

Justices of the Peace Review Council

**IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING UNDER SECTION 11.1 OF
THE *JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT*, R.S.O. 1990, c. J.4, AS
AMENDED,**

**Concerning a Complaint about the Conduct of
Justice of the Peace Paul Welsh**

Before: The Honourable Justice Robert Wadden, Chair
 Her Worship Christine Smythe, Justice of the Peace Member
 Ms. Lauren Rakowski, Community Member

REASONS FOR DECISION

Counsel:

Mr. Matthew Gourlay
Presenting Counsel

Mr. Eugene Bhattacharya
Ms. Mary C. Waters Rodriguez
Counsel for His Worship

REASONS FOR DECISION

- 1) This Hearing before a Panel of the Justices of the Peace Review Council (the “Review Council”) was held to inquire into allegations that Justice of the Peace Paul Welsh engaged in judicial misconduct in his actions at a pre-enquete hearing held on March 1, 2017 (the “Proceeding”). It is alleged, among other things, that Justice of the Peace Welsh “failed to treat the Complainants in a judicious, respectful or dignified manner during the proceeding”, that he failed to provide the self-represented Complainants the requisite minimum level of assistance, and that he failed to conduct the Proceeding with integrity because he deliberately misled the Complainants.
- 2) It is the finding of this Panel, for the reasons set out below, that the allegations have not been proven and the Complaint is dismissed.

Background

- 3) This Hearing was ordered by a Complaints Committee of the Review Council. The original Complaint was made by Silvano Lochner, who wrote to the Review Council on behalf of himself, and Lina and George Lochner, complaining about the conduct of Justice of the Peace Welsh at the Proceeding. Mr. Lochner was a private informant at the Proceeding; he and his family members were seeking to lay charges against a number of Toronto Police Service officers relating to the arrest and tasing of Mr. Lochner’s brother. During the course of the Proceeding, the Crown Attorney intervened and stayed the charges that the Lochners were seeking to lay.

The Allegations Against Justice of the Peace Welsh

- 4) The Notice of Hearing in this matter alleges that:
 - After the charges were stayed, His Worship failed to explain to the Complainants that the charges were stayed and the prosecution was not proceeding. Instead, His Worship made comments to the Complainants that suggested the Proceeding would continue; (para. 10)
 - Without explaining why he was doing so, His Worship then excused the witnesses whom the Complainants had subpoenaed to testify, and did not explain that the Proceeding was over; (para. 11)
 - His Worship asked Mr. Lochner if he was prepared to give evidence, and when he said yes, His Worship then said that the rest of the people had to remove themselves from the courtroom, giving rise to a perception that he was making an Order excluding witnesses; (para. 12)
 - Only after the Crown Attorney intervened and said he had stayed the charges did His Worship acknowledge the Proceeding was over and the pre-enquete would not be continuing; (para. 13)

- His Worship failed to treat the Complainants in a judicious, respectful or dignified manner during the Proceeding; (para. 15)
 - His Worship failed to provide the Complainants, who were self-represented litigants, with the requisite minimum level of assistance by explaining when the charges were stayed that the charges had been stayed by Crown counsel and therefore the matter would not be continuing; (para. 16)
 - His Worship failed to conduct the Proceeding with integrity when he failed to be honest and accurate with the Complainants that the Proceeding had legally ended. It is further alleged that His Worship feigned that the pre-enquete was going to proceed and the Complainants would have an opportunity to give evidence, and furthermore that His Worship appeared to mock, patronize and deliberately mislead the Complainants. It is further alleged that His Worship's actions lacked courtesy, sincerity, respect and fairness; (para. 17) and,
 - Justice of the Peace Welsh's acts constitute judicial misconduct that warrants a disposition under s. 11.1(1) of the *Justices of the Peace Act*.
- 5) The Notice of Hearing also alleges misconduct by Justice of the Peace Welsh because he joked and laughed with the Crown Attorney in a way that showed a perception of bias. Presenting Counsel before us acknowledges that the evidence does not support that allegation and it is not being pursued.

