



Civil Litigation

CIVIL LITIGATION SECTION / SECTION DU LITIGE CIVIL

Volume 16, No. 4
July/Juillet 2008

In this Issue:

[Message from the Co-Chairs](#)

[The Law Society's Intervention to Advance Women in Private Practice](#)

[Mustapha v. Culligan of Canada Ltd.: SCC Tackles Causation](#)

[Why I Became \(an American\) Lawyer](#)

[If it Floats Like a Duck: A Brief Reflection on the History of Pleadings](#)

[Lawyers Giving Back](#)

[OBA Award for Excellence in Civil Litigation](#)

[Section Executive 2007-2008](#)

Message from the Co-Chairs

*Kathleen J. Kelly and A. Jeffrey Radnoff**



The Civil Litigation Section Executive has had a very successful year. We welcome many new members to our Executive to ensure that our Executive will stay strong and continue to grow.

The highlight of our year, at least in regard to programming, was the Civil Litigation Award, which was given to Alan Lenzner. It was a sellout. Over 500 people attended. It has now become the OBA event of the season. The Section has, and continues, to provide well-attended and worthwhile programs.



Over the summer, together with President Greg Goulin, the Section contributed to the OBA's response to the threat to the Certified Specialist Programme, and initiated a letter-writing campaign to save the programme. We then participated in the Law Society's Certified Specialist Review Group. This was of particular interest to civil litigators, who make

up about half of all certified specialists. We got the job done. The programme has been given an indefinite lease on life.

On October 24, 2007, the OBA Conference Centre was a welcome stop for a delegation of 18 judges of the Shenzhen Intermediate People's Court, a body comparable to the Superior Court of Justice with 182 judges serving the bustling City of Shenzhen, the mainland Chinese city closest to Hong Kong. The Civil Litigation Section led the OBA reception.

On December 7, 2007, members of the Civil Litigation Section were out in full force with other Ontario barristers to brave the frosty cold in our gowns and tabs, on the steps of Osgoode Hall to show our solidarity with the lawyers in Pakistan, who risked violence and imprisonment to stand up to the Musharraf regime.

On April 14, 2008, Liam McLear, Carrie Kennedy and Kevin Fisher put on the first annual Civil Litigation Law Day program, a day-long effort to introduce high school students to the work we do as jurists in civil litigation.



ONTARIO
BAR ASSOCIATION
A Branch of the CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION

A member of our Section Executive also has a seat at the table of Attorney-General Chris Bentley's Justice Partners Advisory Group, aimed at implementation of key elements of the recommendations of the Civil Justice Reform Project Report of Justice Osborne.

Our Section will also send the OBA's representative at the 2008 Uniform Law Conference of Canada, to be held in Quebec City.

Thanks to Audrey Ramsay and Lee Akazaki, our incoming Chair, for the best newsletters our Section has ever produced. Thank you for all your hard work.

According to OBA stats, readership is up by staggering amounts. There is also something great about being able to share it with others, without worrying whether you are going to get it back.

* *Kathleen J. Kelly, ADR Chambers*, (416) 362-8555 ext. 1412.

A. Jeffrey Radnoff, Radnoff Law Offices, (416) 203-3641.

Platinum Legal Group is your resource for Electronic Data Discovery and Litigation Support Services.

From chain of custody to extraction and review, it's all in the process!

PLG's team of experienced and dedicated professionals offer clients innovative and reliable solutions.

Whether your EDD requirements arise out of litigation or you simply want to implement best practices, call us.

Document Scanning & Coding

Web Hosting (Remote Access to Document Database)

CT Summation® Software Sales & Training

Document Reproduction

(416) 365-1563
1 888 639 3108
www.platinumlegal.ca
email: info@platinumlegal.ca

170 University Ave.
Suite 800
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3B3



Vancouver ■ Calgary ■ Toronto ■ Ottawa ■ Montreal ■ Halifax

PLATINUM LEGAL GROUP INC
www.platinumlegal.ca

The Law Society's Intervention to Advance Women in Private Practice

May M. Cheng*



After 20 years of women law graduates outnumbering the men, the partnership ranks of most large and mid-size firms remains unchanged, and women remain sorely in the minority. The one positive change is that the problem of female attrition is now being universally acknowledged, including by managing partners from all the major firms. The trouble is, there are no easy solutions and all will be costly to the firms, as well as require a change to the business model.

