



JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

for the Period from

1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025

Toronto, Ontario
July 2025

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/ocj/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 2024 - 31 March 2025	1
2.0 Overview of Appointments: 1 January 1989 - 31 March 2025	1
3.0 Outreach.....	2
4.0 Application Statistics.....	3
5.0 Diversity Statistics	8
PART II	17
LEGISLATION.....	17
1.0 The Courts of Justice Act	17
PART III	22
CONFIDENTIALITY	22
1.0 Introduction.....	22
2.0 Information on Process and Procedures	22
3.0 Information on Persons who are applying for Appointment	22
PART IV	24
CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT	24
1.0 Criteria for Evaluating Candidates	24
PART V	26
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND POLICIES.....	26
1.0 Overview of Process.....	26
2.0 The Judicial Candidate Information Form	28
3.0 References	29
4.0 Law Society and Other Outstanding Complaints and Claims	30
5.0 Criminal Record.....	31
6.0 Conflict of Interest Guidelines.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PART V (Continued)
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND POLICIES
7.0 Re-Interviewing Candidates 31
8.0 Notice of Vacancies and Transfer after Appointment 32
9.0 Changes in Committee Membership 32

PART VI 33
LOOKING TO THE FUTURE 33
1.0 Recommendations of Candidates..... 33
2.0 Outreach..... 33
3.0 A Representative Committee..... 34

APPOINTEE REMUNERATION 35

CONCLUSION 36

APPENDICES
APPENDIX I – Judicial Appointments Made – April 2024 to March 2025..... 39
APPENDIX II – Diversity Statistics of Judicial Appointments Made – 1989 to 2025..... 41
APPENDIX III – Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee Member Biographies 44

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 8, 2025

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

Dear Minister Downey:

On behalf of the Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee, I have the honour of presenting to you this report on our activities for the period from 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025, 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 J. Bondy

Matthew J. Bondy
Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025

Since the establishment of the Committee, 589 judges have been appointed based on Committee recommendations. Of these, 32 appointments were made between 1 April 2024 and 31 March 2025.

The highlights of Committee activities are as follows:

- Appointments: This reporting period saw approximately 50% more appointments compared to each of the previous three reporting periods. Each of the 32 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 32 appointments, the Committee continued to work on 26 vacancies as of the end of March 2025.
- New Judicial Positions: On May 30, 2024, the Ontario government announced its commitment to appoint at least 25 additional judges to the Ontario Court of Justice to address the ongoing backlog of criminal cases and improve access to justice. As a result of these 25 new positions, the Committee had a larger number of judicial vacancies for which it had to provide recommendations.

In order to provide more timely recommendations to the Attorney General and address the large number of vacancies, the Committee held 28 meeting days between April 1, 2024 and March 31, 2025. These efforts demonstrate the Committee's contribution towards the timely administration of justice in Ontario.

- Procedures and Policies: The Committee continually reviews its procedures and policies, which are set forth in detail in Part V of this Report and also made available on the Committee's [website](#).

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 may 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 may 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.

- ☐ Process Efficiencies: During the reporting period, the Committee, of our own volition, developed and implemented several efficiencies to its process that have reduced the time it takes to provide recommendations. This includes application distribution for Committee review while French proficiency testing is pending; background checks being conducted once candidates have been selected for interviews, rather than after the interview; and an updated policy on outstanding Law Society and LawPRO matters. The Committee revised its procedures and policies to reflect these changes.
- ☐ Outreach: The Committee strengthened its outreach by advertising judicial vacancies through the Ministry of the Attorney General's social media accounts, as of May 2024.

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.

On April 19, 2021, the *Courts of Justice Act* was amended, making changes to the Committee and its process for recommending candidates. These changes included increasing the minimum number of candidates to be recommended for a judicial vacancy from two to six. Additionally, 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 may also appoint the three lawyer members of the Committee from lists of three names submitted by the three law associations. Previously, these law associations appointed their own representatives. These amendments also require the Committee to include diversity statistics in its annual reports, based on data voluntarily disclosed by candidates.

The total number of applicants from the inception of the Committee to March 31, 2025 is 4,564, of which 134 are new applicants in this reporting period.

In the reporting period, eighty-four (84) applicants indicated an ability to conduct a trial and write a judgment in the French language. Sixty (60) of these applicants were assessed as meeting the Superior level of French proficiency by testing that was done within the five-year validity period for the proficiency test.

From April 1, 2024 to March 31, 2025, the Committee had 15 sessions (that took place over the course of 28 individual meeting days) to select candidates, conduct interviews and attend to Committee business. The Committee conducted a total of 157 interviews for 142 candidates. One hundred and seventy-five (175) recommendations (94 total candidates) were made by the Committee and 32 judges were appointed.

PART I

ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS MADE

1.0 Judges Appointed: 1 April 2024 - 31 March 2025

During this period, there have been 32 judges appointed as a result of recommendations made by the Committee. Added to the 557 appointments previously made, this number makes a total of 589 judges appointed since the Committee began its work in 1989.

A list of the 32 new judges appointed during this reporting period can be found in Appendix I.

The ages of appointees range from 37 to 59 years, and the average age is 48 years.

2.0 Overview of Appointments: 1 January 1989 - 31 March 2025

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 candidates of diverse backgrounds and experiences. 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.

3.0 Outreach

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.

Since May 2024, judicial vacancies have also been advertised to prospective candidates through the Ministry of the Attorney General's LinkedIn and X social media accounts. This resulted in more than 2,300 engagements on LinkedIn and over 1,100 engagements on X.

