



JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

for the Period from

1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022

Toronto, Ontario
March 2024

ISSN 1198-7111 (Bilingual Print)
ISSN 1923-8959 (English Internet)
ISSN 1923-8967 (French Internet)

CONTACTING THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Persons wishing to comment on the procedures or selection criteria of the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee are invited to visit the website at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/oci/jaac/> or write to:

The Chair
Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee
3rd Floor
720 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 2S9
JAAC@ontario.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	vii
PART I	1
ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS MADE	1
1.0 Judges Appointed: 1 April 2021 - 31 March 2022	1
2.0 Overview of Appointments: 1 January 1989 - 31 March 2022	1
3.0 Application Statistics.....	3
4.0 Diversity Statistics	5
PART II	6
LEGISLATION.....	6
1.0 The Courts of Justice Statute Law Amendment Act	6
PART III	11
CONFIDENTIALITY	11
1.0 Introduction.....	11
2.0 Information on Process and Procedures	11
3.0 Information on Persons who are applying for Appointment	11
PART IV	13
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT	13
1.0 Criteria for Evaluating Candidates	13
PART V	15
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND POLICIES	15
1.0 Overview of Process.....	15
2.0 The Judicial Candidate Information Form	17
3.0 References	18
4.0 Law Society and Other Outstanding Complaints and Claims	18
5.0 Criminal Record.....	19
6.0 Conflict of Interest Guidelines.....	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PART V (Continued)

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND POLICIES

7.0	Re-Interviewing Candidates	20
8.0	Notice of Vacancies and Transfer after Appointment	20
9.0	Changes in Committee Membership	21
10.0	Communications, Education and Marketing	22

PART VI

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

1.0	Recommendations of Candidates.....	23
2.0	Outreach.....	23
3.0	A Representative Committee.....	24

APPOINTEE REMUNERATION

CONCLUSION

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I – Judicial Appointments Made – April 2021 to March 2022.....	28
APPENDIX II – Diversity Statistics of Judicial Appointments Made – 1989 to 2022.....	29
APPENDIX III – Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee Member Biographies	30

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

March 4, 2024

The Honourable Doug Downey
Attorney General for Ontario
720 Bay Street, 11th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 2S9

Dear Minister Downey:

The Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee has the honour of presenting to you this report on its activities for the period from 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022, pursuant to section 43 of the *Courts of Justice Act*.

This report covers all significant matters related to the recommendation to the Attorney General of suitable candidates for judicial appointment to the Ontario Court of Justice.

Respectfully yours,

Original signed by Matthew Bondy

Matthew Bondy
Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022

Since the establishment of the Committee, 517 judges have been appointed based on Committee recommendations. Of these, 20 appointments were made between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2022.

The highlights of Committee activities are as follows:

- Appointments: Each of the 20 appointments has been made from among candidates recommended by the Committee in accordance with the first criterion, being that of professional excellence, and then on the other criteria set out in this Report. In addition to the 20 appointments, the Committee continued to work on 14 vacancies as of the end of March 2022.
- Legislation: Amendments to the *Courts of Justice Act* that came into force on 28 February 1995 established the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee and clothed it with legislative authority. These amendments set out in detail the composition, procedures, criteria for selection, and independent function of the Committee.

Further amendments to the *Courts of Justice Act* came into force on 19 April 2021, which changed the Committee's manner of operating and the process for appointing the three lawyer members. Highlights of the legislative changes include:

- An increase to the minimum number of candidates to be recommended for a judicial vacancy from two to six.
- If a similar vacancy arises within 12 months after a recommendation, the Committee is required to provide a recommendation based on the previous recruitment instead of advertising the vacancy.
- The Attorney General will now appoint the three lawyer members of the Committee from lists of three names provided by each of the Law Society of Ontario, the Ontario Bar Association, and the Federation of Ontario Law Associations. Previously, these law associations appointed their own representatives.
- A requirement for the Committee to include diversity statistics in its annual reports, based on data voluntarily disclosed by candidates.

- Procedures and Policies: The Committee continually reviews its procedures and policies, which are set forth in detail in this Report.

Candidates are generally not considered for an interview if they have any outstanding complaints registered with a Law Society. The candidate is responsible for ensuring the removal of such complaints; however, if the Committee receives sufficient information as to the complaint being frivolous or lacking in foundation, then such a complaint will not be a bar to the candidate being considered and interviewed, but the candidate would not be recommended until it has been removed.

Candidates are generally not considered for an interview if they have any outstanding Errors and Omissions claims registered with the Lawyers' Professional Indemnity Company. The candidate is responsible for ensuring the removal or resolution of such claims; however, if the Committee receives sufficient information that the claim is not substantiated, then such a claim will not be a bar to the candidate being considered and interviewed, but the candidate would not be recommended until it has been removed.

Members of the Committee may consider the application of a candidate who is involved in a civil claim or proceeding if, after receiving details of the proceeding, the members are of the opinion that the nature of the claim is such that it should not prevent the candidate from being considered for a judicial appointment.

The Committee must be informed of any outstanding civil judgments, arrears in family support payments, any past or present proposals to creditors or assignments in bankruptcy, and any sanctioning by the Law Society of Ontario or any other Law Society.

Generally, the Committee does not consider a candidate who has been convicted of a criminal offence for which the candidate has not received a record suspension.

During the reporting period, the Committee revised its procedures and policies to implement changes introduced by the 2021 legislative amendments.

INTRODUCTION

On 15 December 1988, the then Attorney General, the late Honourable Ian Scott, announced in the Ontario Legislature the establishment of the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee as a pilot project, and set out its mandate:

First, to develop and recommend comprehensive, sound and useful criteria for selection of appointments to the judiciary, ensuring that the best candidates are considered; and second, to interview applicants selected by it or referred to it by the Attorney General and make recommendations.

On February 28, 1995, the *Courts of Justice Act* established the Committee by legislation. All judges of the Ontario Court of Justice are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Attorney General from amongst a list of applicants recommended to him or her by the Committee, and chosen in accordance with the Committee's own process of criteria, policies and procedures. The Committee's criteria, policies and procedures are described, in detail, on the following pages.

The total number of applicants from the inception of the Committee to March 31, 2022 is 4,264, of which 109 are new applicants in this reporting period.

From April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022, the Committee met 18 times to select candidates, conduct interviews and attend to Committee business. One hundred and sixty-six (166) applicants were interviewed during the period and 121 have been recommended by the Committee, and 20 judges were appointed.

PART I

ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS MADE

1.0 Judges Appointed: 1 April 2021 - 31 March 2022

During this period, there have been 20 judges appointed as a result of recommendations made by the Committee. Added to the 497 appointments previously made, this number makes a total of 517 judges appointed since the Committee began its work in 1989. However, with various transfers, etc., the number of judges presiding in the Ontario Court of Justice at the time of the reporting period as a result of the Committee's recommendations was 295. The complement of the Ontario Court of Justice is 299 judges. Over 98% of all the present judges have been selected through the Committee process.

A list of the 20 new judges appointed during this reporting period can be found in Appendix I.

The ages of appointees range from 38 to 57 years, and the average age is 47 years.

2.0 Overview of Appointments: 1 January 1989 - 31 March 2022

The diversity statistics of all judges appointed under the Committee process are set out in the tables found in Appendix II, which also show the timing of the various appointments and the legal background of the appointees.

The Committee continues to encourage applications from members of equality-seeking groups. Each advertisement for a judicial vacancy states that:

The Judiciary of the Ontario Court of Justice should reflect the diversity of the population it serves. Applications from members of equality-seeking groups are encouraged.

The advertisement is posted on the Ontario Courts website at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/ocj/jaac/>. Interested persons can register for vacancy notification, via email, through the website.

In addition, advance notice of a judicial vacancy is provided to approximately 223 legal and non-legal associations, such as: the Ontario Bar Association, the ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Aboriginal Legal Services of Toronto, the Canadian Association of Black Lawyers and the Metro Toronto Chinese & Southeast Asian Legal Clinic, with a request that the material be brought to the attention of their members. This notice of judicial vacancy is also emailed to The Advocates' Society, the National Association of Women and the Law, the Canadian Bar Association, the Ontario Crown Attorneys Association, the Ontario Trial Lawyers Association, the Women's Law Association of Ontario, the Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, Indigenous Bar Association, L'Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario, Criminal Lawyers' Association, as well as the legal clinics and law associations throughout Ontario. Committee members are prepared to and do attend association meetings of groups, legal or non-legal, to discuss the appointment process and answer questions concerning Committee procedures and criteria. Our desire is to make sure that the profession and public are fully informed about the process of judicial appointment.