You would think that the studies showing the high cost of associate turnover (over \$300,000 for a 4th year associate), would justify the investment in more progressive policies designed to attract and retain female associates. However, these studies have not motivated firms to introduce more flexible and part-time policies, perhaps suggesting that the issue is not merely about cost, but mindset.

On May 22, 2008, the Law Society of Upper Canada's Equity Initiatives Department released its Final Report to Convocation on the Retention of Women in Private Practice Working Group, which summarizes extensive research findings and tables broad recommendations. The report sets out groundbreaking recommendations for women in small firms of five lawyers or less, including a five-year pilot project for "practice locums" and the implementation of a three-year "Parental Leave Benefit Pilot Program". For mid to large size firms, the Law Society has announced a three-year pilot project for a "Justicia Think Tank", as well as other resources for all women in the profession, such as the creation of a leadership and professional development institute, online resources, and an advisory group of women lawyers from Aboriginal, Francophone and equality-seeking communities.

Practice Locums

The practice locum project is intended to provide women in small firms with the ability to obtain a competent replacement for a short period of time in order to take a leave of absence, particularly for a maternity leave, or to assist with work on a temporary basis.

The practice locum project is intended to encompass, among other resources:

- a. an on-line registry of locum lawyers, with information about qualifications, references and any discipline history;
- b. guidelines on how to make the locum arrangement operate efficiently, including how to handle conflicts; and
- c. sample locum agreements including non-compete clauses.

The practice locums will not only be available to women, but also to sole practitioners and all lawyers who wish to take absences from a small firm (of five lawyers or less), as well as provide the potential to be employed as a practice locum for a more flexible career in law.

Parental Leave Benefit

The parental leave benefit, similar to the ones introduced in Quebec and British Columbia, will allow sole practitioners and lawyers in small firms (of five lawyers or less) to obtain a fixed sum of \$3,000 per month for

three months (maximum \$9,000), in order to take a maternity, parental or adoption leave. The goal of the benefit is to lessen the impact of a leave and hopefully assist those in financial need take a reasonable leave rather than close a practice or take virtually no leave.

The Law Society's Working Group retained the services of a consulting firm to study the feasibility and potential impact on professional dues. It is anticipated that the benefit will cost no more than between \$5 to \$15 per year for each practicing lawyer, which will be simply added to annual dues.

Considering the projected cost, it is difficult to see any reason not to provide a parental leave benefit that could make a real difference to lawyers in small or independent practices.

Justicia Pilot Project

Under the Justicia pilot project, called the Justicia Think Tank, mid to large size firms (mid size being more than five lawyers and less than 100, large firms being over 100) who agree to participate will be required to commit to collecting demographic information for reporting to the law society, adopting flexible work arrangements, introducing networking and client development initiatives specifically for women, and appointing women to leadership roles. The goal of the three-year Justicia pilot project is to develop best practices, model policies and precedents, for the benefit of women in the legal profession over the long-term.

The use of demographic data as benchmarks for the creation of programs to advance women lawyers is not unique, as a similar approach has been adopted in the United States by the Minority Corporate Counsel Association (MCCA), to advance women and visible minorities. The MCCA's Statement of Principles challenges Fortune 500 companies to sign-on to make diversity from their legal service providers a priority. The corporate legal departments of DuPont, Wal-Mart, General Motors, Sara Lee and Shell Oil Company spearheaded the effort with their in-house attorneys to ensure that women-owned and minority-owned firms get a bigger piece of their legal budgets. These companies have adopted diversity benchmarking surveys, which require law firms to disclose the diversity of their workforce and meet the target benchmarks, under the threat of losing the work. Companies like Wal-Mart are using the initiative as a part of a broader publicity campaign to improve their image, and are receiving accolades and awards for their efforts, proving that fostering diversity makes good business sense.

There is hope that the combined effect of client initiated demands for diversity and Law Society intervention may ultimately drive firms to make the changes needed to create a better law firm environment to attract and retain women.

** May M. Cheng, Partner, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP.*

Mustapha v. Culligan of Canada Ltd.: SCC Tackles Causation

James C. Morton*



On May 22, 2008, the Supreme Court of Canada released its decision in *Mustapha v. Culligan of Canada Ltd.* The case involved liability for a fly in bottled water and whether damages were too remote to allow recovery.

In the course of replacing an empty bottle of drinking water with a full one, M saw a dead fly and part of another dead fly in the unopened replacement bottle. Obsessed with the event and its “revolting implications” for the health of his family, he developed a major depressive disorder, phobia and anxiety. He sued C, the supplier of the bottle of water, for psychiatric injury.