To increase outreach and attract more diverse qualified candidates, the Committee has been working diligently to establish relationships with key partners. Introductory meetings were held with the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Anti-Racism Directorate on June 28, 2024, and the Assistant Deputy Attorney General of the Indigenous Justice Division on November 8, 2024.

4.0 Application Statistics

The following table indicates the number of applications received for each vacancy advertised in 2024-25. Where interviews and recommendations were completed in this reporting period, the number of candidates interviewed and recommended are also shown. The 'number of candidates recommended' includes candidates who were recommended for multiple vacancy locations.

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Barrie (Criminal) (3)	24-Jul-2024	97	13	9
Belleville (Criminal)	31-Jan-2025	57	_**	_***
Brampton (Criminal) (2) ^{††††} (+ 1 unadvertised ^{†††})	25-Oct-2023	149	36	19
Brampton (Criminal) (5) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on October 25, 2023 Brampton advertisement – 2 were unfilled and subsequently advertised on October 4, 2024)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	23
Brampton (75% Family, 25% Criminal – Bilingual)	3-May-2024	13	xx****	xx****
Brampton (Criminal – Bilingual)	24-Jul-2024	24	xx****	xx****
Brampton (Criminal) (4)	4-Oct-2024	176	34	_***
Chatham (50% Criminal, 50% Family) ^{††††}	13-Oct-2023	59	15	6
Chatham (50% Criminal, 50% Family) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on October 13, 2023 Chatham advertisement – unfilled and vacancy subsequently changed to a Windsor Criminal position)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	5
Cobourg/Lindsay/Peterborough (Criminal)	24-Jul-2024	71	7	6
Cornwall (Criminal)	31-Jan-2025	54	_**	_***
Dryden (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	10-Jan-2025	27	_**	_***

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Fort Frances/Kenora (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	12-Nov-2024	30	_**	_***
Halton (Criminal) (+ 1 unadvertised ^{†††})	24-Jul-2024	128	23	18
Kenora (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	12-Nov-2024	32	_**	_***
London (Criminal) ^{††††} (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on September 15, 2022 London advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	5
London (Criminal)	21-Feb-2025	55	_**	_***
Milton (75% Family, 25% Criminal) ^{††††}	23-Feb-2024	69	15	9
Newmarket (Criminal) (+ 2 unadvertised ^{†††})	24-Jul-2024	150	34	22
Newmarket (Criminal – Bilingual)	24-Jul-2024	24	xx****	xx****
North Bay (50% Criminal, 50% Family)	10-Jan-2025	46	_**	_***
Oshawa (Criminal – Bilingual)	21-Feb-2025	11	_**	_***
Ottawa (Criminal) (2) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on July 18, 2023 Ottawa advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	8
Ottawa (Criminal) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on July 18, 2023 Ottawa advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	6
Ottawa (Criminal – Bilingual)	3-May-2024	34	7	3
Pembroke (Criminal) ^{††††} (+ 1 unadvertised ^{†††} – 1 was unfilled and subsequently advertised on January 31, 2025)	22-Mar-2024	38	7	4

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Pembroke (Criminal)	31-Jan-2025	50	_**	_***
Simcoe (75% Criminal, 25% Family) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on September 5, 2023 Simcoe advertisement – unfilled and subsequently advertised on September 12, 2024)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	4
Simcoe (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	12-Sep-2024	61	11	7
Sioux Lookout (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	5-Feb-2025	25	_**	_***
Stratford (Criminal)	21-Oct-2024	69	13	8
Sudbury (50% Criminal, 50% Family) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on June 7, 2023 Sudbury advertisement – unfilled and subsequently advertised on January 10, 2025)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	2
Sudbury (50% Criminal, 50% Family)	10-Jan-2025	45	_**	_***
Sudbury (50% Criminal, 50% Family – Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory) ^{††††}	6-Mar-2024	30	7	2
Sudbury (50% Criminal, 50% Family – Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory) (Readvertised – previously advertised on March 6, 2024)	10-Jan-2025	44	_**	_***
Thunder Bay (75% Criminal, 25% Family) (+ 1 unadvertised ^{†††})	12-Nov-2024	31	_**	_***

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Timmins (50% Criminal, 50% Family – Bilingual) ^{††††} (Readvertised – previously advertised on September 5, 2023)	26-Mar-2024	12	xx****	xx****
Timmins (50% Criminal, 50% Family – Bilingual) (Readvertised – previously advertised on September 5, 2023 and March 26, 2024)	10-Jan-2025	9	_**	_***
Timmins/Cochrane (50% Criminal, 50% Family – Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory)	10-Jan-2025	31	_**	_***
Toronto (Criminal) (4) ^{††††}	25-Oct-2023	176	49	29
Toronto (Criminal) (2) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on October 25, 2023 Toronto advertisement – 2 were unfilled and subsequently advertised on October 4, 2024)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	26
Toronto (Criminal – Bilingual)	24-Jul-2024	27	xx****	xx****
Toronto (Criminal) (2)	4-Oct-2024	179	38	_***
Toronto (75% Family, 25% Criminal) (2)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	_***
Walkerton (75% Criminal, 25% Family)	18-Apr-2024	42	6	4
Windsor (Criminal) ^{††††} (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on July 4, 2023 Windsor advertisement – unfilled and subsequently advertised on June 12, 2024)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	3
Windsor (Criminal) (+ 2 unadvertised ^{†††})	12-Jun-2024	53	12	5