Evidence at this Hearing

- 6) The evidence at this Hearing consisted of the transcript and recording of the March 1, 2017 Proceeding, other transcripts and decisions filed in a Joint Book of Documents, and the testimony of Mr. Thaddeus Ofiara, the Crown Attorney at the Proceeding who was called as a witness by Justice of the Peace Welsh's counsel.
- 7) The Joint Book of Documents included the transcript of the Proceeding, as well as the proceeding of January 13, 2017 before Justice of the Peace Welsh, and the Superior Court of Justice decisions of Quigley J. in *Lochner v. Attorney General of Ontario* 2017 ONSC 5293; of Molloy J. in *Lochner v. Ontario (Attorney General)* 2018 ONSC 2994; and of Corbett J. in *Lochner v. Ontario Civilian Police Commission*, 2019 ONSC 3048. The Ontario Court of Appeal decision in *Lochner v. Ontario (Attorney General)* 2019 ONCA 730 was also before us. All those decisions involve the same or related legal proceedings in which Mr. Lochner and his family attempted to lay charges or pursue actions against the Toronto Police Service officers.
- 8) Mr. Lochner was not called as a witness at this Hearing.

Court Appearances Prior to the March 1, 2017 Proceeding

- 9) The evidence before us shows that the attempt by Mr. Lochner to lay charges against Toronto Police Service officers had begun months before the Proceeding was held before Justice of the Peace Welsh, and had involved appearances at pre-enquete hearings before different Justices of the Peace. On October 21, 2016 Mr. Lochner appeared before Justice of the Peace Phillips. That hearing ended, after a morning of disruptive behaviour by Mr. Lochner, when Justice of the Peace Phillips eventually recused himself based on Mr. Lochner's allegations of bias. On November 29, 2016, an out of town justice of the peace, Justice of the Peace Amenta, was brought in to deal with the matter but nothing could be done, as Mr. Lochner had retained counsel just before the hearing.
- 10) On January 13, 2017 the matter first came before Justice of the Peace Welsh, who was brought to Toronto to deal with this matter as an out of town justice of the peace. At that appearance Mr. Lochner fired the lawyer he had retained and sought an adjournment. After a lengthy hearing, which included rambling submissions by Mr. Lochner, Justice of the Peace Welsh granted Mr. Lochner's request for an adjournment and put the matter over to March 1, 2017. There is no fault alleged in Justice of the Peace Welsh's conduct of the January 13 hearing, or his dealings with Mr. Lochner that day.

The March 1, 2017 Proceeding

- 11) On March 1, 2017, Justice of the Peace Welsh again came to Toronto to deal with this matter. At this appearance, Mr. Lochner and his family attempted to bring forward charges of perjury against the Toronto Police Service officers, in addition to the assault charges. This led the Crown Attorney at the Proceeding, Mr. Ofiara, to describe the requests of the Lochners as "a moving target." Mr. Lochner had subpoenaed numerous witnesses to the March 1 hearing. Mr. Lochner, as in previous hearings, spoke out of turn, interrupted other speakers and did not follow court decorum. There was a long discussion where Justice of the Peace Welsh appeared to be trying to comprehend the case Mr. Lochner was bringing forward and how to proceed with the hearing itself, such as whether to deal with the assault charge, or the assault and perjury charges. Witnesses had been subpoenaed and they were represented by counsel, who made submissions seeking the release of their clients.
- 12) After the matter had gone on for some time, Mr. Ofiara, for the Crown, stated the following, at p. 14:

... I have had the opportunity, Your Worship, to extensively review every piece of paper that Mr. Lochner has provided me both in person and by email. And at this point in time, I can indicate to the Court that there is no reasonable prospect of conviction on these charges ...

So there's no public interest in proceeding either and I can ask that all informations before the Court today be stayed, please.

- 13) Mr. Lochner's response was "I'm prepared to proceed today". Justice of the Peace Welsh then asked for submissions from other counsel present. He heard submissions from counsel for a witness, a doctor who had been subpoenaed by Mr. Lochner but who was not present at the Proceeding. Justice of the Peace Welsh released the witness from the subpoena. Justice of the Peace Welsh then invited submissions from Mr. Lochner. There followed an exchange over several pages of transcript in which Mr. Lochner expressed a wish to proceed on the pre-enquete hearing just on the assault charge, and Justice of the Peace Welsh appeared to be ready to have him give evidence. At that point the Crown Attorney intervened, and said "I just stayed the proceedings, Your Worship." Justice of the Peace Welsh responded "I know you did. So this is over."
- 14) Mr. Lochner did not accept that was the end of the matter, and argued with Justice of the Peace Welsh, interrupting him as His Worship tried to explain that the Crown Attorney had the right to stay the proceedings and bring the matter to an end. Justice of the Peace Welsh eventually ended the Proceeding, saying "Matters are stayed, you're free to go." Mr. Lochner continued to argue with the Court, at one point calling Justice of the Peace Welsh "a criminal." He eventually left the courtroom.