The trial judge awarded him general and special damages, as well as damages for loss of business, but the Court of Appeal overturned the judgment on the basis that the injury was not reasonably foreseeable and hence did not give rise to a cause of action.

The Supreme Court agreed and the appeal and the cross-appeal were dismissed.

M’s damages are too remote to allow recovery. As the manufacturer of a consumable good, C owed M, the ultimate consumer of that good, a duty of care in supplying bottled water to him, and it breached the standard of care by providing M with contaminated water.

The requirement of personal injury, which includes serious and prolonged psychological injury, is also met: M suffered a debilitating psychological injury, which had a significant impact on his life. C’s breach caused that injury in fact, but not in law: M failed to show that it was foreseeable that a person of ordinary fortitude would suffer serious injury from seeing the flies in the bottle of water he was about to install.

Unusual or extreme reactions to events caused by negligence are imaginable, but not reasonably foreseeable. In this case, the trial judge erred in applying a subjective standard.

The claim for damages for breach of contract also fails. M’s damages could not be reasonably supposed to have been within the contemplation of the parties when they entered into their agreement.

*James C. Morton, *Steinberg Morton Hope & Israel LLP*.

Why I Became (an American) Lawyer

*Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**



A few years ago, after my friend and colleague in the next office died way too early, I made a list of things I'd been thinking of doing, but hadn't done. I restricted my list to the things I'd spoken to my friend about, so there were only three or four (though I did add that I'd show Giovanna, and the four kids that I love them more often). The first thing on that list was to become an American lawyer — and thereby get into the American marketplace — though still reside in Canada.

A lawyer I knew in Vancouver had moved to Arizona, studied part-time for the bar exams over a one-year period, found them “fairly straightforward” and sent me all his cassettes and study materials. I thought it best I double his study period (on the basis he's twice as smart as me), so for two years I left work mid-afternoon, came home, made myself a cup of tea, and got into it — then tried to ignore the hustle and bustle of the kids coming in from school, but still help them with their homework and their end-of-year exams. I also studied evenings, weekends, and holidays.

I went down to my Vancouver/Arizona friend's house and crammed for two weeks before the exam. I got 68.5% — the pass mark was 70.

I took the following summer off, went back down to Arizona, took a two and a half month crash course (at Arizona State University, organized by a private-provider called BarBri) and studied every American subject from Aboriginal to Zoning — all the “federal” subjects like Constitutional, Criminal, Property, Evidence, Torts, Contracts; all the state subjects like Corporations, Civil Procedure, Family, Tax, Wills and Estates, etc.

The exam I wrote (two and half days including a half-day ethics exam) was the toughest exam I've ever written (to put humility aside for a moment, I've four university degrees, so I've written a lot of exams) and the exam questions are specifically drafted so that if, for example, you know your material “reasonably well”, you will be attracted by what the instructors call “sucker answers” and promptly fail. Indeed, in very many questions, if you know the material even a bit better than that, you'll get attracted by the “sub-sucker answers”, and again promptly fail. The only sure-fire way to get through the exam is to put your complete personal and professional life on hold for three months and work your ass off — and speaking of that, I even studied on the can. I can now read the O.R.'s with my left hand.

What's the main reason for doing this? For me, getting access to the American marketplace. I now know American law just as well as any American lawyer practising that law, and am obliged to keep up-to-date on an annual basis with mandatory CLE. Here's what I'm now able to do: if a U.S. lawyer approaches me whose client has a trans-border issue, I am able to understand the legal position of the U.S. client, explain to that client how the Canadian system of law procedurally and substantively works, and strategize to find that U.S. client an appropriate solution within Canada — and vice versa, with a Canadian client going to the U.S. I generally refer Canadian clients over to one of the U.S. law firms that I work closely with — either on a straight referral basis, or I may work as part of the legal team. As we all know, you make a referral, you get a referral, that's the way it works.

Just so you know, the four toughest bars to pass are: California, Michigan, New York, and Arizona. In some years, the California bar pass rate has been as low as 23%. Many Canadian lawyers have written both New York and California — not passed, and don't tell — it's like people that go to Vegas: if they lose a lot of money, they don't tell you; if they make a lot of money, they tell everybody.

Doing a U.S. Bar, is it worth it? Who knows? I can, however, tell you this: a lawyer down there told me a Bar exam's really like a glorified IQ test: if you pass, no big deal; if you fail, you're an idiot.

I'm both.

** Eugene Meehan, Q.C., is a partner at Lang Michener, Ottawa, (613) 232-7171 x132.*



VICTORY VERBATIM
REPORTING SERVICES INC.