Vacancy	Advertisement Date	Total Number of Applications Received	Number of Candidates Interviewed [†]	Number of Candidates Recommended
Windsor (Criminal – Bilingual ability an asset but not mandatory) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on June 12, 2024 Windsor advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	5
Windsor (75% Family, 25% Criminal) ^{†††} (Readvertised – previously advertised on November 3, 2022)	5-Oct-2023	49	11	6
Windsor (Criminal – Bilingual) (Unfilled and designation subsequently changed to 75% Family, 25% Criminal non-bilingual position)	6-Mar-2024	14	xx****	xx****
Windsor (75% Family, 25% Criminal) (Unadvertised ^{††} – recommendation based on October 5, 2023 Windsor advertisement)	Not advertised ^{††}	N/A	N/A	4

- † 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.
- ††† Pursuant to section 1.0 (7) of the Committee's Process and Policies, the Committee may forego advertising subsequent vacancies that occur when the selection process is in progress for an advertised vacancy in the same location and with the same law specialty.
- †††† Applications received and previously reported in 2023-24 Annual Report. Interviews conducted and/or recommendation submitted in 2024-25.
- * Advertisement closed in the next reporting period. The number of applications received will be reported in the 2025-26 Annual Report.
- ** Interviews held in the next reporting period. The number of candidates interviewed will be reported in the 2025-26 Annual Report.
- *** Recommendation submitted in the next reporting period. The number of candidates recommended will be reported in the 2025-26 Annual Report.
- **** Data sets are not reported due to confidentiality considerations.

5.0 Diversity Statistics[†]

As of July 6, 2017, the Committee commenced collecting diversity-related statistics from candidates who volunteer this information. The diversity statistics in the current reporting period are based on two versions of the application form. The Committee continued to work on some vacancies which had utilized the May 2023 application form. A new application form was introduced in February 2024 with changes to the diversity statistics collected from candidates. Statistics for judicial vacancies posted after February 2024 follow the new reporting system.

Statistics Based on the May 2023 Application Form^{††}:

The table below shows the totals for each of the categories selected by candidates who self-identified for the 2024-25 reporting period^{†††}:

Self-Identity	Applicants*	Percentage of Total Applicants (187)**	Appointments (20 of 32)	Percentage of Total Appointments (32)
Woman	97	51.9%	11	34.4%
Francophone	4	2.1%	0	0.0%
Ability to conduct a trial and write a judgment in French	17	9.1%	2	6.3%
Indigenous	2	1.1%	0	0.0%
Visible Minority	46	24.6%	4	12.5%
Persons with Disabilities	9	4.8%	0	0.0%
Ethnic/Cultural Group	60	32.1%	7	21.9%
LGBTQ2	16	8.6%	0	0.0%

[†] 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 has undertaken work to update 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 who also applied on the February 2024 version of the application form during the current reporting period are also included in the statistics below for the February 2024 application form.

^{†††} 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.

Statistics Based on the February 2024 Application Form:

The tables below show the totals for each of the categories selected by candidates who self-identified for the 2024-25 reporting period[†].

For reference purposes, accompanying the Committee's data are charts which have been adapted from Statistics Canada. They use the same diversity classification categories and variables to depict the population of Ontario.

Demographic Statistics on Diversity:

		Applicants*		Interviewed		Recommended		Appointments (12 of 32)	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total		425**	100%	119**	100%	68**	100%	32	100%
Sex	Male	148	34.82%	49	41.18%	21	30.88%	5	15.63%
	Female	206	48.47%	60	50.42%	44	64.71%	6	18.75%
	Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Gender	Man	143	33.65%	49	41.18%	21	30.88%	5	15.63%
	Woman	195	45.88%	59	49.58%	42	61.76%	6	18.75%
	Non-Binary	1	0.24%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Two Spirit	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Other Gender Identity	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Francophone		51	12.00%	16	13.45%	11	16.18%	5	15.63%
Ability to Conduct Proceedings and Write a Judgment in French		78	18.35%	23	19.33%	15	22.06%	8	25.00%
Person with a Disability		36	8.47%	6	5.04%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Indigenous Person		11	2.59%	2	1.68%	1	1.47%	1	3.13%
Ethnic Origin***		320	75.29%	99	83.19%	59	86.76%	0	0.00%
Racialized Person****†		104	24.47%	20	16.81%	13	19.12%	1	3.13%
2SLGBTQIA+ Person††		26	6.12%	4	3.36%	2	2.94%	0	0.00%

- ◆ 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.
- *** This question was a multi-select question (meaning a respondent could choose more than one answer). As a result, the percentages could add up to more than 100%.
- † In this report, the concept of “racialized person” is based and derived directly from the concept of “visible minority” in the census. The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as “persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour”. It consists mainly of the following groups: South Asian, Chinese, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Arab, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean and Japanese.
- †† Respondents were provided with the acronym “2SLGBTQI+” if they wished to identify as part of sexual and gender diverse communities. Following guidance from the Office of Women's Social and Economic Opportunity, the more inclusive acronym “2SLGBTQQIA+” is now being used: 2S: at the front, recognizes Two-Spirit people as the first 2SLGBTQQIA+ communities; L: Lesbian; G: Gay; B: Bisexual; T: Transgender; Q: Queer; Q: Questioning, I: Intersex, considers sex characteristics beyond sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression; A: Asexual; +: is inclusive of people who identify as part of sexual and gender diverse communities, who use additional terminologies.

Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population, Ontario

Source: Adapted from Statistics Canada. 2023. (Table). Census Profile. 2021 Census of Population. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2021001. Ottawa. Released November 15, 2023.

