement of Defence pursuant to Rule 75 of the *Rules*, to plead ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act*, on the basis that the adjournment of the trial was a material change in circumstances.
8. The Motion Judge dismissed the Appellant’s fresh motion on the basis that the motion was an abuse of process.
9. The Motion Judge erred by denying the Appellant leave to plead the limitation period in ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act*.
10. The Motion Judge erred by misapplying and misapprehending the applicable principles governing the exercise of the Court’s discretion under Rule 75 of the *Rules*.
11. The Motion Judge erred in finding that the Appellant was required to provide evidence establishing what the Appellant, His Majesty the King, “may or may not have thought about ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act* at the time the Statement of

Defence was prepared.”

12. The Motion Judge erred in dismissing the fresh motion on the ground that the omission in pleading ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act* was not “unknowable” by His Majesty the King at the time the Statement of Defence was prepared.
13. The Motion Judge erred in failing to consider the prejudice to the Appellant by not permitting him to raise the defences in ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act*.
14. The Motion Judge erred by imposing an onus on the Crown to show evidence about whether His Majesty the King, knew about ss. 269 and 270 of the *Act* at the time the Statement of Defence was prepared.
15. The Motion Judge erred by ruling that the Appellant could not rely on the material change of circumstances resulting from the adjournment of the trial.
16. The Motion Judge erred in finding that the doctrine of issue estoppel applied to preclude Canada’s fresh motion for leave to amend the Statement of Defence.
17. The Motion Judge erred in finding that the Appellant’s motion was frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process.
18. The Motion Judge erred in dismissing the fresh motion on the grounds that the Appellant appealed the Motion Judge’s Order dismissing the Appellant’s earlier motion for leave to amend the Statement of Defence, and in finding that allowing the Appellant’s motion would “foster judicial inconsistency and result in an unnecessary waste of scarce judicial resources”.
19. Such further grounds as counsel may advise and this Court may permit.

Dated: June 14, 2024



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
Department of Justice Canada
Ontario Regional Office
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite #400

Toronto, ON M5H 1T1

Fax: (647) 973-4328

Per: Sean Gaudet / Melissa Gratta
Adam Gilani / Alyson E Sutton

Tel: (647) 293-4462 / (647) 527-6392
(416) 557-3574 / (437) 423-0106

Email: sean.gaudet@justice.gc.ca
melissa.gratta@justice.gc.ca
adam.gilani@justice.gc.ca
alyson.sutton@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Appellant