

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	xix
Preface	xxi
Introductory Note	xxiii
CHAPTER 1 – THE ROLE OF APPELLATE TRIBUNALS	1
PART 1 – Why Standards of Review?	2
PART 2 – Why Review?	5
(a) The Error Correcting Role	5
(b) The Call for Universality	6
(c) The Law-Making Role	8
PART 3 – Why Limit Review?	13
(a) The Presumption of Fitness	13
(b) Respect for Ad Hoc Jurisprudence	16
(c) Scarcity of Resources	18
(d) Deference to the Skills of the Original Tribunal	21
PART 4 – Reconciliation of Competing Claims: A Sense of Role	24
PART 5 – Some Dubious Explanations for Limited Review	29
(a) Lack of Jurisdiction	29
(b) Seeing and Hearing the Witness	32
(c) Floodgates	33
(d) Parallel Justice	34
PART 6 – Some Dubious Calls for Expended Review	35
CHAPTER 2 – THE STANDARDS	37
PART 1 – The Standards	38
(a) The Traditional Five Standards	38
(i) <i>Absolute deference</i>	38
(ii) <i>Unreasonableness</i>	38
(iii) <i>Patent Unreasonableness</i>	39
(iv) <i>Concurrence (Correctness)</i>	39
(v) <i>Fresh Assessment</i>	39
(b) The Correct Standards of Review	40
(i) <i>How many standards?</i>	40
(ii) <i>The key standards</i>	40
(iii) <i>The need for categories</i>	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 2 — Interpretative Problems 43

- (a) Absolute Deference 43
- (b) De Novo Hearings 43
 - (i) *Meaning* 43
 - (ii) *Masters of own procedure* 44
- (c) Concurrence (Correctness) 46
 - (i) *Meaning* 46
 - (ii) *Presumption of fitness* 47
- (d) Demonstrable Unreasonableness 48
 - (i) *Which term to employ?* 48
 - (ii) *Meaning* 50
 - (iii) *Presumption of fitness and onus on appellant* 52
 - (iv) *The need to articulate the test* 54

PART 3 — Dangerous Formulations of the Unreasonableness Standard 57

- (i) *Evidence to support?* 57
- (ii) *Substantial evidence to support?* 61
- (iii) *Doubtful error?* 62
- (iv) *U.S. “Clearly erroneous” test* 64
- (v) *Palpable error?* 65

CHAPTER 3 — CATEGORIES FOR REVIEW GENERALLY 69

PART 1 — Introduction 69

PART 2 — Criteria for Standards Choice 71

- (a) Introduction: A Sense of Role 71
- (b) Presumption of Fitness 72
- (c) The Call for Universality and the Exemptions from the Call 73
- (d) Balancing the Presumption of Fitness and the Call for Universality 74
- (e) An Aside: The Governing Rule or the Standard of Review? 77
- (f) Expertise 78
- (g) Another Aside: Statutory Limits on Review 81
- (h) Scarcity of Resources 82
- (i) Conclusion 82

PART 3 — The Basic Tests for Selection of the Standards 84

- (a) Introduction 84

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(b) Considerations that Lead to Review
on Concurrence (Correctness) Basis 85

(i) *Does the decision of the first tribunal
clearly fail to follow an established and
unquestioned governing rule?* 85

(ii) *Aside entirely from the decision on the
first tribunal, does the case raise a question
about a rule of law that must be stated or
revised for the general benefit of society?* 85

(iii) *Does the decision or process of the first
tribunal raise a question about the reputa-
tion of the administration of justice?* 87

(iv) *Are there at least some factors in the case
about which, either in terms of relevance
or weight, the court should offer
guidance?* 87

(v) *Does the decision have strong precedential
character because the matrix of facts
present in it is commonplace?* 89

(c) Considerations that May Lead to Review
Only for Unreasonableness 90

(i) *Is this issue one where the call for regard
to management of judicial resources,
reliance on the presumption of fitness,
respect for ad hoc jurisprudence,
or deference to the skills of the first
tribunal are very strong and the call
for universality less strong?* 90