For appointments, visit www.victoryverbatim.com to book online or call:

416.360.6117

VICTORY VERBATIM REPORTING SERVICES INC.
Ernst & Young Tower | 222 Bay Street, Suite 900 | Toronto, Ontario M5K 1H6
t 416.360.6117 | f 416.360.6482 | www.victoryverbatim.com

If It Floats Like a Duck: A Brief Reflection on the History of Pleadings¹

David Sterns*



Monty Python's Sir Bedevere the Wise devises the following procedure when asked by a group of medieval villagers to adjudicate a charge of witchcraft: ... witches burn, and so does wood, so witches are made of wood; wood floats on water, and so do ducks; therefore, if she weighs as much as a duck, she is a witch.

When the Normans arrived on the English shores in 1066, they must have been as startled by the prevailing system of local "justice" as by any defending forces. For the ragtag societies that inhabited the British Isles before the Conquest, disputes tended to be settled with the use of boiling cauldrons, ordeals by fire and water, "judicial combat" and reference to supernatural proofs.

The Roman-based legal system, which the Normans were accustomed to, was far more civilized by comparison. Disputes started with a general written statement outlining the nature of the claim, requiring the defendant to appear before a high-ranking magistrate known as the Praetor. The parties would present their positions orally before the Praetor, who particularized the issues and reduced them to a document called a *formula*. Once an issue had been identified in the *formula*, the parties were prohibited from further submissions or additional action on the same subject matter. The *formula* also designated the judge, or *iudex*, who would preside over the trial of the issue.

The melding of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon legal systems produced a hybrid procedure which incorporated elements of both legal traditions. The debate was initiated orally by the plaintiff, who appeared before a royal justice to provide an account of the factual basis for his claim known as a "declaration", "narratio" or "count".

The defendant could respond in one of four ways: (i) outright denial of the facts thereby making an issue of all of them (the "general traverse"), (ii) denial of one material fact, which was thereby put in issue (a "special traverse"), (iii) admission of the facts, but denial that they supported a legal case, giving rise only to a legal issue for adjudication (a "demur"), or (iv) admission of the facts and introduction of new facts, which constituted a defence, but did not produce an issue ("confession and avoidance"). Thereupon, the plaintiff was required to reply in a "replication", using one of the four methods available to the defendant.

This procedure continued in multiple rounds before the magistrate. After replication came the "rejoinder", then the "sur-rejoinder", the "rebutter" and the "sur-rebutter" until the parties arrived at a singular point, which was affirmed by one side and denied by the other. At that stage, the parties were said to be "at issue" (*ad exitum*). The pleadings were then closed and the debates reduced to writing on a parchment scroll kept by the court, called the court record. The record formed the four corners of the case and could not be amended later. Neither judge nor jury could consider an issue outside of the written record.

The golden age of oral pleading began under the reign of Edward I (1239-1307), (a.k.a. "Edward the Lawgiver"), and lasted until the 15th or 16th century, when the practice developed for each pleader to borrow the parchment roll and enter his statements himself. Thus began the era of written pleadings.

With the introduction of written pleadings, the fluidity that existed during oral pleading was supplanted by rigid procedures. These procedures were so complicated that they became the exclusive preserve of a select

group of practitioners, who had mastered the highly technical rules. Many cases became a contest to see which party made the fewest fatal errors in drafting. The perils of pleading during this time caused Coke CJ to remark “more jangling and questions grow upon the manner of pleading, and exceptions to form, than upon the matter itself, and infinite causes are lost or delayed for want of good pleading.”

What we would now recognize as the statement of claim was, before 1875, called a declaration. A declaration could contain more than one count, but each count had to state a complete and separate cause of action, and constitute a good and valid declaration on its own.

A more enlightened approach to pleading arrived with the introduction of the *Common Law Procedures Acts* of 1852-1860. This judicial overhaul replaced the formulaic system of pleading with rules which would be recognizable to present-day practitioners. The focus of pleading became identifying a tenable cause of action. Sequential paragraph numbering was introduced, as well as the requirement that every pleading contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the party relies for the claim or defence, but not the evidence by which those facts are to be proved (the precursor to our Rule 25.06).

Considering that the rules which we now take for granted are derived from two ancient and contrasting legal systems, it is remarkable that our Rules of Civil Procedure distil the essentials of pleading into five flexible rules of general application (Rules 25 to 29). While they present their own challenges (e.g., the differences among facts/evidence/particulars), they are a breeze when compared with the daunting rules which our forbears had to contend with.