		Ontario Population, 2021	
		Number	Percentage
Sex¹	Total	14,031,755	100%
	Male	6,968,425	49.66%
	Female	7,255,515	51.71%
	Other²	--	--
Gender Identity³	Cisgender Men	5,715,140	40.73%
	Cisgender Woman	6,028,260	42.96%
	Non-binary Person	15,360	0.11%
	Transgender Persons	24,085	0.17%
	Two Spirit Person	--	--
	Other	--	--
Francophone⁴		651,680	4.64%
Ability to Speak French⁵		1,558,675	11.11%
Person with a Disability⁶		3,235,340	23.06%
Indigenous Person⁷		406,585	2.90%
Ethnic Origin		14,031,755	100.00%
Visible Minority of Person		4,817,360	34.33%
2SLGBTQ+ Person⁸		470,800	3.36%

¹ Values are derived from Broad age groups and sex: Canada, provinces and territories, Ontario, Release date 2022-04-27. Statistics Canada. Table 98-10-0034-01.

² Statistics Canada does not collect specific information on intersex Canadians.

³ Statistics Canada classifies gender identity using three categories: cisgender person, transgender person and non-binary person. Values are derived from the Broad age groups and gender: Canada, provinces and territories, Ontario, Release date: 2022-04-27. Statistics Canada. Table 98-10-0036-01.

⁴ Value is derived from combining the "Mother tongue" and "All languages spoken at home" for the total population excluding institutional residents Census of Population category.

⁵ Value is derived from the Knowledge of official languages for the total population excluding institutional residents for "French only" and "English and French" Census of Population categories.

⁶ Value is derived from Persons with and without disabilities aged 15 years and over, by age group and gender, Ontario, Release date: 2024-12-03. Statistics Canada. Table 13-10-0374-01.

⁷ Value is derived from the Indigenous identity for the population in private households Census of Population category.

⁸ Value is derived from Socioeconomic characteristics of the 2SLGBTQ+ population, 2019 to 2021, Ontario, Release date: 2024-01-25. Statistics Canada. Table 13-10-0874-01.

Diversity Statistics – Ethnic Origin Group[†]:

	Applicants		Interviewed		Recommended		Appointments (12 of 32)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total	425*	100%	119*	100%	68*	100%	32	100%
North American Aboriginal	7	1.65%	2	1.68%	1	1.47%	1	3.13%
European Origins (includes Northern, Eastern, Southern and Western European Origins)	200	47.06%	73	61.34%	43	63.24%	10	31.25%
French Origins	23	5.41%	6	5.04%	5	7.35%	5	15.63%
Caribbean Origins	21	4.94%	4	3.36%	2	2.94%	0	0.00%
Latin, Central and South American Origins	6	1.41%	1	0.84%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
African Origins	10	2.35%	3	2.52%	1	1.47%	0	0.00%
Asian Origins	12	2.82%	1	0.84%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
South Asian Origins	31	7.29%	5	4.20%	3	4.41%	1	3.13%
East and Southeast Asian Origins	9	2.12%	3	2.52%	4	5.88%	1	3.13%

† This question was a multi-select question (meaning a respondent could choose more than one answer). As a result, the percentages could add up to more than 100%.

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

Population Overview by Ethnic or Cultural Origins, Ontario, 2021

Source: Adapted from Statistics Canada. Table 98-10-0355-01 Ethnic or cultural origin by gender and age: Canada, provinces and territories.

	Ethnic or Cultural Origin for the Population in Private Households	
	Number	Percentage
Total	14,031,755	100%
North American Aboriginal¹	2,561,050	18.25%
European Origins (includes Northern, Eastern, Southern and Western European Origins)	12,330,340	87.87%
French Origins	1,043,040	7.43%
Caribbean Origins	458,695	3.27%
Latin, Central and South American Origins	427,680	3.05%
African Origins	533,935	3.81%
Asian Origins	3,571,265	25.45%
South Asian Origins	1,394,200	9.94%
East and Southeast Asian Origins	1,520,680	10.84%

¹ Value is derived from the North American origins Census of Population category.

Diversity Statistics – Race Category[†]:

	Applicants		Interviewed		Recommended		Appointments (12 of 32)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total	425*	100%	119*	100%	68*	100%	32	100%
Black	31	7.29%	6	5.04%	2	2.94%	0	0.00%
East/Southeast Asian	10	2.35%	3	2.52%	4	5.88%	1	3.13%
Indigenous	8	1.88%	2	1.68%	1	1.47%	1	3.13%
Latino	5	1.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Middle Eastern	13	3.06%	3	2.52%	1	1.47%	0	0.00%
South Asian	33	7.76%	6	5.04%	3	4.41%	1	3.13%
White	215	50.59%	77	64.71%	46	67.65%	10	31.25%
Another Race Category**	12	2.82%	3	2.52%	3	4.41%	0	0.00%

† This question was a multi-select question (meaning a respondent could choose more than one answer). As a result, the percentages could add up to more than 100%.

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

** Respondents were provided with the option of "Other" if they wished to describe their racial backgrounds in ways that were not captured by the available race categories. Following guidance from Ontario's Anti-Racism Data Standards, the term "other" has been replaced by the term "another race category".

Population Overview by Racialized Group, Ontario, 2021

Source: Adapted from Statistics Canada. 2023. (Table). Census Profile. 2021 Census of Population. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2021001. Ottawa. Released November 5, 2023.

	Visible Minority for the Population in Private Households	
	Number	Percentage
Total	14,031,750	100%
Black	768,740	5.48%
East/Southeast Asian¹	1,482,585	10.57%
Indigenous	406,585	2.90%
Latino²	249,190	1.78%
Middle Eastern³	496,400	3.54%
South Asian	1,515,295	10.80%
White⁴	9,214,395	65.67%
Another Race Category⁵	124,120	0.88%

¹ Value is derived from combining the "Southeast Asian", "Chinese", "Filipino", "Korean" and "Japanese" visible minority Census of Population categories.

² Value is derived from the "Latin American" visible minority Census of Population category.