(ii) *Is the complaint made in a case, or about an
issue, where considerations of cost and time
alone greatly outweigh the claims of
universality?* 90

(iii) *Does the governing rule require the
decision-maker to consider and balance
many factors?* 91

(iv) *Is the decision about a matter that
essentially involves the management of
the caseload of the first tribunal?* 92

(v) *Has the Legislature indicated that it
would prefer deferential review?* 93

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 4 — STANDARDS OF REVIEW AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS 95

PART 1 — Introduction 95

 (a) The Reason for This Chapter 95

PART 2 — Recent Developments in the Law 98

 (a) Judicial Review Generally 98

 (b) Prerogative Review 100

 (c) Compulsory Arbitration 101

PART 3 — The Modern Rules for Judicial Review of Decisions by Administrative Tribunals: The Standards 102

PART 4 — The Modern Rules for Judicial Review of Decisions by Administrative Tribunals: The Categories 106

 (a) Pragmatic and Functional Analysis 106

 (b) Considerations That Lead to Review for Correctness (concurrence) 108

 (i) *Does the decision of the first tribunal clearly fail to follow an established and unquestioned governing rule?* 108

 (ii) *Aside entirely from the decision on the first tribunal, does the case raise a new question about a rule of law that must be stated or revised for the general benefit of society?* 108

 (iii) *Does the decision or process of the first tribunal raise a question about the reputation of the administration of justice?* 111

 (iv) *Are there at least some factors in the case about which, either in terms of relevance or weight, the court should offer guidance?* 112

 (v) *Does the decision have strong precedential character because the matrix of facts present in it is commonplace?* 113

 (c) Considerations That May Lead to Review Only for Unreasonableness 113

 (i) *Is this issue one where the call for regard to management of judicial resources, reliance on the presumption of fitness, respect for ad hoc jurisprudence, or deference to the skills of the first tribunal are very strong and the call for universality less strong?* 113

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(A) Privative clauses 114
(B) Expertise 114
(C) Social Role 116
(ii) *Does the decision or process of the first tribunal raise a question about the reputation of the administration of justice?* 118
(iii) *Are there at least some factors in the case about which, either in terms of relevance or weight, the court should offer guidance?* 118
(iv) *Does the decision have strong precedential character because the matrix of facts present in it is commonplace?* 118
(v) *Is the complaint made in a case, or about an issue, where considerations of cost or time alone greatly out-weigh the claims of universality?* 119
(vi) *Does the governing rule require the decision-maker to consider and balance many factors?* 119
(vii) *Is the decision about a matter that essentially involves the management of the caseload of the first tribunal?* 120
(viii) *Has the Legislature indicated that it would prefer deferential review?* 120
(d) Privative Clause and the Standard of Review 124

CHAPTER 5 — MATTERS OF FACT 133
PART 1 — Reception of Evidence 133
PART 2 — The Weighing of Evidence 136
 (a) The Legal Rules That Guide the Finding of Facts 136
 (b) Failure to Consider Evidence 137
PART 3 — Fact-Finding 138
 (a) General Rule 138
 (b) Functional Tests 139

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(c) History 139

(d) The “Special Advantage” Rule 140

(e) Dubious Exceptions: Interpretation of Documents 142

(f) Dubious Exceptions: Expert Testimony . . . 143

(g) Dubious Exceptions: Acquittals 143

(h) Dubious Exceptions: Demeanour and Credibility 143

PART 4 — Inferences 147

(a) General Rule 147

(b) History of the Rule 148

PART 5 — Social Facts 151

CHAPTER 6 — MATTERS OF LAW 155

PART 1 — Errors in Application of Governing Rules 155

(a) Simple Application of Settled Rules 156

(b) Complicated Applications of Legal Rules . 156

PART 2 — Error of Law Generally 157

PART 3 — Mixed Fact and Law 163

(a) Sorting Fact-Issues and Law-Issues 163

(b) Characterization of Facts as Matching (or not) a Legal Rule 164

(c) A Modern Re-statement of the Approach to Mixed Fact and Law 168

PART 4 — The Appropriate Criteria for Selection of a Standard When a Question of Law Arises 178