By the way, in Sir Bedevere’s trial, the accused does weigh the same as a duck and is carried off to be burned at the stake, content, however, that she received a fair hearing.

Sources:

Bullen & Leake & Jacob’s Precedents of Pleadings, Fifteenth Edition, Volume 1, (Sweet & Maxwell, London: 2004)

John Burke, *Jowitt’s Dictionary of English Law*, Second Edition, Volume 2 (Sweet & Maxwell, London: 1977)

Rt. Hon Lord Bingham L.C.J. “The Future of the Common Law” *C.J.Q.* Vol. 18, July 1999, Sweet & Maxwell at 203ff.

David C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror* (University of California Press, Berkeley: 1964)

Simon Goulding, *Oggers on Civil Court Actions* (Sweet & Maxwell, London: 1996).

David M. Walker, *The Oxford Companion to Law*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1980)

* *David L. Sterns, partner, Sotos LLP*, (416) 977-0007 x313.

¹ Taken from introductory remarks from the The Art of Pleading: Mastering the Fine Strokes, Friday, November 30, 2007, OBA Conference Centre. With thanks to my colleague Sam Hall for the inspirational topic.

Lawyers Giving Back

Second Annual Personal Injury Bar Charity Hockey Challenge

Michael J. Henry

The 2nd Annual Personal Injury Bar Charity Hockey Challenge was held at the Westwood Arena on March 27, 2008.

The event was put on by Michael J. Henry of Howie, Sacks & Henry LLP and hosted by a number of sponsors.

There were four teams, McKellar Sharks, Beard Winter Sharks, Bergmanis Preyra Stars and Neinstein Stars. The McKellar Sharks, captained by Brian Bangay, won the tournament. MVP Goalie was Casey Van Moorlehan, MVP Forward was Dale Orlando and MVP Defence was Peter Bodi. With all the enthusiastic new sponsors, the Personal Injury Bar was able to raise over \$18,000.00 for SFAC, a Canadian spinal research organization. Organizer, Michael J. Henry of Howie, Sacks & Henry LLP was thrilled with the level of support and enthusiasm for the tournament and is looking to double the number of teams for next year's 3rd Annual Personal Injury Bar Charity Hockey Challenge.

Sponsors of the event included, York Street Dispute Resolution Group Inc., MEA Forensic Engineers & Scientists Ltd., McKellar's Structured Settlements Inc., Beard Winter LLP, Neinstein & Associates, Able Translations Ltd., Rich Rotstein Limited, Bergmanis Preyra LLP, Deloitte & Touche, Carol Bierbrier & Associates, Network Reporting & Mediation, Rogers Partners LLP, Adaptable Design, Bay Street Process Servers, Aylesworth LLP, Andrew P. Suboch, Pepsi and Rapid Photo.

CHART YOUR OWN COURSE.



Power through dispute, investigative and regulatory challenges. Turn to us for direction[s].

www.navigantconsulting.com

Toronto 416.777.2440 » Ottawa 613.230.4500
Montréal 514.798.5874 » Québec City 418.780.5874
offices in over 40 cities worldwide

©2008 Navigant Consulting, Inc. All rights reserved. Navigant Consulting is not a certified public accounting firm and does not provide audit, attest, or public accounting services. "NAVIGANT" is a service mark of Navigant International, Inc. Navigant Consulting, Inc. (NCI) is not affiliated, associated, or in any way connected with Navigant International, Inc., and NCI's use of "NAVIGANT" is made under license from Navigant International, Inc.

NAVIGANT
CONSULTING

OBA Award for Excellence in Civil Litigation

*The Ontario Bar Association is pleased to announce that the
2008 OBA Award for Excellence in Civil Litigation will be presented to*



Thomas G. Heintzman, O.C., Q.C.

McCarthy Tétrault LLP

*Mr. Heintzman will be honoured at a gala dinner and award ceremony
to be held on Thursday, October 16, 2008
in the Concert Hall, Fairmont Royal York Hotel, Toronto*

Special Guests:

*The Honourable Mr. Justice Ian Binnie
Gérard R. Tremblay, C.M., O.Q., Q.C.*

Registration

*To purchase tickets or for more information, visit the OBA website at
www.oba.org or call 1-800-668-8900 ext. 307*

Exclusive Award Sponsor:

NAVIGANT
CONSULTING



**ONTARIO
BAR ASSOCIATION**
A Branch of the CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION



THE CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION
L'ASSOCIATION DU BARREAU CANADIEN

Call for Nominations

The National Civil Litigation Section is seeking nominations for the position of **Communications Officer** and two **Executive Members**, for the term September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2009.