³ Value is derived from combining the Arab and West Asian visible minority Census of Population categories.

⁴ Value is derived from "Not a visible minority" Census of Population category.

⁵ Value is derived from "Visible Minority, n.i.e." Census of Population category.

PART II

LEGISLATION

1.0 The Courts of Justice 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 and Section 42 deals with the appointment of provincial judges.

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, 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; 2024, c. 2, Sched. 6, s. 1.

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 judgesQualification*

- 42 (2)** No person shall be appointed as a provincial judge unless the person satisfies the following criteria:
- 1. The person has,
 - i. been a member of the bar of one of the provinces or territories of Canada for at least 10 years, or
 - ii. for an aggregate of at least 10 years, been a member of a bar mentioned in subparagraph i 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 of a position held under a law of Canada or of one of its provinces or territories.
 - 2. The person undertakes to participate in such courses as may be designated for newly appointed judges by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice under subsection 51.10.1 (3). 2023, c. 12, Sched. 3, s. 2.

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

In addition to legislative criteria outlined in s. 42(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* regarding qualifications for judicial 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. 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, Francophone, Indigenous, racial and ethnic minorities, 2SLGBTQI+ 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. French Language Proficiency Testing

Candidates who identify bilingual ability as indicated on the application form must undergo standardized French language testing to assess their proficiency at the application stage. For bilingual imperative vacancies, candidates must achieve a Superior level of proficiency on the test to proceed further through the process.

3. 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 (with the exception of those candidates who do not achieve a Superior level of proficiency on the French language test for bilingual imperative vacancies). 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.

4. 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. Law Society, LawPRO and CPIC checks are conducted on all candidates selected for an interview. Interviews normally take place approximately three weeks after the selection meeting.

5. 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. The Committee members take alternate turns asking interview questions. 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.

6. 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.

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.

7. 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.

Candidates should ensure complete, accurate and candid responses are provided to all questions in the application form. Failure to complete all questions and provide accurate information may result in the candidate not being considered for judicial appointment.

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 may 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 may 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 within four months after the judge's appointment. The Court has a policy that outlines relocation expenses that are eligible for reimbursement. 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

Ms. Christine Johnson was appointed as the Law Society of Ontario representative in April 2024.

Ms. Cheryl Siran, a representative of the Federation of Ontario Law Associations, retired in December 2024 after serving on the Committee for six years.

Mr. Jeffrey Lanctot was appointed as the Federation of Ontario Law Associations representative to replace Ms. Siran in December 2024.

Ms. Kavita Bhagat was reappointed for a second term of three years as the Ontario Bar Association representative.

Ms. Holly Haire and Mr. Scott Munnoch were reappointed as lay members for a second term of three years by the Attorney General.

Ms. Karin Vogt's term concluded on February 28, 2025. Ms. Vogt had been a member for six years. The Attorney General appointed lay member Ms. Angela Mondou to fill this vacancy.

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.

Over time, the Committee has looked for opportunities to increase the 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.

In addition, the Committee continues to review its processes to look for opportunities for efficiencies to further streamline processes and expedite recommendations to the Attorney General.

2.0 Outreach

The Committee has firmly accepted outreach as one of its roles, and continues to invite candidates from the various under-represented sections of the legal community to seek appointment. The Committee has increased its outreach by advertising through social media, as well as engaging with Ministry of the Attorney General stakeholders. The Committee continues to look for opportunities to attend and present at professional events.

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 encourages all lawyers with the requisite qualifications to apply and continue to apply if they are desirous of seeking a judicial appointment.

The Committee will continue to look for ways to further its outreach and to increase the number of qualified candidates applying for judicial appointments. 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.

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. It is important that the Committee's composition reflects the bilingualism of Ontario. In 2024-25, three Committee members are 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, 2024 to March 31, 2025:

Appointee	Position	Per Diem Rate	Original Position Appointment Date	Appointment End Date	Total Remuneration (not including expenses)
Matthew Bondy	Chair	\$566	1-Feb-2024	31-Jan-2027	\$31,413.00
Kavita Bhagat	Member	\$355	3-Dec-2021	2-Dec-2027	\$25,382.50
Christine Johnson	Member	\$355	23-Apr-2024	22-Apr-2027	\$27,867.50
Jeffrey Lancot	Member	\$355	3-Dec-2024	2-Dec-2027	\$10,295.00
Holly Haire	Member	\$355	29-Mar-2022	28-Mar-2028	\$35,677.50
Angela Mondou	Member	\$355	1-Mar-2025	29-Feb-2028	\$0
Scott Munnoch	Member	\$355	19-Apr-2022	18-Apr-2028	\$34,612.50
Karen Restoule	Member	\$355	12-Sep-2023	11-Sep-2026	\$0
Cheryl Siran	Member	\$355	29-Nov-2018	2-Dec-2024	\$27,157.50
Keith Strachan	Member	\$355	25-Oct-2022	24-Oct-2025	\$32,482.50
Brock Vandrick	Member	\$355	6-Dec-2023	5-Dec-2026	\$37,985.00
Karin Vogt	Member	\$355	1-Mar-2019	28-Feb-2025	\$39,050.00

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/ocj/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.

Additionally, the Committee will continue its ongoing efforts to identify process efficiencies to ensure timely recommendations and reduction in the overall process. Opportunities to strengthen outreach will continue to be explored, including attracting a higher number of qualified bilingual candidates.

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
- 10 minutes to go over one application

10 min. x 150 = 1500 minutes = **25 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 30 minutes

30 min. x 5 x 4 = 600 minutes (minimum – to add call back time) = **10 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
- 10 minutes per applicant

10 min. x 60 = 600 minutes = **10 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 = **66 hours**

Assuming there are 7 hours in a working day, 66 hours = **9.43 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 should the Committee resume some meetings in person. All interviews and meetings have been taking place virtually since March 2020; however, the Committee may review this practice in future.