3.0 Application Statistics

The following table indicates the number of applications received for each vacancy advertised in 2021-22. Where interviews and recommendations were completed in this reporting period, the number of candidates interviewed and recommended are also shown:

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Barrie (Criminal) (2)	7-Jan-2022	56	_**	_***
Brampton (Criminal) (4)	16-Feb-2022	174	_**	_***
Cornwall (Criminal-Bilingual)	21-Jan-2022	17	_**	_***
Elliot Lake (50% Criminal, 50% Family-Bilingual)	28-Sep-2021	12	3	2
Guelph (Criminal)	15-Nov-2021	90	16	8
Halton (Criminal) ^{†††} (+ 1 unadvertised ^{††})	1-Mar-2021	121	22	14
Halton (Family)	22-Nov-2021	90	_**	_***
Kitchener (Criminal)	14-Mar-2022	_*	_**	_***
London (Criminal) ^{†††}	16-Nov-2020	69	13	7
Newmarket (Criminal) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on September 30, 2020 Newmarket advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	6
Newmarket (Criminal) (3)	16-Feb-2022	160	_**	_***
North Bay (50% Criminal, 50% Family - Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory) (Readvertised – previously advertised as Bilingual on November 16, 2020)	15-Sep-2021	50	15	7
Oshawa (Criminal)	26-May-2021	94	20	9
Peterborough (Criminal) ^{†††}	16-Nov-2020	74	11	5
St. Catharines (Criminal)	23-Aug-2021	70	15	8

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Sudbury ^{†††} (50% Criminal, 50% Family) (2)	18-Feb-2021	41	11	7
Sudbury (50% Criminal, 50% Family - Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory) (Readvertised – previously advertised as Bilingual on November 16, 2020)	16-Sep-2021	49	13	5
Toronto (Criminal) (2) ^{†††} (+ 2 unadvertised)	16-Nov-2020	147	33	25
Toronto (Criminal) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on November 16, 2020 Toronto advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	_***
Toronto (Family)	30-Mar-2021 (closed 20-Apr-2021)	84	26	10
Toronto (75% Family, 25% Criminal)	30-Mar-2021 (closed 20-Apr-2021)	82	22	8
Windsor (Criminal)	6-Aug-2021	38	11	6

[†] The Committee may choose not to re-interview a candidate who has been interviewed in the previous 12 months. These numbers include such candidates, who are compared and ranked along with all other persons interviewed for that vacancy.

^{††} Pursuant to section 43.1 (2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, if, within 12 months after the Committee has provided a recommendation for a judicial vacancy, a subsequent vacancy arises in the same location and with the same requirements, the subsequent vacancy will not be advertised. Instead, the Committee will provide a recommendation based on the previous recruitment.

^{†††} Applications received and previously reported in 2020-21 Annual Report. Interviews conducted and/or recommendation submitted in 2021-22.

* Advertisement closed in the next reporting period. The number of applications received will be reported in the 2022-23 Annual Report.

** Interviews held in the next reporting period. The number of candidates interviewed will be reported in the 2022-23 Annual Report.

*** Recommendation submitted in the next reporting period. The number of candidates recommended will be reported in the 2022-23 Annual Report.

4.0 Diversity Statistics[†]

As of July 6, 2017, the Committee revised the Judicial Candidate Information Form to include an option for candidates to self-identify regarding diversity.

The table below shows the totals for each of the categories selected by candidates who self-identified for the 2021-22 reporting period^{††}:

Self-Identity	Applicants*	Percentage of Total Applicants (386)**	Appointments	Percentage of Total Appointments (20)
Woman	201	52.1%	6	30.0%
Francophone	23	6.0%	1	5.0%
Ability to conduct a trial and write a judgment in French language	47	12.2%	3	15.0%
Indigenous	13	3.4%	1	5.0%
Visible Minority	70	18.1%	2	10.0%
Persons with Disabilities	21	5.4%	0	0
Ethnic/Cultural Group	96	24.9%	1	5.0%
LGBTQ2	25	6.5%	2	10.0%

[†] Amendments to the *Courts of Justice Act* that came into force on April 19, 2021 require the Committee to collect and report on diversity statistics in its annual reports. The Committee is working on updating its practices around the collection of diversity-related statistics, with revisions to the application form implemented in February 2024. The reporting on diversity statistics based on the revised application form will be fully implemented in the 2025-26 reporting period.

^{††} Applicants are included only for those vacancies where interviews occurred during the reporting period. Applicants for vacancies where interviews had not yet taken place will be reported in the next annual report.

* An applicant may self-identify in more than one category.

** Candidates who applied to multiple vacancy locations during the reporting period are counted only once in this total.

PART II

LEGISLATION

1.0 The Courts of Justice Statute Law Amendment Act

The amendments to the *Courts of Justice Act* were given Royal Assent in June 1994 and proclaimed on 28 February 1995. Section 43 deals with the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee. Legislative amendments made to this section in 2021 came into force on 19 April 2021. It is included here in full, for ease of reference:

Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee

43 (1) The committee known as the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee in English and Comité consultatif sur les nominations à la magistrature in French is continued. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Composition

- (2) The Committee is composed of,
- (a) two provincial judges, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice;
 - (b) three lawyers appointed by the Attorney General, one appointed from a list of three names submitted by the Law Society of Ontario, one appointed from a list of three names submitted by the Ontario Bar Association and one appointed from a list of three names submitted by the Federation of Ontario Law Associations;
 - (c) seven persons who are neither judges nor lawyers, appointed by the Attorney General; and
 - (d) a member of the Judicial Council, appointed by it. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Criteria

- (3) In the appointment of members under clauses (2) (b) and (c), the importance of reflecting, in the composition of the Committee as a whole, Ontario's linguistic duality and the diversity of its population and ensuring overall gender balance shall be recognized. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Term of office

- (4) The members hold office for three-year terms and may be reappointed. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Chair

- (5) The Attorney General shall designate one of the members to chair the Committee for a term of up to three years. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Term of office

- (6) The same person may serve as chair for two or more terms. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Meetings

- (7) The Committee may hold its meetings and conduct interviews in person or through electronic means, including telephone conferencing and video conferencing. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Annual report

- (8) The Committee shall prepare an annual report, provide it to the Attorney General and make it available to the public. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Same

- (9) The annual report must include,
- (a) statistics about the sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, cultural identity, disability status and ability to speak French of candidates who volunteer that information, including whether the candidates identify as Indigenous or as a member of a Francophone community, at each stage of the process, as specified by the Attorney General; and
 - (b) such other content as the Attorney General may require. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Tabling of annual report

- (10) The Attorney General shall table the Committee's annual report in the Assembly. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Personal liability

- (11) No action or other proceeding for damages shall be instituted against any member or former member of the Committee for any act done in good faith in the execution or intended execution of any power or duty that he or she has or had as a member of the Committee, or for any neglect or default in the exercise or performance in good faith of such power or duty. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Crown liability

- (12) Subsection (11) does not, by reason of subsection 8 (3) of the *Crown Liability and Proceedings Act, 2019*, relieve the Crown of liability in respect of a tort committed by a person mentioned in subsection (11) to which it would otherwise be subject. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Transition

- (13) Despite subsection (2), the appointment of every person who was a member of the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee on the day before the day section 4 of Schedule 3 to the *Accelerating Access to Justice Act, 2021* came into force is continued. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee

Functions

43.1 (1) The functions of the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee are to,

- (a) recommend candidates to the Attorney General for the appointment of provincial judges; and
- (b) provide advice to the Attorney General respecting the process for appointing provincial judges in accordance with this Act. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Manner of operating

(2) The Committee shall perform its functions in the following manner:

1. When a judicial vacancy occurs and the Attorney General asks the Committee to make a recommendation, it shall, subject to paragraph 2, advertise the vacancy and solicit applications.
2. If the Committee provided a recommendation for a judicial vacancy for the same court location that matches the requirements of the current judicial vacancy within 12 months before the day the Attorney General asked for a recommendation for the current judicial vacancy, it shall not advertise the current judicial vacancy and shall, subject to subsection (9), instead provide to the Attorney General a ranked list of at least six candidates whom it recommends, with brief supporting reasons, consisting of,
 - i. all of the candidates for the previous judicial vacancy who were recommended by the Committee for that vacancy, who confirm their interest in being considered for the current judicial vacancy and who continue to meet the Committee's criteria for recommendation, and
 - ii. if subparagraph i results in a list of fewer than six candidates, enough additional candidates to prepare a list of at least six candidates from among the candidates for the previous judicial vacancy who were not recommended for that vacancy but who meet the Committee's criteria for recommendation and who confirm their interest in being considered for the current judicial vacancy.
3. If the Committee advertises a judicial vacancy, it shall review and evaluate all applications received in response to the advertisement.
4. It may interview any of the candidates in conducting its review and evaluation.
5. It shall conduct the advertising, review and evaluation process in accordance with the criteria it establishes, which must, at minimum, provide for an assessment that,
 - i. assesses the candidates' professional excellence, community awareness and personal characteristics, and
 - ii. recognizes the desirability of reflecting the diversity of Ontario society in judicial appointments.