For further details, please see the full [Call for Nominations](#).

Civil Litigation is published by the Civil Litigation Section of the Ontario Bar Association. Members are encouraged to submit articles or suggest story ideas.

The articles that appear in this publication represent the opinions of the authors. They do not represent or embody any official position of, or statement by the OBA except where this may be specifically indicated; nor do they attempt to set forth definitive practice standards or to provide legal advice. Precedents and other material contained herein are intended to be used thoughtfully, as nothing in the work relieves readers of their responsibility to consider it in the light of their own professional skill and judgment.

Too many emails clogging your inbox?



We heard your concerns about the volume of emails. That's why we have introduced **OBA at a Glance**, your one stop weekly e-newsletter. *Every Tuesday* in your inbox, giving you all your OBA news.



OBA at a Glance
Every Tuesday.

Section Executive 2007-2008

Co-Chair: **Kathleen J. Kelly**,
ADR Chambers
(416) 362-8555

Co-Chair: **Arthur Jeffrey Radnoff**,
Radnoff Law Offices
(416) 203-3641

Past Chair: **Peter Henderson**,
Kramer Henderson LLP
(416) 601-6820

Vice-Chair: **Riichiro Lee Akazaki**,
Gilbertson Davis Emerson LLP
(416) 979-2020

Secretary (Sections): **Paul H. Voorn**,
Andriessen & Associates, Barristers
(416) 620-7020 x23

Newsletter Co-Editor:
Riichiro Lee Akazaki,
Gilbertson Davis Emerson LLP
(416) 979-2020

Newsletter Co-Editor: **Audrey P. Ramsay**,
Withrow & Associates
(416) 512-3260

Program Coordinator:
Dante Alighieri Capannelli,
Capannelli Law Professional Corporation
(416) 593-1541

AGR Liaison: **Derek R. Freeman**,
FreemanLaw - Barristers
(416) 596-1177 x370

CLE Liaison: **Ryder L. Gilliland**,
Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
(416) 863-5849

Regional Coordinator: **Nicole Ewing**, B.A.
(Hons) LL.B., Brazeau Sellar LLP
(613) 237-4000 x227

Member-At-Large: **Kevin W. Fisher**,
Basman Smith LLP
(416) 365-0300

Member-At-Large: **J. Gardner Hodder**,
Polten & Hodder
(416) 601-6766

Member-At-Large: **Kenneth G. Hood**,
Lawrence, Lawrence, Stevenson LLP
(905) 452-6890

Member-At-Large: **Christopher J. Jaglowitz**,
Gardiner Miller Arnold LLP
(416) 363-2614

Member-At-Large: **Carrie M. Kennedy**,
Speigel Nichols Fox
(905) 791-6262 x274

Member-At-Large: **Andrew R. Kerr**,
Barrister and Solicitor Professional Corporation
(705) 727-1700

Member-At-Large: **Jacqueline L. King**,
Miller Thomson LLP
(416) 595-2966

Member-At-Large: **Liam Matthew McAlear**,
Wray James LLP
(416) 703-2067 x *292

Member-At-Large: **Jennifer McAleer**,
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
(416) 366-8381

Member-At-Large: **Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**,
Lang Michener LLP
(613) 232-7171 x132

Member-At-Large: **Brett-David Moldaver**,
Davis Moldaver LLP
(416) 869-0077

Member-At-Large: **Guillermo Schible**,
Polten & Hodder
(416) 601-6766

Member-At-Large: **David L. Sterns**,
Sotos LLP
(416) 977-0007 x313

Staff Liaison: **Peter Guennel**,
Ontario Bar Association
(416) 869-1047 x340

Staff Liaison: **Geraldine Hyland, CAE**,
Ontario Bar Association
(416) 869-1047 x320

Staff Liaison-AGR&CC: **Jonathan Clancy**,
Ontario Bar Association
(416) 869-1047

Editors:

Audrey P. Ramsay
R. Lee Akazaki

OBA News Editor:

Vickie Rose

Graphic Designer:

Simon Bluestein

Ontario Bar Association
Association du Barreau
de l'Ontario

300-20 rue Toronto St.
Toronto, Ontario
M5C 2B8

Phone • Tél.
1-800-668-8900
416-869-1047

Fax • Téléc.
416-869-1390

www.oba.org