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 Coordinators, the Committee Administrative Assistants, and Senior Program Consultant for ensuring the smooth operations of the Committee's work.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

Original signed by Matthew J. Bondy

Matthew J. Bondy
Chair

APPENDIX I**JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY
THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 2024 - MARCH 2025**

NAME	LOCATION	EFFECTIVE DATE
Assié, Christopher Kalee	Brampton *	30 January 2025
Boyce, Michael Robert Barry	Ottawa	11 July 2024
Campbell, Adam Sean Jeremy	Windsor	26 December 2024
Chorney, Christopher Klaus	Walkerton	24 October 2024
Frank, Michael David	Windsor	13 June 2024
Gaudet, Michael Sean	Toronto *	30 January 2025
Haklander, Dana Irene	Milton	12 September 2024
Hanna, Joseph	Oshawa	13 June 2024
Harris, Courtney Jayne	Chatham	13 June 2024
Harris, Joanna	Toronto	9 May 2024
Marcon, Liana	Oshawa	13 June 2024
Martel, Juliana	Ottawa *	5 December 2024
McGivern, Gregory William	Windsor	26 December 2024
Miles, Lisa Maurene	Ottawa	11 July 2024
Miller, Jason	London	9 May 2024
Mintz, Sara	Toronto	9 May 2024
Mizel, Ilana Lauren	Windsor	26 December 2024
Moore, Caolan	Toronto	11 July 2024
Pemberton, Shauna	Brampton	11 July 2024
Puls, Veronica Katherine Judith	Brampton	12 September 2024
Reccord, Christa	Pembroke	24 October 2024
Rumble, Michelle Louise	Newmarket *	30 January 2025
Scrutton, Peter	Toronto	11 July 2024

NAME	LOCATION	EFFECTIVE DATE
Singh, Anil Neil Ranji	Brampton	11 July 2024
Slate, Kelly Marie	Brampton	12 September 2024
Strezos, Louis	Toronto	11 July 2024
Thomas, Erin Samantha	Brampton	12 September 2024
Topp, Daniel Keyworth	Windsor 🌐	26 December 2024
Weinstein, Seth	Toronto	11 July 2024
Wills, Annik Sonia	Ottawa	26 September 2024
Woodley, Alayna Janai Vivienne	Brampton	11 July 2024
Yee Kin Shin, Jane Wendy	Brampton *	5 December 2024

* 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 2025**

TIMING OF THE APPOINTMENTS				
Reporting Period	1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025		Overall Total of Appointments (January 1989 – March 2025)	
Total Appointments	32		589	
LEGAL BACKGROUND				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 24 – 31 Mar 25	Percent (N=32)	Total No.	Percent (N=589)
Private Practice	8	25.0%	345	58.6%
Provincial Crown	13	40.6%	164	27.8%
Federal Prosecutor	1	3.1%	21	3.6%
Government	10	31.3%	59	10.0%
DIVERSITY STATISTICS [†]				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 24 – 31 Mar 25	Percent (N=32)	Total No.	Percent (N=589)
Francophone	5	15.6%	41	7.0%
Ability to conduct a trial and write a judgment in French language*	10	31.3%	20	3.4%
Indigenous	1	3.1%	17	2.9%
Visible Minority	5	15.6%	60	10.2%
Persons with Disabilities	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Ethnic/Cultural Group**	7	21.9%	25	4.2%
2SLGBTQQIA+**	0	0.0%	8	1.4%

DIVERSITY STATISTICS [†]				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 24 – 31 Mar 25	Percent (N=32)	Total No.	Percent (N=589)
Statistics for the categories below, except Woman, started with the 2024-25 annual report***				
Male	5	15.6%	5	0.8%
Female	6	18.8%	6	1.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Man	5	15.6%	5	0.8%
Woman	17	53.1%	245	41.6%
Non-Binary	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Two Spirit	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Gender Identity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
ETHNIC ORIGIN:				
North American Aboriginal	1	3.1%	1	0.2%
European Origins (includes Eastern, Northern, Southern and Western European origins)	10	31.3%	10	1.7%
French Origins	5	15.6%	5	0.8%
Caribbean Origins	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Latin, Central and South American Origins	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
African Origins	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian Origins	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
South Asian Origins	1	3.1%	1	0.2%
East and Southeast Asian Origins	1	3.1%	1	0.2%

DIVERSITY STATISTICS†				
Reporting Period	1 Apr 24 – 31 Mar 25	Percent (N=32)	Total No.	Percent (N=589)
RACE:				
Black	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
East/Southeast Asian	1	3.1%	1	0.2%
Indigenous	1	3.1%	1	0.2%
Latino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Middle Eastern	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
South Asian	1	3.1%	1	0.2%
White	10	31.3%	10	1.7%
Another Race	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

- † 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 has undertaken work to update 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.
- *** As of February 23, 2024, 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

Matthew Bondy, Kitchener: (Lay Member) (Chair)

Matthew Bondy is CEO of Bondy & Associates, a government relations and industry intelligence firm. He is a public affairs and policy leader, having worked previously in various roles, including as Deputy Chief of Staff to the Premier of Ontario, Vice-President for National Public Affairs at Enterprise Canada, and Vice-President, External Relations at Communitech Corporation, one of North America's largest tech incubators. Matthew has a long-standing passion for foreign and defence policy, stemming from his prior service with the Army Reserve, and continuing through his work as a Senior Fellow with the Macdonald-Laurier Institute. A regular speaker and columnist on these issues, his byline has appeared in the National Post, Financial Post, New York Post, Toronto Star, Australian Naval Review, Foreign Policy Magazine, Centre for International Governance Innovation, and other publications. He obtained undergraduate and graduate degrees in political science from the University of Waterloo. Matthew is a dedicated volunteer. He serves currently as a member of St. Jerome's University Board of Governors, as the only non-Jewish Member of the Israeli Consul General's Advisory Board (Toronto and Western Canada), and previously as Chairman of the Ontario Trillium Foundation. He was awarded the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal for service to Canada in 2012. Mr. Bondy has been a member of the Committee and the Chair since 2024.