6. It shall make the criteria it established under paragraph 5 available to the public.
7. Subject to subsection (9), for every judicial vacancy advertised by the Committee, it shall provide the Attorney General a ranked list of at least six candidates whom it recommends, with brief supporting reasons. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Qualifications

- (3) The Committee shall not consider an application by a candidate,
 - (a) who does not meet the qualifications set out in subsection 42 (2)*; or
 - (b) who is or was a member of the Committee within the previous three years. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Information to be provided to Attorney General on request

- (4) The Committee shall provide the Attorney General with any information about the application, review and evaluation process that the Attorney General requests, other than,
 - (a) the names or identifying information of candidates who were not recommended for a judicial vacancy;
 - (b) the names or identifying information of candidates who are being assessed for a judicial vacancy that has been advertised but for which the Committee has not yet made a recommendation; and
 - (c) information collected or prepared by the Committee through a discreet inquiry. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Same

- (5) The Committee shall provide any information requested by the Attorney General under subsection (4) within 30 days of the request unless otherwise directed by the Attorney General. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Meaning of discreet inquiry

- (6) For the purposes of clause (4) (c), a discreet inquiry is a confidential inquiry conducted by the Committee into the views or opinions of individuals with knowledge of a candidate's suitability for appointment. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Recommendation of criteria

- (7) The Attorney General may recommend criteria to be included in the criteria the Committee establishes under paragraph 5 of subsection (2), and the Committee shall consider whether to include those criteria in the criteria it has established. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Rejection of ranked list

- (8) The Attorney General may reject a ranked list of recommended candidates provided under paragraph 2 or 7 of subsection (2), or under this subsection, and require the Committee to produce a new ranked list of at least six candidates whom the Committee recommends from among the remaining candidates for the judicial vacancy, with brief supporting reasons. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Insufficient recommendable candidates

- (9) If there are not enough candidates for the Committee to recommend at least six candidates who meet the Committee's criteria for recommendation in a ranked list described in paragraph 2 or 7 of subsection (2) or in subsection (8), the Committee shall,
- (a) if there is at least one candidate who meets the criteria for recommendation,
 - (i) include in the ranked list as many candidates as possible who meet the Committee's criteria for recommendation, and
 - (ii) provide the Attorney General with an explanation as to why six candidates have not been recommended; or
 - (b) if no candidates meet the criteria for recommendation, begin a new process to advertise the judicial vacancy and solicit applications in accordance with paragraphs 3 to 7 of subsection (2). 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Recommendation by Attorney General

- (10) The Attorney General shall only recommend a candidate who is in a ranked list provided under paragraph 2 or 7 of subsection (2) or under subsection (8) to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for appointment to fill a judicial vacancy. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

Transition

- (11) Despite this section, subsections 43 (8) to (12) of this Act, as they read immediately before the day section 4 of Schedule 3 to the *Accelerating Access to Justice Act*, 2021 came into force, continue to apply to any judicial vacancy that was advertised by the Committee before that day. 2021, c. 4, Sched. 3, s. 4.

***Appointment of provincial judges**

Qualification

- 42 (2)** No person shall be appointed as a provincial judge unless he or she,
- (a) has been a member of the bar of one of the provinces or territories of Canada for at least 10 years; or
 - (b) has, for an aggregate of at least 10 years,
 - (i) been a member of a bar mentioned in clause (a), and
 - (ii) after becoming a member of such a bar, exercised powers and performed duties of a judicial nature on a full-time basis in respect to a position held under a law of Canada or of one of its provinces or territories. 2006, c. 21, Sched. A, s. 5 (1).

PART III

CONFIDENTIALITY

1.0 Introduction

The Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee has developed two fundamental principles on the issue of confidentiality of committee information. These are:

- (a) information about general committee process is open to any person;
- (b) information about particular candidates is confidential unless released by candidates themselves.

2.0 Information on Process and Procedures

The *Courts of Justice Act*, by virtue of the amendments made in 1995, requires that the Committee have 13 members of which the majority shall be lay persons, i.e., neither judges nor lawyers. The appointing bodies are required to recognize that the Committee should reflect the diversity of Ontario's population and maintain linguistic duality, minority and gender balances.

The criteria for, and the manner of, selection of candidates are outlined in this Report.

Committee members individually speak to organizations and at legal conferences to publicize the process of appointments and believe that the process should be open and transparent.

3.0 Information on Persons who are applying for Appointment

By contrast to the preceding section, the Committee goes to great lengths to protect the privacy of the applicant. These measures include:

- (1) keeping sensitive information securely stored;
- (2) keeping applicants apart on interview days;
- (3) destroying or shredding applications and notes as soon as possible after appointment of a candidate;

- (4) advising references that all information received will be kept in confidence by the Committee;
- (5) advising lawyers, judges, court officials and community contacts approached for discreet inquiries that their names will not be associated with their confidential comments;
- (6) maintaining strict non-access to our files, except as provided for in the legislation, including government personnel not associated with the Committee;
- (7) holding all meetings and interviews in non-government locations.

PART IV

CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT

It is important that eligible members of the Bar and the public be aware of the criteria used by the Committee in the selection of candidates for recommendation, and for convenience, those criteria are reiterated again in this Annual Report.

The current Summary Statement of the criteria is as follows:

1.0 Criteria for Evaluating Candidates

Professional Excellence

- Professional excellence is the paramount criterion in assessing judicial candidates.
- A high level of professional achievement in the area(s) of legal work in which the candidate has been engaged. Experience in the field of law relevant to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Court of Justice on which the applicant wishes to serve is highly desirable but not essential.
- Involvement in professional activities that keeps one up to date with changes in the law and in the administration of justice.
- A demonstrated commitment to continuing legal education.
- An interest in or some aptitude for the administrative aspects of a judge's role.
- Good writing and communications skills.

Community Awareness

- A commitment to public service.
- Awareness of and an interest in knowing about the social problems that give rise to cases coming before the courts.
- Sensitivity to changes in social values relating to criminal and family matters.
- Interest in methods of dispute resolution alternatives to formal adjudication and interest in community resources available for participating in the disposition of cases.

Personal Characteristics

- An ability to listen.
- Respect for the essential dignity of all persons regardless of their circumstances.
- Politeness and consideration for others.
- Moral courage and high ethics.
- An ability to make decisions on a timely basis.
- Patience.
- Punctuality and good regular work habits.
- A reputation for integrity and fairness.
- Compassion and empathy.
- An absence of pomposity and authoritarian tendencies.

Demographics

- The Judiciary of the Ontario Court of Justice should be representative of the population it serves. The Committee is sensitive to the issue of under-representation in the judicial complement of women, Indigenous, visible and ethnic/cultural minorities, LGBTQ2 and persons with disabilities.

PART V

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND POLICIES

Set out below is a step-by-step account of how the Committee arrives at its recommendations:

1.0 Overview of Process

1. Advertising the Vacancy

Vacancies are advertised on the Ontario Courts website at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/ocj/iaac/>, subject to exceptions noted below under Subsequent Vacancies. Four weeks are allowed for applications to be received. Interested persons can register for vacancy notification, via email, through the website. In addition to advertising, the Committee contacts approximately 223 legal and interested non-legal associations with notice of the vacancy with a request that they bring the copy of the advertisement to the attention of their members.

2. Review of Applications by Members

Each member is provided with a list of all candidates who respond to an advertisement plus copies of all Judicial Candidate Information Forms. Members carefully review and assess the application forms and list candidates whom they feel should proceed to the second stage of reference checks and confidential inquiries. This list is submitted to the Committee Secretary, who compiles a master list of candidates who have been selected by four or more members, as well as all new candidates applying for the first time, for the purpose of making reference checks and confidential inquiries. If any member of the Committee ascertains that a possible suitable applicant for a judicial appointment has not been selected for reference checks and confidential inquiries, the member may request of the Committee that the applicant's name be added to the list.