Evidence of Thaddeus Ofiara

- 15) Mr. Ofiara, the Crown Attorney at the Proceeding on March 1, 2017, testified that Mr. Lochner was one of the most difficult individuals he has ever had to deal with in the course of his career. He testified that the first time he dealt with the Lochners was at an earlier pre-enquete hearing in front of Justice of the Peace Phillips, which devolved into a hearing unlike any he had seen in his life, with a "level of screaming and crying and yelling [that] was unbelievable."
- 16) In relation to the Proceeding before Justice of the Peace Welsh, Mr. Ofiara testified that the language he used in staying the charges on March 1, 2017 – "I can ask for all the informations to be stayed" – was a polite figure of speech, requesting the stay but not directing the justice of the peace to do what the Crown has the power to do. Mr. Ofiara was of the view that after that, Justice of the Peace Welsh was "just allowing Mr. Lochner an opportunity to vent." Mr. Ofiara was of the view that "Mr. Lochner is a bully, and he likes to vent on and on, and sometimes he just runs out of steam" after which he, "just sort of scatters away and adjourns something." Mr. Ofiara grew impatient of this and, wanting the proceeding to end, intervened a second time and repeated that he had just stayed the charges.
- 17) Mr. Ofiara was of the view that there was nothing about the conduct, demeanor or way that Justice of the Peace Welsh conducted the proceeding that caused Mr. Ofiara any concerns about His Worship's judicial conduct. He testified that Justice of the Peace Welsh kept good control over Mr. Lochner, not letting him talk and rant over other people, and that he "tried to control the process as best he could."

Subsequent Related Court Appearances

- 18) After the Proceeding, Mr. Lochner brought a *mandamus* application to the Superior Court of Justice. In a decision reported at *Lochner v. Attorney General of Ontario* 2017 ONSC 5293, Quigley J. dismissed the *mandamus* application. The Lochners then attempted to relay the same charges and a new pre-enquete hearing was held before a different justice of the peace, in October and November of 2017. When that process was refused, they brought another *mandamus* application to the Superior Court of Justice, which was dismissed by Molloy J., reported at *Lochner v. Ontario (Attorney General)* 2018 ONSC 2994. Approximately one year later Corbett J., in a decision reported at *Lochner v. Ontario Civilian Police Commission*, 2019 ONSC 3048, declared Silvano Lochner a vexatious litigant, restricted his access to the courts, and sentenced him to a short jail term for contempt of court. The Lochners had continued to pursue their attempts to bring criminal charges, relaying the same information and seeking pre-enquete hearings in different jurisdictions. By September 2019 their appeals had reached the Ontario Court of Appeal, which ruled, in *Lochner v. Ontario (Attorney General)* 2019 ONCA 730, that the Lochners had “engaged in an unremitting regimen of forum shopping clothed in deceit to make it appear as a matter of first impression” (para. 24). The Court of Appeal dismissed their appeal as frivolous and vexatious.
- 19) In the context of those other proceedings, various judges had occasion to comment on the courtroom behaviour of the Lochners.
- 20) Quigley J. stated that they had “been difficult, aggressive and disrespectful litigants. There have been numerous instances on appearances where there have been shouting matches in the courtroom ...” involving “allegations of bias and conspiracy, ... deception and corruption” (para. 67). He noted that they “have been largely ungovernable in these court proceedings. They have rejected applicable principles of law that govern these proceedings, their role in them, or the evidence that they may legally present. They have repeatedly interrupted proceedings, attempting to speak over ... Crown counsel in these private criminal prosecutions or the presiding judges or justices of the peace. ... This has made for very difficult proceedings” (para. 72).
- 21) Justice Molloy noted the “extremely abusive” and profane conduct from Silvano Lochner towards a different justice of the peace (para. 18), describing it as “extremely discourteous, indeed outrageous, behavior” (para. 28). Justice Corbett detailed a course of behaviour in his court that led him to have Mr. Lochner jailed for contempt. He also found that “[e]ven a cursory review of past decisions related to these matters makes it clear that Mr. Lochner has been carrying on as an unreasonable, ungovernable litigant for quite some time” (para. 13).