(a) Considerations that Lead to Review on Concurrence (Correctness) Basis 178

(i) *Does the decision of the first tribunal clearly fail to follow an established and unquestioned governing rule?* 178

(ii) *Aside entirely from the decision on the first tribunal, does the case raise a question about a rule of law that must be stated or revised for the general benefit of society?* 180

(iii) *Does the decision or process of the first tribunal raise a question about the reputation of the administration of justice?* 182

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(iv) *Are there at least some factors in the case about which, either in terms of relevance or weight, the court should offer guidance?* 184

(v) *Does the decision of the first tribunal have a strong precedential character because the precise matrix of facts in the present case are commonplace?* 185

(b) Considerations that May Lead to Review Only for Unreasonableness 187

(i) *Is this issue one where the call for regard to management of judicial resources, reliance on the presumption of fitness, respect for ad hoc jurisprudence, or deference to the skills of the first tribunal are very strong and the call for universality less strong?* 187

(ii) *Is the complaint made in a case, or about an issue, where considerations of cost and time alone greatly outweigh the claims of universality?* 187

(iii) *Does the governing rule require the decision-maker to consider and balance many factors?* 188

(A) Explicitly multi-factoral guidelines or governing rules 188

(B) Implicitly multi-factoral general rules 188

(iv) *Is the decision about a matter that essentially involves the management of the caseload of the first tribunal?* 189

(v) *Has the Legislature indicated that it would prefer deferential review?* 190

PART 5 — Reasons for Decision by First Tribunal 190

(a) Absence of Reasons 190

(b) Remedies 194

(c) The Missed-Issue Rule 197

PART 6 — Appeals Limited to Matters of “Law Alone” 198

(a) Generally 198

(b) Does the “Law Alone” Rule Mandate That all Errors be Reviewed on the Correctness (Concurrence) Standard? 200

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(c) The Special Status of a Jury in Our Society · 201
 (d) Acquittals by a Judge Sitting Alone ····· 205

CHAPTER 7 — GUIDELINES ····· 207

PART 1 — Modern Re-statement of the Rule ····· 208

(a) What is a Guidelines Case? ····· 208
 (b) Guidelines ····· 211
 (c) Categories for Review ····· 213

PART 2 — Problems with the Traditional Discretion
 Category ····· 215

(a) Confusion of Discretion With Power ···· 215
 (b) History of the Discretion Rule ····· 217
 (c) Problems with the Traditional Formula ··· 223
 (d) The Rise and Fall of the Attack on
 “Fettering” ····· 225

PART 3 — Specific Cases ····· 229

(a) Quantum of Damages for Non-Pecuniary
 Loss ····· 229
 (b) Custody of Children ····· 233
 (c) Family Support ····· 235
 (d) Transfer Orders ····· 237
 (e) Interlocutory Orders ····· 238
 (i) *Generally* ····· 238
 (ii) *Case management* ····· 239
 (iii) *Appeals from masters* ····· 240
 (f) Sentencing of Crime ····· 243
 (i) *In general* ····· 243
 (ii) *History of the rule about review of
 sentencing* ····· 247

CHAPTER 8 — HARMLESS ERROR ····· 251

PART 1 — Introduction ····· 251

(a) Summary of the Rules ····· 251
 (i) *“Untainted decision” rule* ····· 251
 (ii) *“Inevitable result” rule* ····· 252
 (iii) *“Fair appearances” rule* ····· 252
 (iv) *“Nullity” rule* ····· 252
 (b) The Purpose of the Rules ····· 252
 (i) *Prejudice to the appellant* ····· 253
 (ii) *Pointless re-hearings* ····· 254