3. References and Confidential Inquiries

Each member is provided with a list of candidates who have been selected by four or more Committee members, as well as all new candidates. Reference checks and confidential inquiries are then completed, unless that process has already been conducted within the last two years in relation to another vacancy. These inquiries may include judiciary, court officials, lawyers, law associations, community and social service organizations, plus the named references provided by the candidate. Once the reference checks and confidential inquiries are completed, the Committee meets to discuss the information obtained and to select candidates to be interviewed.

This selection meeting usually takes place three to four weeks after the members have received the list of candidates to be considered. Interviews normally take place approximately three weeks after the selection meeting.

4. Interviews

The number of candidates to be interviewed for a judicial vacancy will normally be a maximum of 16 over a two-day period. Each interview lasts approximately 30 minutes. Normally, the entire Committee sits for each interview. For questioning purposes, the Committee members take alternate interview turns. Following each interview, the Committee discusses the merits of the candidate interviewed. After the last interview for that particular vacancy, the Committee considers the merits of the candidates interviewed, plus the merits of the candidates interviewed on a prior occasion within the year and who have applied to be considered for the current vacancy.

5. Recommendations to the Attorney General

Pursuant to the *Courts of Justice Act*, a ranked list composed of a minimum of six candidates for each vacancy is forwarded to the Attorney General, along with brief supporting reasons, subject to exceptions set out in the legislation. In addition, the application form submitted by each ranked candidate is delivered to the Attorney General with the list.

The list of recommended candidates is provided to the Attorney General only after the clearances requested from the Law Society, LawPRO and CPIC checks have been received. These clearances are usually received approximately three weeks after the interviews have taken place.

It is at this point that the Committee's work is complete. A candidate is not notified whether or not his or her name has been put forward in the short ranked list to the Attorney General as this recommendation is personal and confidential for the Attorney General.

6. Subsequent Vacancies

Occasionally, after a vacancy has been advertised and the selection process is in progress, subsequent vacancies occur in the same location, with the same specialty of law. In these circumstances, in the interest of time, the Committee may forego advertising the subsequent vacancies. The members will evaluate the candidates who have responded to the advertised position and decide which of those candidates will be selected for consideration and interview for all vacancies.

If, within 12 months after the Committee has provided a recommendation for a judicial vacancy, a subsequent vacancy arises in the same location and with the same requirements, the subsequent vacancy will not be advertised. Instead, as required by the legislation, the Committee will provide a recommendation based on the previous recruitment.

2.0 The Judicial Candidate Information Form

1. All candidates must complete a typed current Judicial Candidate Information Form which has been designed to elicit information that is not usually included in a standard curriculum vitae, such as the nature of the legal work and experience gained in various positions the candidates have held, including pre-law experience. Also, applicants are required to express their reasons for wanting to become a judge and provide an appraisal of their own qualifications for being a judge.

Candidates who send in their standard curriculum vitae and do not complete the Committee's form are not considered.

2. Candidates are required to provide a signed electronic copy of the current Judicial Candidate Information Form together with a copy each of the signed Security Release Form, Release of Information Form and Authorization and Release Form.
3. Should a candidate wish to change any information in his or her Judicial Candidate Information Form after applying for a judicial vacancy, the candidate should contact the Committee Secretary for instructions.
4. A candidate must submit the current Judicial Candidate Information Form each time they apply for an advertised vacancy that is of interest. The Committee does not automatically consider applications on file.
5. The Judicial Candidate Information Form must be submitted in PDF format in order to ensure integrity of the application. No other format will be accepted. Additionally, the Committee will not consider applications that are not on the **current** Judicial Candidate Information Form or are received after the closing date in the vacancy advertisement.
6. All responses to an advertisement to be considered for a judicial vacancy are acknowledged. However, the Committee does **not** advise candidates that they have not been selected for an interview. Instead, the acknowledgement letter states: *"If you are selected for an interview, you will be contacted by telephone during the week of ..."*.

7. Candidates who have been interviewed within the previous twelve-month period may not necessarily be re-interviewed but will be equally considered, based on the previous interview, by the Committee in determining its list of recommendations, provided that the candidate has applied to be considered for the vacancy advertised.
8. Candidates who are interviewed and/or candidates who have been interviewed on a previous occasion and who have requested to be considered for a particular advertised vacancy **are not** advised as to whether they have been included in the list submitted to the Attorney General. Also, the Committee does not advise applicants when its work has been completed for a particular judicial vacancy and a list of recommended candidates has been submitted to the Attorney General.

3.0 References

1. The Committee requests that a candidate does not send or have submitted letters of support.
2. The Committee requires a candidate to provide the names, complete residential/office and e-mail addresses, including postal codes, personal cell phone and business telephone numbers of his or her named references. Care should be taken to provide the correct information before submitting the form. Since the members who check the references frequently do so during evenings and weekends, it is essential that personal cell phone numbers be provided.
3. All named references receive a letter from the Committee advising them that a candidate has provided their names for reference purposes and that they may be contacted by a member of the Committee. They are advised that they do not have to write to the Committee. Attached to the letter is a list of current Committee members.
4. The Committee maintains strict confidentiality with respect to the information provided by named references and obtained by confidential inquiries.

4.0 Law Society and Other Outstanding Complaints and Claims

1. Membership: To qualify for consideration, candidates must have been a member of the Bar of one of the provinces or territories of Canada for at least 10 years, or, for an aggregate of at least 10 years, been a member of such a Bar and after becoming a member of such a Bar, exercised powers and performed duties of a judicial nature on a full-time basis in respect to a position held under a law of Canada or of one of its provinces or territories, and currently be a member in good standing.

2. Complaints as to Practice: Candidates are generally not considered for an interview if they have any outstanding complaints registered with a Law Society. The candidate is responsible for ensuring the removal of such complaints; however, if the Committee receives sufficient information as to the complaint being frivolous or lacking in foundation, then such a complaint will not be a bar to the candidate being considered and interviewed, but the candidate would not be recommended until it has been removed.
3. If the candidate has been sanctioned by the Law Society of Ontario or any other Law Society, the Committee considers the circumstances. The Committee then decides whether the candidate should be considered for a judicial appointment.
4. Errors and Omissions Claims: Candidates are generally not considered for an interview if they have any outstanding Errors and Omissions claims registered with the Lawyers' Professional Indemnity Company. The candidate is responsible for ensuring the removal or resolution of such claims; however, if the Committee receives sufficient information that the claim is not substantiated, then such a claim will not be a bar to the candidate being considered and interviewed, but the candidate would not be recommended until it has been removed.
5. Civil Claims or Judgments: Members of the Committee may consider the application of a candidate who is involved in a civil claim or proceeding if, after receiving details of the proceeding, the members are of the opinion that the nature of the claim is such that it should not prevent the candidate from being considered for a judicial appointment.
6. Other Financial Matters: The Committee must be informed of any outstanding civil judgments, arrears in family support payments, any past or present proposals to creditors or assignments in bankruptcy, or serious financial difficulties of each candidate.
7. The Committee must also be informed by the candidate if the candidate is the subject of any current court order.

5.0 Criminal Record

Generally, the Committee does not consider a candidate who has been convicted of a criminal offence for which the candidate has not received a record suspension.

6.0 Conflict of Interest Guidelines

1. The Committee will not consider an application for judicial appointment from a member of the Legislative Assembly if he/she is a member of the political party of the current government. Former members of the Legislative Assembly of the same political party as the current government may apply two years after the date of resignation or retirement from office.
2. In accordance with the *Courts of Justice Act*, members of the Committee cannot apply to be considered for an appointment to the Ontario Court of Justice for a period of three years from the date they cease to serve as a member of the Committee.
3. No current member of the Committee can act as a reference for a candidate seeking an appointment to the Ontario Court of Justice.
4. Members of the Committee who have a conflict or a perceived conflict in the nature of a potential bias or prejudice in regard to a candidate must declare such conflict and refrain from taking part in the assessment, questioning and evaluation of that candidate.

7.0 Re-Interviewing Candidates

The Committee does maintain a pool of candidates who have previously been recommended but not appointed, or interviewed but not recommended.

The Committee may not consider it essential to re-interview a candidate who has been interviewed in the previous 12 months. That candidate will be compared and ranked along with all other persons interviewed for that vacancy so long as the candidate has submitted a new application to be considered for that advertised vacancy. Nevertheless, the Committee may, in its discretion, re-interview a previously interviewed candidate, and, in fact, does in circumstances where it deems it appropriate.