Justice of the Peace Welsh’s Conduct of the March 1, 2017 Proceeding

- 22) The evidence reveals that the Proceeding of March 1, 2017 was a chaotic hearing involving an unruly litigant.

- 23) The crucial aspects in the hearing, for our purposes, were the points at which the Crown Attorney indicated it was intervening and staying the charges that the Lochners were seeking to lay.
- 24) In the Notice of Hearing before this Panel, the evidence on the first intervention is summarized as follows, at para. 9: "Crown counsel then indicated to His Worship that he was exercising the Crown's right to stay the proceedings in accordance with section 579(1) of the *Criminal Code*." This gives rise to the complaints that follow, because, as stated in the Notice, "Pursuant to section 579(1), when Crown counsel directs that the proceedings be stayed, it must be done forthwith."
- 25) A careful review of the evidence before us leads this Panel to conclude that the Notice of Hearing overstates the clarity of the Crown Attorney's statement at the Proceeding.
- 26) In the midst of the Proceeding of March 1, 2017, Mr. Ofiara intervened, stated that he had reviewed all the material available to him and determined there was no reasonable prospect of conviction and no public interest in proceeding. He then said, "I can ask that all informations before the Court today be stayed, please."
- 27) We find that Mr. Ofiara did not state the issue in the way it is summarized in paragraph 9 of the Notice of Hearing. On hearing and reading the words used, and on Mr. Ofiara's own evidence, we find his language was somewhat ambiguous. He did not state that he was relying on his authority under s. 579 of the *Criminal Code*, or any other statutory or common law authority. As he himself testified, his language was polite and did not clearly direct the justice of the peace to enter the stay.
- 28) After this point in the hearing, Justice of the Peace Welsh invited submissions from counsel for the witnesses, then invited Mr. Lochner to speak, eventually going so far as to suggest that Mr. Lochner could give evidence on the pre-enquete hearing. Then Mr. Ofiara intervened a second time and said, "I just stayed the proceedings, Your Worship", Justice of the Peace Welsh replied "I know you did. So this is over."
- 29) Presenting Counsel asks us to find this is evidence that Justice of the Peace Welsh knew all along that the hearing was at an end yet he was mocking, patronizing and deliberately misleading the Lochners by feigning that the hearing was still proceeding. We do not agree.
- 30) Justice of the Peace Welsh's response – "I know you did" – is somewhat confusing, and out of place. Prior to this second intervention by the Crown Attorney, Justice of the Peace Welsh did not seem to know that the Crown Attorney had stayed the proceeding, and a more candid response on his part, recognizing that the process was confusing, might have been appropriate. However, as we noted, the Crown Attorney had not been explicit in his language of staying the proceedings, had not cited his statutory authority and in our view, in the context of this chaotic hearing, did not make it clear that he was intervening and staying the charges. Some confusion on the part of Justice of the Peace Welsh would be understandable.

- 31) Mr. Ofiara testified that he found no fault with Justice of the Peace Welsh's conduct between the first intervention when he tried to stay the charges and the second intervention when he clarified the position. His view was that Justice of the Peace Welsh was allowing Mr. Lochner to vent.
- 32) Justice Quigley reviewed the Proceeding on a *mandamus* application. Although he was not considering the issue of Justice of the Peace Welsh's conduct, it is notable that he thoroughly considered this portion of the transcript and did not make any negative comment on the way Justice of the Peace Welsh dealt with the matter at this point in the Proceeding. It was clear to Justice Quigley that the first intervention had the effect of staying the proceedings, and that the second intervention by the Crown Attorney removed any ambiguity. After quoting what the Crown Attorney said on his first intervention, Quigley J. stated, at para. 78: "Even if there was any doubt in the choice of words used and the reference to "Informations" relative [to] the power he was calling upon to bring the proceedings to an end, and I do not believe there was, any such uncertainty was clarified minutes later when Mr. Ofiara spoke again. After the first statement, Mr. Lochner continued to berate Justice of the Peace Welsh about wanting to continue to proceed"

The Law

- 33) In the Ontario Judicial Council hearing decision in *Re Douglas*, OJC 2006, the Hearing Panel described the test for judicial misconduct as follows:

8. Based on *Re: Baldwin* and *Re: Evans*, the test for judicial misconduct combines two related concerns: (1) public confidence; and (2) the integrity, impartiality and independence of the judge or the administration of justice. The first concern requires that the Hearing Panel be mindful not only of the conduct in question, but also of the appearance of that conduct in the eyes of the public. As noted in *Therrien*, the public will at least demand that a judge give the appearance of integrity, impartiality and independence. Thus, maintenance of public confidence in the judge personally, and in the administration of justice generally, are central considerations in evaluating impugned conduct. In addition, the conduct must be such that it implicates the integrity, impartiality or independence of the judiciary or the administration of justice.

9. Accordingly, a judge must be, and appear to be, impartial and independent. He or she must have, and appear to have, personal integrity. If a judge conducts himself, or herself, in a manner that displays a lack of any of these attributes, he or she may be found to have engaged in judicial misconduct.

[Emphasis added.]

- 34) Public confidence should be viewed from the perspective of the "reasonable, fair-minded, informed member of the public" (*Re Baldwin*, OJC 2002). Evidence of bad

faith, ulterior motives or deliberate misconduct is not required for a finding of judicial misconduct.

The Principles of Judicial Office

35) While ethical principles of judicial office do not constitute a prescriptive code of conduct, they do set out a general framework of values and considerations that are relevant in evaluating allegations of improper conduct by a justice of the peace. The fact that conduct complained of is inconsistent with or in breach of the principles constitutes a factor to be taken into account in determining whether there has been judicial misconduct.

36) The preamble of the *Principles of Judicial Office of Justices of the Peace of the Ontario Court of Justice* (the “Principles”) includes:

The justices of the peace of the Ontario Court of Justice recognize their duty to establish, maintain, encourage and uphold high standards of personal conduct and professionalism so as to preserve the independence and integrity of their judicial office and to preserve the faith and trust that society places in the men and women who have agreed to accept the responsibilities of judicial office.

37) The Principles also include the following:

1.1 Justices of the peace must be impartial and objective in the discharge of their judicial duties.

Commentaries:

Justices of the peace should not be influenced by partisan interests, public pressure or fear of criticism.

Justices of the peace should maintain their objectivity and shall not, by words or conduct, manifest favour, bias or prejudice towards any party or interest.

1.3 Justices of the peace will endeavour to maintain order and decorum in court.

Commentaries:

Justices of the peace must strive to be patient, dignified and courteous in performing the duties of judicial office and shall carry out their role with integrity, appropriate firmness and honour.

Analysis

Failure to Treat the Complainants in a Judicious, Respectful or Dignified Manner

- 38) This Panel was referred to decisions of the Justice of the Peace Review Council in which misconduct was found for rude, abusive or inappropriate behaviour by a justice of the peace. In one case, *Re Bisson* (JPRC, July 10, 2018), the justice of the peace was, among other things, rude, discourteous, demeaning, impatient and sarcastic; he mocked aspects of the justice system, including suggesting a party engaged in dishonest behaviour; and he showed a pattern of legal errors and failed to properly apply the law.
- 39) There was no such behaviour on the part of Justice of the Peace Welsh in this Proceeding.
- 40) At the highest, Justice of the Peace Welsh may have been abrupt in his dismissal of witnesses without explanation. Furthermore, a comment he made at the end of the Proceeding – “Like the way I handled that?” – was inappropriate, given that this was a highly charged proceeding with a difficult, self-represented litigant. But this Panel has to consider Justice of the Peace Welsh’s behaviour as a whole in the Proceeding, and with whom he was dealing. Mr. Lochner was a litigant whose appearances in court were unfocused, disrespectful and disruptive. A previous hearing before Justice of the Peace Phillips had broken down into a shouting match and tantrums. A previous civil proceeding had resulted in a lawyer being assaulted. A later proceeding in front of Corbett J. resulted in Mr. Lochner being jailed for his contemptuous conduct in court. Considered in context, it is fair to say that Justice of the Peace Welsh exercised a reasonable level of control over Mr. Lochner, perhaps allowing the Proceeding to continue longer than it was legally entitled to, but ultimately ending it and having everyone leave without an episode of outbursts or violence. It is worth noting that the Proceeding before Justice of the Peace Welsh ended on a better note than other proceedings involving Mr. Lochner and his family.
- 41) This Panel finds no evidence to support the allegations that Justice of the Peace Welsh mocked, patronized or deliberately misled the Lochners. We find that he did not feign that the Proceeding was continuing. Rather, we find this was an extremely difficult court hearing, over which Justice of the Peace Welsh presided in a way that would be regarded as fair and reasonable by an impartial observer.
- 42) The Notice of Hearing alleges that Justice of the Peace Welsh failed to treat the Complainants in a judicious, respectful or dignified manner during the proceeding. We find that the evidence does not support this allegation.