Madam Justice Karen Lische, Regional Senior Justice, Sudbury

Justice Karen Lische is the Regional Senior Justice for the Northeast Region of the Ontario Court of Justice. As the Regional Senior Justice, Justice Lische exercises the powers of the Chief Justice. This includes scheduling court hearings and assigning cases to individual judges. Justice Lische is the French language education lead for the bilingual judges of the Ontario Court of Justice. Justice Lische has experience as the Local Administrative Judge in Sudbury and has served on the executive of the Canadian Association of Provincial Court Judges. Prior to her appointment to the bench in 2014, she had extensive criminal law experience as an Assistant Crown Attorney and significant family law experience as a family lawyer, including child protection, while in private practice in Sudbury. In addition, she worked as a panel lawyer for the Family Responsibility Office, for the Office of the Children's Lawyer, and for the Consent and Capacity Board. She is a former President of the Sudbury and District Law Association. Justice Lische is a graduate of the University of Ottawa Law School and was called to the Bar in 1996. She is fluently bilingual. Justice Lische is appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice. Justice Lische is appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and has been a member since 2023.

Madam Justice Marlyse Dumel, Ottawa

Justice Marlyse Dumel was appointed to the bench in February 2017. Prior to her appointment, she practiced law with the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, where her work included drug prosecutions and providing training and support to police officers. She also served as the secretary of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada's National Prosecution Policy Committee and as a member of its National Employment Equity Committee. In addition to her legal practice, Justice Dumel acted as mentor to the immigrant, refugee, and international students enrolled in the University of Ottawa Faculty of Law. She also contributed for many years to the Faculty as an Adjunct Professor for the Crown Internship Program. She speaks as a guest lecturer at the Faculty and continuing education programs. Justice Dumel is appointed to the Committee by the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice and has been a member since 2023.

Mr. Justice Riun Shandler, Toronto

Justice Riun Shandler was appointed a Judge of the Ontario Court of Justice in 2014. He currently presides at the Ontario Court of Justice – Toronto. Justice Shandler is a member of both the Ontario Judicial Appointments Advisory Committee and a member of the Ontario Judicial Council. 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 active participant in continuing legal education and chaired continuing education for the Ontario Court of Justice, as well as an adjunct professor at Osgoode Hall Law School teaching mental health and criminal justice to upper year and LLM students. He is the co-author of *Mental Disorder in Canadian Criminal Law* (Carswell) with Justice Joan Barrett. He graduated from the University of British Columbia Law School and was called to the Ontario bar in 1997. Justice Shandler is appointed to the Committee by the Ontario Judicial Council 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 of the Committee since 2021.

Christine Johnson, Ottawa: (Lawyer)

Christine Johnson received her Juris Doctor (2011) from Osgoode Hall Law School and was called to the Ontario Bar in 2012. She is currently a lawyer at Champ & Associates in Ottawa practicing primarily in the areas of labour and employment, human rights and public interest law. She has appeared as counsel or co-counsel before various administrative bodies and all levels of court, including the Federal Court of Appeal, the Court of Appeal for Ontario and the Supreme Court of Canada. Christine is a member of the Canadian Association of Labour Lawyers (CALL) and the Women's Legal Education & Action Fund (LEAF). She is also a regular mentor with Toronto Metropolitan University's Law Practice Program (LPP). Christine is appointed to the Committee as the Law Society of Ontario representative and has been a member of the Committee since 2024.

Jeffrey Lanctot, Peterborough: (Lawyer)

Jeffrey Lanctot is a senior litigation partner at the law firm of LLF Lawyers LLP in Peterborough, Ontario. Jeff was called to the Ontario bar in February of 1992 and has focused his legal practice in the area of civil litigation for over 32 years. He represents clients in a broad range of legal matters at various Court levels and before various tribunals. Prior to being called to the Ontario bar, Jeff completed a Bachelor of Science (Hons.) in 1986 and a Master of Arts in 1987 in the field of economics. Following this, he completed his Bachelor of Laws at the University of Toronto in 1990. Jeff was appointed a Deputy Judge of the Small Claims Court (being a branch of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice) in 2006 and continues to serve in that Court. Jeff is also a co-founder of Courthouse Solutions Inc. which developed the cloud-based Court case management system called Dockets. He has been actively involved as a board member for a number of not-for-profit organizations, including being a former board member and president of the Four Counties Brain Injury Association for approximately nine years. Jeff is appointed to the Committee as the Federation of Ontario Law Associations representative and has been a member of the Committee since 2024.

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.