8.0 Notice of Vacancies and Transfer after Appointment

When a vacancy in the complement of the Ontario Court of Justice occurs, the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice, after considering the judicial resources required throughout Ontario, determines the location of the vacancy to be filled and advises the Attorney General accordingly. The Attorney General then requests the Committee to commence its process to identify candidates suitable for judicial appointment in order to make recommendations.

Because of the many requests for transfer, the Chief Justice has advised the Committee that while the Chief Justice retains the discretion to assign judges according to the needs of the Court at any time, it is the general policy of the Ontario Court of Justice that no personal request for permanent re-assignment will be considered for a period of at least five years following a judge's appointment. The determination of a judicial vacancy involves a review and assessment of the needs of the Court and a long-term commitment to the community in which the vacancy is declared. It is a commitment that is made both by the Court and by the judge who is appointed to that position. Generally speaking, where a judge is appointed to sit at a base court location and the judge does not live within that community or near to it, the Court will expect the judge to move either to the community or to within a reasonable distance of it shortly after the judge's appointment. Once a judge has been on the bench for a period of five years, the judge may request a re-assignment to another base court location. If a vacancy subsequently arises, that request will be considered along with requests received from other judges who wish to move to the same location. Other factors will also be taken into account, including the needs of the locations involved, the views of the regional senior judges and of the judges at the affected locations.

9.0 Changes in Committee Membership

The Committee saw a number of membership changes during this reporting period.

Regional Senior Justice Jeanine LeRoy was appointed by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice to replace Regional Senior Justice Aston Hall, who became Associate Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice on June 3, 2021.

Madam Justice Lise Parent was appointed by the Ontario Judicial Council on August 31, 2021 to replace Mr. Justice Peter Doody, who was on leave.

Mr. Justice Riun Shandler was appointed by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice to replace Mr. Justice Martin Lambert, whose term expired on December 31, 2021.

Ms. Katherine Hensel, a representative of the Ontario Bar Association, retired in May 2021.

Ms. Kavita Bhagat was appointed as the Ontario Bar Association representative to replace Ms. Hensel in December 2021.

Ms. Cheryl Siran was reappointed for a second term of three years as the Federation of Ontario Law Associations representative.

The members of the Committee were saddened to learn that Mr. Brian Mullan passed away on July 19, 2021. Mr. Mullan had been a lay member for 11 years. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. C. Richard Oatway was appointed by the Attorney General to fill this lay member vacancy. Mr. Oatway subsequently resigned on February 15, 2022. The Attorney General appointed Ms. Holly Haire, a lay member, to replace Mr. Oatway.

Ms. Karin Vogt was reappointed as a lay member for a second term of three years by the Attorney General.

Mr. Fareed Amin's term as a lay member and Chair expired on February 28, 2022. Mr. Amin had served as a member and Chair for six years. The Committee is grateful to Mr. Amin for his leadership, commitment and dedication.

Ms. Rachel Curran has been designated as the new Chair of the Committee. Additionally, the Attorney General reappointed Ms. Curran as a lay member for a second term.

10.0 Communications, Education and Marketing

The Committee

- ▶ notified approximately 218 organizations, including law schools, that the Committee would be pleased to attend any meetings of any group to explain its mandate, criteria and procedures. This offer extends to both legal and non-legal organizations;
- ▶ has appeared and spoken at various legal meetings and to associations, including the Annual Institute of the OBA and council meetings of the Ontario Bar Association;
- ▶ has appeared and spoken at schools and universities.

PART VI

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

1.0 Recommendations of Candidates

The Committee believes that trial experience is important. However, it also believes that all its criteria must be applied in assessing the merits of each applicant. Accordingly, the Committee from time to time has recommended and will continue to recommend suitable individuals who are not trial lawyers but who have achieved a professional excellence in other areas of law.

The Committee has continued the increased number of interviews for each vacancy. With the inclusion for consideration of all candidates who have been interviewed in the previous twelve months, a larger number of candidates from diverse backgrounds are being considered for recommendation to the Attorney General on a ranked list. Professional excellence remains of paramount importance to the Committee.

2.0 Outreach

The Committee has firmly accepted outreach as one of its roles, and will continue to invite candidates from the various under-represented sections of the legal community to seek appointment. It is looking for ways to communicate with all eligible candidates to encourage them to consider a public service through appointment to the Ontario Court of Justice.

Although there has been a steady increase in the number of students from traditionally under-represented communities entering the legal profession, the Committee recognizes that there are a number of barriers, both physical and societal, to be overcome before there will be a large enough pool to enable Ontario to reach its goal of a truly representative judiciary.

The Committee has found that, frequently, applicants from the various under-represented groups do not re-apply if unsuccessful in their first application for a particular judicial vacancy. The Committee encourages all lawyers with the requisite qualifications to apply and continue to apply if they are desirous of seeking a judicial appointment.

The Committee is concerned about the number of new applications. It is to be noted that the quality of the applicants is high; nevertheless, the Committee feels that there are many truly qualified applicants out there, but who are not applying.

The Committee believes that the profession, community groups and the public in general have a duty to encourage appropriate lawyers to submit applications.

The Committee acknowledges that it must increase its efforts to encourage qualified members of under-represented groups to apply for judicial positions.

3.0 A Representative Committee

It is important to have representation on the Committee that is as diverse as possible. Subsection 43 (3) of the amended Act establishes criteria for Committee members as follows:

In the appointment of members ..., the importance of reflecting, in the composition of the Committee as a whole, Ontario's linguistic duality and the diversity of its population and ensuring overall gender balance shall be recognized.

Although it may not be possible for the Committee to reflect all groups at all times, a good balance certainly enriches its deliberations.

Although the Attorney General makes the majority of appointments to the Committee, it is equally important that the remaining members appointed by the Chief Justice and the Ontario Judicial Council, as well as the lists of prospective member names submitted to the Attorney General by the Law Society of Ontario, the Ontario Bar Association, and the Federation of Ontario Law Associations also continue to be reflective of the population of the Province of Ontario.

The Chief Justice designates certain judicial positions, in locations where there are large Francophone populations, to be bilingual. To assess the capabilities of candidates to conduct a trial in French, it is essential that some members of the Committee be bilingual. In 2021-22, one Committee member is fluent in both English and French.

APPOINTEE REMUNERATION

The following chart provides a breakdown of the remuneration for each Committee member over the reporting period from April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022:

Appointee	Position	Per Diem Rate	Original Position Appointment Date	Appointment End Date	Total Remuneration (not including expenses)
Rachel Curran	Chair	\$566	1-Mar-2022	25-Mar-2025	\$39,227.50
	Member	\$355	26-Mar-2019	28-Feb-2022	
Fareed Amin	Chair	\$566	1-Mar-2016	28-Feb-2022	\$59,147.00
Kavita Bhagat	Member	\$355	3-Dec-2021	2-Dec-2024	\$0
Gerald Chan	Member	\$355	15-Aug-2017	14-Aug-2023	\$30,707.50
Geewadin Elliott	Member	\$355	8-Oct-2020	7-Oct-2023	\$32,305.00
Holly Haire	Member	\$355	29-Mar-2022	28-Mar-2025	\$0
Katherine Hensel	Member	\$355	4-May-2018	3-May-2021	\$3,017.50
Edward Langley	Member	\$355	4-Sep-2019	3-Sep-2022	\$35,500.00
Brian Mullan	Member	\$355	1-Jun-2010	19-Jul-2021	\$6,212.50
C. Richard Oatway	Member	\$355	18-Aug-2021	15-Feb-2022	\$17,750.00
Cheryl Siran	Member	\$355	29-Nov-2018	2-Dec-2024	\$34,790.00
Trevor Townsend	Member	\$355	3-May-2019	2-May-2022	\$38,340.00
Karin Vogt	Member	\$355	1-Mar-2019	28-Feb-2025	\$35,500.00

Travel and Meal Expenses

Information on the travel and meal expenses incurred by each Committee member is available on the Committee's website at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/oci/jaac/open/>.

There were no travel and meal expenses incurred by Committee members during this reporting period.

CONCLUSION

The Committee has established criteria and procedures that have resulted in a fair and impartial process for the appointment of judges to the Ontario Court of Justice, one that it hopes has assisted in removing any perception of unwarranted political bias or patronage in appointments to the judiciary. It will continue to re-evaluate its criteria and procedures. The Committee has worked to ensure that the candidates recommended to the Attorney General possess all the required qualities set out in its criteria and are well regarded by their peers and community.

The Committee will continue its pursuit of excellence in recommending candidates for appointment as judges to the Ontario Court of Justice. It will continue to encourage applicants from under-represented groups such that the provincial judiciary shall reasonably reflect the diversity of the population it serves. The quality of the applicants it sees is impressive.