Assistance to a Self-Represented Litigant

- 43) The Notice of Hearing further alleges that His Worship failed to provide the Lochners with the requisite level of assistance owed to a self-represented litigant.

- 44) In assessing this allegation, this Panel has to consider that this Proceeding was a pre-enquete hearing and Mr. Lochner was a private informant, not an accused person. He did not face any jeopardy as a result of the Proceeding, either in the way of punishment, penalty or conviction.
- 45) Taking into account that this was a pre-enquete hearing, not a trial, we find that Justice of the Peace Welsh provided the Lochners with the necessary level of instruction about their role in the Proceeding.
- 46) Had the hearing proceeded, Mr. Lochner would have been able to give evidence to the justice of the peace, *in camera*, just as Justice of the Peace Welsh indicated.
- 47) We find no fault with the way Justice of the Peace Welsh explained the stay of proceedings, at the end of the hearing. He made it clear, through numerous interruptions by Mr. Lochner, that the proceedings were over, that they were being stayed, that the Crown Attorney had the right to intervene and that the process had ended.
- 48) We find His Worship could have provided more information about his process of dismissing the witnesses, but he was legally correct in doing so, and was dealing with a difficult litigant who was not prone to accepting explanations of legal process.
- 49) Mr. Lochner was not accepting of the outcome of the Proceeding but showed a comprehension of it. He said that he intended to file a “mandamnesty [*sic*] hearing”, obviously referring to a *mandamus*. That is the correct legal avenue for review. Mr. Lochner did make a *mandamus* application, which was heard by Quigley J. on July 5, 2017, and ultimately dismissed. This was a mere four months after the Proceeding before Justice of the Peace Welsh. It is clear that Mr. Lochner left the March 1, 2017 Proceeding with full knowledge of what had occurred. He acted quickly in seeking review in the Superior Court of Justice and was able to achieve that result without delay. There is nothing on the evidence before us that shows he did not understand the outcome of the Proceeding.
- 50) We do not find that Justice of the Peace Welsh failed to provide Mr. Lochner with the necessary level of assistance. We find it was Mr. Lochner’s aggressive, abusive and disrespectful conduct, and his constant interruptions of Justice of the Peace Welsh and others, that interfered with His Worship’s attempts to assist him.

Conclusion

- 51) This was a difficult matter for any jurist to deal with, involving a litigant who was almost unimaginably obstructive. There were times during the hearing when Justice of the Peace Welsh was abrupt with Mr. Lochner, but we agree with Mr. Ofiara’s perception that Mr. Lochner had to be controlled in order to keep the Proceeding on track, and Justice of the Peace Welsh was doing that. There were other times, such as before the stay was clarified, that Justice of the Peace Welsh was overly accommodating to Mr. Lochner. Overall, we find Justice of the Peace Welsh struck a reasonable balance in dealing with Mr. Lochner, and that he exercised patience

with him, in spite of his numerous interruptions and lack of respect for court decorum.

- 52) In conclusion, we find that the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing have not been proven. Justice of the Peace Welsh's conduct did not implicate the integrity and impartiality of his judicial office. A reasonable person informed of all of the facts would not find that public confidence in the judiciary or the administration of justice has been undermined.
- 53) Accordingly, the Complaint is dismissed. The March 11, 2020 return date for submissions on disposition is vacated.
- 54) If His Worship is requesting, pursuant to section 11.1 of the *Act*, that the Hearing Panel make a recommendation to the Attorney General that he should be compensated for the legal costs incurred by the hearing, written submissions may be filed at the Office of the Justices of the Peace Review Council.

Dated at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, March 2, 2020.

HEARING PANEL:

The Honourable Justice Robert Wadden, Chair

Justice of the Peace Christine Smythe

Ms. Lauren Rakowski, Community Member