Angela Mondou, Flesherton: (Lay Member)

Angela Mondou is TECHNATION's President and CEO with 25+ years of global technology leadership. Her expertise in developing strategic partnerships between industry and government leaders has elevated TECHNATION as Canada's leading technology association to influence Canada's tech sector and innovators as global leaders. Angela spearheaded TECHNATION's Strategic Knowledge Exchange program, which convenes industry executives and government officials to drive national-scale change. Under her leadership, TECHNATION became a founding member of the TECH7, a G7 engagement group, and is Chair of the 2025 TECH7 Summit in Canada. Angela's unique career path began with nine years as a military officer specializing in global supply chain and air movements, serving in NATO command and as a supply chain strategist for the UN Protection Force Peacekeeping Strategy in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. She then spent 20+ years in senior roles in the tech sector across North America and Europe, including senior marketing director at BlackBerry, global program director at Nortel Networks, and leading a health-tech AI predictive analytics company. Angela is a member of the World Economic Forum AI Governance Alliance Working Group, a board member of NGen, Canada's Global Innovation Supercluster for Advanced Manufacturing, has held positions as Entrepreneur-in-Residence at the Ivey School of Business, EVP of Leadership with the International Women's Forum, and Honorary Colonel of the Canadian Forces School of Aerospace, Technology and Engineering, and holds P.Log and ICD.D designations. She is the author of the leadership best-seller *Hit the Ground Leading!: Seize your leadership potential and do incredible things*. Ms. Mondou has been a member of the Committee since 2025.

Scott Munnoch, Toronto: (Lay Member)

Scott Munnoch joined the government and public relations firm of Temple Scott Associates in 2010 and is now one of three partners. After beginning his career in corporate public affairs, Scott transitioned into government, working closely with many Canadian leaders, both federally and provincially. Starting as an event coordinator, he served as Executive Assistant to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tour Director for the Prime Minister of Canada and a Senior Advisor to the Premier of Ontario. Scott has been active in government and public relations for over 25 years and has represented both the governments of Ontario and Canada on the international stage. He has played senior roles in the coordination of international summits and tours, including the G-7 Summits, the Commonwealth Summits, Royal Tours and state visits. In 1997, Scott was named as a Member of the Royal Victorian Order (M.V.O.) by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for his work on the Royal Tours to Canada. Scott is a graduate of both Queen's University and the University of Windsor, where he also played varsity football. He served as President of the Albany Club of Toronto from 2014-2016. Mr. Munnoch has been a member of the Committee since 2022.

Karen Restoule, North Bay: (Lay Member)

Karen Restoule is Vice President with Crestview Strategy and offers expertise in community, stakeholder, and Indigenous engagement, transformative leadership, change management, and policy development. Karen previously led Ontario's administrative justice system at Tribunals Ontario, where she led key modernization initiatives across the organization with noted transformations at the Licence Appeal Tribunal, Ontario Parole Board, Human Rights Tribunal Ontario, and most recently, the Landlord and Tenant Board. Karen has also led an environmental consulting firm, building on a previous role serving First Nations leadership as Director of Justice at Chiefs of Ontario. In 2016, she co-founded BOLD Realities to advance economic reconciliation and partnered with TakingITGlobal to co-create whose.land, a web-based mobile app that provides users with information about Indigenous territories. A graduate of the University of Toronto, the University of Ottawa's French Common Law Program, and Osgoode Hall's Intensive Program in Aboriginal Lands, Resources, and Governments, Karen was the youngest and most recent graduate to be inducted into the Faculty of Law's Honour Society in 2014 for using legal education as a foundation for making significant contributions to society. She was named Public Policy Forum's 2018 Prime Ministers of Canada Fellow and received CivicAction's 2018 Emerging Leader Award. A sought-after speaker and advisor, Karen brings her expertise to a number of advisory and governance boards and previously served on the federal Judicial Advisory Committee for Ontario East and North. She serves on juries for Canadian policy awards The Donner Prize and The Hunter Prize and is a contributing writer at thehub.ca. Karen is Ojibwe from Dokis First Nation. Ms. Restoule has been a member of the Committee since 2023.

Keith Strachan, Barrie: (Lay Member)

Keith Strachan is the President and co-founder of MediPharm Labs, a publicly listed TSX company focused on the pharmaceutical application of cannabinoids. In 2015, Keith utilized his expertise in compliance for government licensing and local planning, to break the mould and secure the first Health Canada Licence for cannabis oil production. This then contributed to other industry leading pharmaceutical certifications from both Health Canada and global regulatory bodies. A seasoned entrepreneur, Keith has applied his leadership to building out MediPharm Labs' leading-edge facilities, launching operations and growing its workforce, while also strategically driving business development with the company's customers in Canada, Australia, South America, and the European Union. Prior to entrepreneurship, Keith held various public service roles with the Ontario Government and Royal Victoria Regional Health Centre, focused primarily on supply chain management. As a resident of Barrie, he is an active community contributor, including a member of the Kempenfelt Rotary Club. Mr. Strachan has been a member of the Committee since 2022.

Brock Vandrick, Ottawa: (Lay Member)

Brock Vandrick is Senior Vice President at Wellington Dupont Public Affairs. Brock has previously served in several government roles, including Chief of Staff to Ontario's Minister of Natural Resources, Director of Stakeholder Relations to the Premier of Ontario, and as an advisor to Canada's Minister of International Trade. He is a board member at ParcelPal Logistics Inc. and is a fellow of the Royal Canadian Geographical Society. Mr. Vandrick has been a member of the Committee since 2023.

Cheryl Siran, Kenora: (Lawyer)
(Retired on December 2, 2024)

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 construction 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 Bencher of the Law Society of Ontario as of May 2022. She is also 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 acts as a Board member of the Pellatt United Firefighters, her local volunteer fire department. Cheryl was appointed to the Committee as the Federation of Ontario Law Associations representative and had been a member of the Committee since 2018.

Karin Vogt, Stoney Creek: (Lay Member)
(Retired on February 28, 2025)

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 was most recently employed at CURIE (Canadian Universities Reciprocal Insurance Exchange), where she provided 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 had been a member of the Committee since 2019.