The majority of the Committee members are lay persons who work during the day and give extraordinarily of their time and abilities to the workings of the Committee. Despite a heavy workload, Committee members work tirelessly to maintain a high level of interest in the process and derive a great deal of personal satisfaction in being part of this rewarding work.

Set out below is the estimated time spent by a lay member on the selection and recommendation process for one judicial vacancy:

Stage 1: Review of applications received

- on average, 150 applications are received for each advertised vacancy
- 15 minutes to go over one application

15 min. x 150 = 2250 minutes = **37.5 hours**

Stage 2: Reference checks

- 4 named referees for each applicant
- assuming each member has to conduct reference checks on 5 applicants and each reference check takes 15 minutes

15 min. x 5 x 4 = 300 minutes (minimum - to add call back time) = **5 hours**

Stage 3: Preparation for selection meeting

- on average, 60 applicants are on the list to be selected for an interview
- time spent going over applications and notes on reference checks/discreet inquiries
- 15 minutes per applicant

15 min. x 60 = 900 minutes = **15 hours**

Stage 4: Selection meeting, on average, to select 16 applicants out of 60 to be interviewed

- 3 minutes for each applicant

3 min. x 60 = 180 minutes = **3 hours**

Stage 5: Preparation for interviews

- assuming 15 minutes are spent on reviewing each application and notes on reference checks/discreet inquiries on 16 candidates

15 min. x 16 = 240 minutes = **4 hours**

Stage 6: Interviews, on average, 16 interviews over 2 days

- 45 minutes per interview

45 min. x 16 = 720 minutes = **12 hours**

Stage 7: Evaluation of previously interviewed candidates

- Discussion of candidates' merits
- Recommendation

1 hour – 2 hours

Estimated total hours spent by each lay member on one judicial vacancy = **78.5 hours**

Assuming there are 7 hours in a working day, 78.5 hours = **11.21 days**. The above numbers and figures are estimates only.

The above estimate does not allow for travel time associated with attendance at in-person Committee meetings.

In addition, each Committee member has additional administrative work relating to the maintenance of the confidential documents associated with the work of the Committee.

Therefore, I wish to personally commend each of the lay members as well as the judicial and lawyer members for his or her contribution to the justice system in Ontario. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work and professionalism of the Committee Coordinator and Ministry of the Attorney General support staff for ensuring the smooth operations of the Committee's work.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

Original signed by Matthew Bondy

Matthew Bondy
Chair

APPENDIX I

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE APRIL 2021 - MARCH 2022

NAME	LOCATION	EFFECTIVE DATE
Baker, Nathan Neuman	Oshawa	7 April 2022
Brown, Andrew Walter	St. Catharines	7 April 2022
Callaghan, Joseph	Toronto	30 December 2021
Campitelli, Jennifer Marie	Halton	30 December 2021
Cooper, Paul Martin	Newmarket	3 June 2021
Darroch, Stephen	London	26 August 2021
Jones, Brock	Toronto	30 December 2021
Kapurura, Wiriranai	Toronto	14 April 2022
Kim, Leonard	Sudbury	18 November 2021
Lefebvre, Julie Y.	Sudbury ☼	7 April 2022
McMorrow, Colin Daniel	North Bay ☼	14 April 2022
Myers, Jennifer Lynn	Newmarket	18 November 2021
Peterson, Dana	Elliot Lake *	7 April 2022
Puddington, Brian Gregory	Halton	30 December 2021
Restoule-Mallozzi, Jenny	Sudbury	18 November 2021
Richardson, Jeffrey Ralph	Pembroke	27 May 2021
Sickinger, Jessica Elizabeth	Newmarket	24 June 2021
Waby, Michael	Toronto	30 December 2021
Wood, Russell James	Peterborough	24 June 2021
Wright, Robert	Toronto	30 December 2021

* Denotes designated bilingual position

☼ Denotes bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory position

APPENDIX II**DIVERSITY STATISTICS OF JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY
THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JANUARY 1989 - MARCH 2022**

TIMING OF THE APPOINTMENTS				
Reporting Period	1 April 2021 – 31 March 2022		Overall Total of Appointments (January 1989 – March 2022)	
Total Appointments	20		517	
LEGAL BACKGROUND				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 21 – 31 Mar 22	Percent (N=20)	Total No.	Percent (N=517)
Private Practice	7	35.0%	323	62.5%
Provincial Crown	8	40.0%	133	25.7%
Federal Prosecutor	2	10.0%	18	3.5%
Government	3	15.0%	43	8.3%
DIVERSITY STATISTICS [†]				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 21 – 31 Mar 22	Percent (N=20)	Total No.	Percent (N=517)
Women	6	30.0%	210	40.6%
Francophone	1	5.0%	33	6.4%
Ability to conduct a trial and write a judgment in French language*	3	15.0%	3	0.6%
Indigenous	1	5.0%	16	3.1%
Visible Minority	2	10.0%	49	9.5%
Persons with Disabilities	0	0	1	0.2%
Ethnic/Cultural Group**	1	5.0%	10	1.9%
LGBTQ2**	2	10.0%	5	1.0%

† Amendments to the *Courts of Justice Act* that came into force on April 19, 2021 require the Committee to collect and report on diversity statistics in its annual reports. The Committee is working on updating its practices around the collection of diversity-related statistics, with revisions to the application form implemented in February 2024. The reporting on diversity statistics based on the revised application form will be fully implemented in the 2025-26 reporting period.

* The Committee began to report statistics on this category starting with the 2021-22 annual report.

** As of July 6, 2017, the Committee's Judicial Candidate Information Form includes a Self-Identification Regarding Diversity (Optional) section, which includes these additional categories.

APPENDIX III

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER BIOGRAPHIES

Rachel Curran, Ottawa: (Lay Member) (Chair)

Rachel Curran is a lawyer by training, and has nearly 15 years of experience in public affairs, including extensive experience providing strategic and policy advice to the Prime Minister of Canada and federal and provincial Cabinet ministers. As Director of Policy to the Prime Minister, Rachel was closely engaged in all matters involving the federal government, including foreign and defence policy, trade negotiations, economic affairs, immigration, transportation, energy and the environment, indigenous affairs, social development and intergovernmental relations. She was directly responsible for setting and implementing the government's policy agenda over the course of four years, and oversaw all major governmental initiatives including the preparation of the annual federal budget. At the provincial level, as Chief of Staff and advisor to two senior Cabinet ministers, Rachel provided advice on a range of political, policy and legislative issues related to public safety, including law enforcement, residential tenancy, consumer protection, automobile insurance, road safety, gaming, liquor licensing and distribution, and provincial emergency management. In the last five years, Rachel has worked as a senior associate with Harper & Associates Ltd., an international consulting firm led by former Prime Minister Harper, and as an instructor at Carleton University's Riddell Program in Political Management. She also appeared as a regular panelist and commentator on CBC's *Power & Politics*, and was a recurring contributor to the Institute for Research on Public Policy's *Policy Options* magazine. Rachel currently works as a member of the public policy team for Facebook Canada. Ms. Curran has been a member of the Committee since 2019 and the Chair since 2022.

Madam Justice Jeanine LeRoy, Regional Senior Justice, London

Justice Jeanine LeRoy is the Regional Senior Justice for the West Region of the Ontario Court of Justice. As the Regional Senior Justice, Justice LeRoy exercises the powers of the Chief Justice in her region, subject to the authority of the Chief Justice. This includes scheduling court hearings and assigning cases to individual judges. Previously, Justice LeRoy served as the Local Administrative Judge in London, and as a member of the Court's Education Secretariat in her roles as an Education Co-Chair for the West Region and as the Conference Coordinator for the Association of Ontario Judges. Prior to her appointment to the bench in 2011, she was certified by the Law Society of Upper Canada as a Specialist in Criminal Law. In addition to extensive criminal trial experience throughout Southwestern Ontario, Justice LeRoy argued appeals on a regular basis at the Court of Appeal and in the Superior Court of Justice. She also served as a Director of the Criminal Lawyers Association (Ontario) and as President of the Criminal Lawyers Association (London). She graduated from the University of British Columbia Law School in 1991 and was called to the Bar in 1993. Justice LeRoy is appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and has been a member since 2021.