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(iii) *Appearance of justice* 254
(iv) *Doctrinal purity* 254
(c) Sources of the Rules 255
PART 2 — The Nullity Rule 257
(a) The Rule 257
(b) Commentary 257
(c) Harmless Administrative Decisions 259
(d) The Idea of Gaining Jurisdiction Through
Lost Jurisdiction 261
PART 3 — The Untainted Decision Rule 262
(a) The Rule 262
(b) Civil Cases 262
(c) Criminal Cases 264
(i) *Conviction appeals* 264
(ii) *Appeals from acquittals* 265
(d) The Onus of Proof That the Error Failed
to Affect the Jury 267
(e) This Jury or a Hypothetical Jury? 269
(i) *In general* 269
(ii) *The constructive murder cases* 272
PART 4 — The Inevitable Result Rule 274
(a) Statement of the Rule 274
(b) Commentary 274
(c) The Strength of the Case 275
(d) History of the Rule 278
(e) The Inevitable Verdict Rule and the
Right to Trial by Jury 281
PART 5 — Fair Appearances Rule 285
(a) The Rule 285
(b) Specific Applications of the Rule 290
(i) *Improper remarks by trial judge* 290
(ii) *Accused not present during trial* 292
(iii) *Admission of prejudicial evidence* 293
(iv) *Denial of right of audience* 294
(v) *Apparent bias* 294
(vi) *Counsel's address* 294
(vii) *Directed verdicts* 295
(viii) *In camera hearings* 296

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(ix)	<i>Failure to comply with prescribed procedure</i>	296
(x)	<i>Trial without language comprehension</i> ..	297
PART 6	— Specific Applications of the Harmlessness Rules	297
(a)	Failure to Admit Relevant Evidence	297
(b)	Admission of Irrelevant Evidence	299
(c)	Misdirection or Misstatement	301
CHAPTER 9	— CONSENSUAL ARBITRATION	305
PART 1	— What is Consensual Arbitration	305
PART 2	— Domestic Consensual Arbitration	306
(a)	Introduction	306
(b)	Privative Clauses	307
(c)	Uniform Arbitration Act	308
(d)	Standards of Review in Domestic Consensual Arbitration	312
(e)	Grievance Dispute	315
PART 3	— International Commercial Arbitration	316
(i)	<i>Statutes</i>	316
(ii)	<i>Standards of review and enforcement of Canadian international commercial arbitral awards</i>	318
CHAPTER 10	— RELIEF	321
PART 1	— Choice of Relief	321
PART 2	— A New Trial	322
(a)	Fresh Assessment or New Trial?	322
(b)	New Trial	323
PART 3	— A Fresh Assessment	324
(a)	Powers	324
(i)	<i>Limits: Prerogative Relief</i>	325
(ii)	<i>Limits: Criminal Jury Trials</i>	326
(iii)	<i>Limits: Appeals from Convictions</i>	326
(b)	New Conclusion Based on Existing Findings of Fact	327
(c)	Rules About Fresh Assessment	327
PART 4	— Fresh Evidence on Appeal	330

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 5 — Mootness 333
 (a) The Rule 333
 (b) Election 334

CHAPTER 11 — SECOND LEVEL REVIEW 337

 PART 1 — Generally 337

 PART 2 — Appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada 340
 (a) Law-Settling Cases 340
 (b) Review the Choice of Standard of Review 340
 (c) Review of the Application of the
 Unreasonableness Standard 341
 (d) Standard of Review on Second-Level
 Review for Unreasonableness 342
 (e) Concurrence Between Original Decision
 and First-Level Review 345

CHAPTER 12 — LEAVE TO APPEAL 347

 PART 1 — Leave to Appeal and Standards of Review 347

 PART 2 — Leave Rules 348

 PART 3 — Burden of Persuasion on a Leave Application 350

 PART 4 — General Public Importance 351

 PART 5 — At Large or on Specified Issues 352

BIOGRAPHIES

 Roger P. Kerans BIO-1

 Kim Melissa Willey BIO-6

BOOKS BKS-1

ARTICLES ART-1

STATUTES ST-1

CASES TOC-1

INDEX IND-1