Madam Justice Lise S. Parent, Brampton

Justice Lise Parent is the Senior Advisory Family Judge of the Ontario Court of Justice. In this role, Justice Parent advises the Chief Justice on family matters across the province. Previously, Justice Parent served as the Local Administrative Judge (Family) in Brampton, and as a member of the Court's Education Secretariat in her role as Conference Co-Chair (Family). Justice Parent is a graduate of the University of Ottawa Law School and was called to the Bar in 1989. She is fluently bilingual. Prior to her appointment to the bench in 2013, she practised exclusively family law, including child protection, in Ottawa. Justice Parent was a panel member for the Office of the Children's Lawyer and the Family Responsibility Office. She is also a former president of the Carleton County Law Association. Justice Parent is appointed to the Committee by the Ontario Judicial Council and has been a member since 2021.

Mr. Justice Riun Shandler, Toronto

Justice Riun Shandler was appointed a Judge of the Ontario Court of Justice in 2014. He currently serves as the Local Administrative Judge for the Metro North Courthouse in Toronto and as the Education Co-Chair (Criminal) for the Court's Education Secretariat and Association of Ontario Judges. Prior to his appointment, he worked at the Ministry of the Attorney General for Ontario, Crown Law Office – Criminal where his practice focussed on large and complex trials and appeals. Justice Shandler is an adjunct professor at Osgoode Hall Law School teaching mental health and criminal justice to upper year and LLM students. He is an active participant in continuing legal education and is the co-author of Mental Disorder in Canadian Criminal Law (Carswell) with Joan Barrett. He graduated from the University of British Columbia Law School in 1995 and was called to the Ontario bar in 1997. Justice Shandler is appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and has been a member since 2022.

Kavita Bhagat, Brampton: (Lawyer)

Kavita has practiced law for over 20 years. In February 2015, she was designated as a Certified Specialist in Family Law by the Law Society of Ontario (LSO). Kavita is an accredited Family Mediator, Arbitrator, Parenting Coordinator and a former Panel Lawyer for the Office of the Children's Lawyer. She offers evaluative Voice of the Child Reports. She is also trained to provide Collaborative Family Law services. Kavita is a regular presenter for the Ontario Justice Education Network and various continuing professional development programs through the Ontario Bar Association, LSO, Peel Law Association, etc. She is also an Alternate Dispute Resolution instructor at York University. As a first-generation immigrant, giving back to the community and the profession is important to her. Kavita is a former board member of the Family Dispute Resolution Institute of Ontario and past-President of the Peel Chapter of the Ontario Association of Family Mediators. She currently serves as the treasurer for Peel Mediation Arbitration. She is a former board member of the Caledon Parent and Child Centre, Ontario Early Years. Kavita currently serves as the fund development coordinator and board member of Volunteer MBC, a not-for-profit that oversees 220 plus not-for-profits in the Region of Peel. Kavita is appointed to the Committee as the Ontario Bar Association representative and has been a member since 2021.

Gerald Chan, Toronto: (Lawyer)

Gerald is a partner at Stockwoods LLP, where he practises criminal, constitutional, administrative, and select civil litigation. He has been counsel in numerous cases in the Supreme Court of Canada and he is a member of the Ontario Inmate Appeal Duty Counsel Program (a roster of lawyers who argue pro bono appeals for marginalized inmates in the Court of Appeal for Ontario). Before his call to the bar, Gerald clerked for the Honourable Justice Rosalie Silberman Abella at the Supreme Court of Canada and graduated from Osgoode Hall Law School as the co-gold medallist. Gerald is appointed by the Law Society of Ontario to this Committee and has been a member since 2017.

Cheryl Siran, Kenora: (Lawyer)

Cheryl received her Bachelor of Laws (2005) from Robson Hall at the University of Manitoba and was called to the Ontario Bar in 2006. She is currently the managing partner at Hook, Seller & Lundin LLP in Kenora practicing primarily in the fields of real estate transactions and civil and estate litigation. Cheryl has been actively involved in volunteering in the legal community throughout her career despite the challenges faced in doing so from a rural/remote location in the province. Cheryl is a Past Chair of the Federation of Ontario Law Associations (FOLA), formerly the County and District Law Presidents' Association (CDLPA). She was Chair from May 2014 to November 2015 and was a Board member from May 2011 to May 2018. Cheryl also currently sits on the Board of LibraryCo, after being appointed in November 2015. Cheryl is appointed to the Committee as the Federation of Ontario Law Associations representative and has been a member since 2018.

Geewadin Elliott, Neyaashiinigmiing: (Lay Member)

Geewadin Elliott was born in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario and is a proud Potawatomi Anishinabe citizen of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation in Neyaashiinigmiing. He has 20 years of concurrent public service and Indigenous relations experience advising government, private and public companies on culture, socioeconomics, relationship building and community engagement protocols. In 2019, after a 15-year career with the Ontario Provincial Police and Rama Police Service (Detective Constable), Geewadin pivoted toward First Nations business development and now enjoys his role with Aecon Group Inc. as Manager for Indigenous Relations for Canada-East. As a forward-thinking Indigenous leader, Geewadin has a vision to build strong partnerships among First Nations throughout the Great Lakes area to promote knowledge sharing and capacity development. Through his initiative (The Potawatomi Nation Economic Development Summit), tribal and business leaders from the United States and Canada meet quarterly to discuss nation building, economic development and trade. In 2014, Geewadin was appointed by leadership as community

trustee for the Edkaagmik Nbiizh Neyaashiinigamiingninwag Edbendaagzijig Trust (Coldwater Land Claim). He proudly serves on the Board of Governors at St. Andrew's College in Aurora and as an elected council member of The Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation. Geewadin earned a Bachelor of Arts degree (Marketing) from Michigan State University in 1999 and a diploma from the Ontario Police College in 2006, where he was selected as class leader by command staff. Geewadin enjoys cultural gatherings with his family and is a woodland style pow wow dancer. Mr. Elliott has been a member of the Committee since 2020.

Holly Haire, Wasaga Beach: (Lay Member)

Holly Haire obtained her diploma in business from Georgian College in 2004. Following her graduation, she worked as the Special Events Coordinator for the Town of Wasaga Beach. After six years in this position, she moved on to become the Executive Assistant to the Member of Parliament for Simcoe Grey. Holly opened her own business in 2016, an indoor playground facility in Collingwood, Ontario. She sold that business in 2020 and is now the owner and operator of an event company that serves Simcoe County. Volunteering and giving back to her community are priorities for Holly. She has served as President for the Rotary Club of Wasaga Beach, is a previous board member for Big Brothers Big Sisters of The Georgian Triangle, and actively participates in many community-based fundraisers and initiatives. Holly was recognized as "Wasaga's Finest Citizen" for making a difference in her community and is a Paul Harris Fellow through Rotary International for her dedication to volunteering. Ms. Haire has been a member of the Committee since 2022.

Edward Langley, Hamilton: (Lay Member)

Edward Langley was born in Toronto and has lived mostly in the west GTA, including his current home in Hamilton. He attended Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, where he obtained his BA in Psychology with a minor in History. Edward's professional career has been primarily focused in the insurance industry, including his current position as a Business Development Agent with Allstate Insurance Canada. In his professional development, Edward fulfilled the requirements to complete his Certified Insurance Professional (CIP) and his Other Than Life (OTL) industry leading designations. Edward believes strongly in giving back to his community. He completed a Level 2 certified instructor program with Hockey Canada, and coached minor hockey in Toronto and Mississauga for almost 20 years. Through various corporate partnerships, he has been involved in supporting such organizations as Mothers Against Drunk Driving, United Way, and the Saltfleet Stoney Creek Youth Soccer's Active Start Program, a grassroots organization that provided facilities, uniforms and instruction to eligible families in the community. Mr. Langley has been a member of the Committee since 2019.

Trevor Townsend, Toronto: (Lay Member)

Trevor Townsend was born and raised in Hamilton, Ontario. In 1991, he obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree (Political Science) from the University of Western Ontario. After graduation, Trevor worked briefly in the pharmaceutical industry before commencing a career on Bay Street within the financial services industry as a Financial Advisor. Trevor is Senior Vice President within the Wealth Management Division of Canaccord Genuity Corporation in Toronto. Over the past 25 years, Trevor has successfully built an advisory practice providing counsel to affluent investors and private corporations on the public markets. He has also pursued additional education within the investment industry, earning his Certified Investment Manager (CIM) designation, and is a Fellow of the Canadian Securities Institute (FCSI). Trevor believes strongly in giving back to the community and considers volunteerism to be of the utmost importance. He has taken great pride in supporting countless charitable causes throughout his career. More recently, Trevor was a founding Board member of *The Pindoff Family Charitable Foundation* from 2015 to 2018. Trevor is currently a Board member with the *Alma Children's Education Foundation*, which assists with children's educational initiatives in both Peru and Bolivia. Mr. Townsend has been a member of the Committee since 2019.

Karin Vogt, Stoney Creek: (Lay Member)

Karin C. Vogt has enjoyed an extensive career in both the private and public sectors as well as wide-ranging experiences in community development and capacity building. Karin is currently employed at CURIE (Canadian Universities Reciprocal Insurance Exchange), where she provides direct support to the Chief Operating Officer and other senior staff. Previously, she was Executive Assistant to the President at Pearson Dunn Insurance Ltd. In her role as the Senior Campaign Manager for United Way of Burlington and Greater Hamilton, Karin formulated and directed the organization's policy development, stewardship planning and implementation for Leadership and Major Gifts. The recognition of her contribution in these areas resulted in an appointment to Mohawk College, where she taught an extension program on Marketing, Fundraising and Public Relations in the Not for Profit Sector. Previously, Karin was Councillor Constituency Coordinator and Policy Advisor at the City of Hamilton. Karin's professional accomplishments were equally matched by both her leadership and grassroots community contributions. For her contributions as President of the Hamilton Canadian Club, the Rotary Club of Ancaster, support of women across the broad sectors of the Hamilton community, as well as numerous fundraising chairs, Karin was nominated for the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce Athena Woman of the Year Award and the Ancaster Citizenship of the Year Award. Karin continues to be involved in a number of community undertakings within the broader Hamilton community. Ms. Vogt has been a member of the Committee since 2019.

Fareed Amin, Toronto: (Lay Member) (Chair)
(Retired on February 28, 2022)

Fareed Amin worked in the public service in Ontario at the provincial and municipal levels for more than 25 years. During his tenure with the Ontario Public Service, Mr. Amin served as the Deputy Minister with the following ministries: Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; Energy and Infrastructure; Municipal Affairs and Housing; Consumer Services; Economic Development and Trade; Citizenship and Immigration and the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. Mr. Amin also worked as the Assistant Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Finance. At the municipal level, Mr. Amin was the Deputy City Manager at the City of Toronto and the CAO of the Town of Collingwood. Mr. Amin is a member of a number of not-for-profit and charitable organizations. He is on the Executive Committee of Lifeline Syria and the President of the Islamic Institute of Toronto. Mr. Amin serves on the Board of Governors for Seneca College and the University of Toronto (Scarborough Campus). Mr. Amin has an undergraduate degree in Applied Geography and Planning from the University of Guyana; a Certificate in Public Administration from the University of Toronto; a Master's Degree in Public Administration from Queen's University in Kingston and a Certificate in Leadership from the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, USA. Mr. Amin had been a member of the Committee and the Chair since 2016.

Mr. Justice Aston Joseph Hall, Regional Senior Justice, Toronto
(Retired on June 2, 2021)

Justice Aston Joseph Hall currently serves as the regional senior judge for the Toronto Region of the Ontario Court of Justice. Previously, Justice Hall was the local administrative judge in Scarborough, and a member of the court's education secretariat. Justice Hall was called to the bar in 1995, and in 2009 opened his own law firm, Aston J. Hall and Associates. Justice Hall was appointed to the Ontario Court of Justice in 2011. Born and raised in Kingston, Jamaica, Justice Hall immigrated to Canada in 1983. Justice Hall studied law at Osgoode Hall, where he was president of the Black Law Students' Association and the Black Law Students' Association of Canada. Justice Hall also holds a Master of Laws degree from Osgoode Hall. As regional senior judge of the Toronto Region of the Ontario Court of Justice, Justice Hall exercises the powers of the Chief Justice in his region, subject to the authority of the Chief Justice. This includes scheduling court hearings and assigning cases to individual judges. Justice Hall was appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and had been a member since 2020.

Mr. Justice Peter K. Doody, Ottawa
(Retired on August 26, 2021)

Justice Peter K. Doody is a judge of the Ontario Court of Justice, sitting in Ottawa. He was appointed to the bench in 2016. Justice Doody was called to the bar in 1982 and practiced as a litigation lawyer with a national law firm for over 30 years. He was the managing partner of the Ottawa office and sat on the firm's National Council. His practice covered a wide range of areas, from constitutional law to criminal law, commercial litigation and insurance law. He was on the Board of Directors and executive of The Advocates' Society, lectured frequently for the Law Society and other legal organizations, and was an adjunct professor at the law faculties of the University of Ottawa and Queen's University and the law department at Carleton University. He has served on the court's Education Secretariat and is a member of the Ontario Judicial Council. Justice Doody was appointed to the Committee by the Ontario Judicial Council and had been a member since 2020.

Mr. Justice Martin Lambert, Timmins
(Retired on December 31, 2021)

Justice Martin Lambert received his LL.B. from the University of Ottawa in 1984 and was called to the Bar in 1986. He was an associate and partner at Riopelle, Carr, Lambert, Ellery from 1986 to 1992 and was the Crown Attorney in the District of Cochrane North from 1992 to 1999. Justice Lambert was appointed to the Ontario Court of Justice in 1999. He was the local administrative judge in Cochrane from 2001 to 2003 and has been the local administrative judge in Timmins since 2003. He served as Regional Senior Judge for the Northeast Region from June 2012 to July 2015. Justice Lambert is a member of the Ontario Conference of Judges. He is a member of the committee which drafted the new Criminal Rules of the Ontario Court of Justice. He sat on the Ontario Judicial Council from August 2013 to July 2016. Justice Lambert was appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and had been a member since 2015.

Katherine Hensel, Toronto: (Lawyer)
(Retired on May 3, 2021)

Katherine Hensel is the founder and principal lawyer at Hensel Barristers. She was called to the bar in 2003. She began a litigation practice with McCarthy Tetrault in Toronto, and in 2004, Katherine joined the Ipperwash Inquiry (an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of an Anishnaabek man, Dudley George), as Assistant Commission Counsel. She served the Commission in that capacity until the release of its report in 2007. In 2007, Katherine joined Stockwoods LLP in Toronto, before leaving to establish Hensel Barristers in 2011. Katherine has built a diverse practice focused on serving First Nations and their members. She has provided advice and acted in disputes

concerning: the assertion of Aboriginal, treaty, and other Constitutional rights; the duty to consult; employment law and wrongful dismissal; commercial matters; public inquiries (including the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women's Inquiry currently underway, where she is counsel to two parties with standing); Coroners' Inquests; inherent jurisdiction; governance; child welfare matters; and select criminal cases. Along with her litigation practice, Katherine has served as an Adjunct Professor at the University of Toronto's Faculty of Law since 2009. In 2012, Katherine was counsel to Attawapiskat First Nation. The First Nation successfully applied to the Federal Court to have the decision of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to appoint a Third Party Manager declared unlawful. In 2013, Katherine was awarded the Minaake Award for Human Rights and Advocacy from the Native Women's Resource Centre and the Advocate Society's 2013 Arleen Goss Young Advocates' Award. Katherine was appointed by the Ontario Bar Association to the Committee and had been a member since 2018.

Brian Mullan, Hamilton: (Lay Member)
(Deceased on July 19, 2021)

Born and raised in Hamilton, Ontario, Brian was a career police officer who retired as the Chief of Hamilton Police Service in December 2009. He is a former member of the Parole Board of Canada. He has received the Police Exemplary Service Medal and he has been appointed as a Member of the Order of Merit for Police. Brian has a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration. He is a graduate of the F.B.I. Academy in Quantico, Virginia and the F.B.I.'s prestigious National Executive Institute. Brian has also attended the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Business, Mohawk College and Bay Area Leadership Program. Brian has been active in his community, having served as Chair of the Hamilton Community Care Access Centre, the Hamilton District Health Council, and he has been the President of Eastern Canada Chapter of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy Associates. Brian is also a former Member of the Board of Governors for Mohawk College and a former Vice President of the St. Joseph's Hospital Foundation. Mr. Mullan had been a member of the Committee since 2010.

Charles Richard Oatway, Oro-Medonte: (Lay Member)
(Resigned on February 15, 2022)

C. Richard Oatway is a retired Orillia businessman. He graduated from the University of Waterloo with a Bachelor of Mathematics degree in 1977. Richard's past community involvement includes serving as the President and Treasurer of the Orillia YMCA; the Treasurer and Building Committee Chair of the Orillia Museum of Art and History; and the President of the Simcoe County Victorian Order of Nurses. He is also a former member of the Board of Governors of Trinity College School, Port Hope, and of the Simcoe-York Grant Review Team, Ontario Trillium Foundation. Mr. Oatway had been a member of the Committee since 2021.