

No.	Case Name & Citation	Court	Judgment Date	Source
1	Herman v. Rathbone, [2000] O.J. No. 318 <b>Support Orders</b> -- Enforcement -- Priorities amongst judgment creditors -- Support recipient enjoys priority even though enforcement process in her favour was issued well after bank sold matrimonial home under power of sale with intention of satisfying claims of payor's other judgment creditors.	ONSupCtJus	2000/01/27	Ontario Judgments
2	Ellman v. Ellman, [1984] O.J. No. 1019	ONHCJ	1984/01/23	Ontario Judgments
3	Herman v. Rathbone, [1998] O.J. No. 2295 <b>Practice</b> -- Pleadings -- Striking out pleadings -- Bankruptcy -- Setting aside transactions prior to bankruptcy -- Fraudulent preferences -- Fraudulent conveyances -- Evidence and proof.	ONCtGDFamCt	1998/06/03	Ontario Judgments
4	Canada Trust v. Off Estate, [1999] O.J. No. 4422 <b>Wills</b> -- Construction -- Construction of words in context of whole will -- Ascertainment of intention of testator -- Failure of gifts.	ONSupCtJus	1999/11/24	Ontario Judgments
5	Tahor Holdings Ltd. v. 381579 Ontario Ltd., [2001] O.J. No. 2196 <b>Trusts</b> -- The trustee -- Duties -- Fiduciary or confidential relationships -- Breach of fiduciary relationship -- Breach of trust -- Purchase of trust property -- Remedies -- Removal.	ONSupCtJus	2001/06/06	Ontario Judgments
6	Strobele v. Strobele, [2006] O.J. No. 4220 <b>Family law</b> -- Marital property -- Equalization -- Contribution of parties -- Debts -- Matrimonial home -- Appeal by husband from order declaring the wife to be a 50 per cent equitable owner of the matrimonial home allowed -- Trial judge had no authority to determine ownership of the home as a discrete matter -- Husband's net family property was negative, so wife not entitled to equalization payment.	ONCA	2006/10/24	Ontario Judgments
7	Strobele v. Strobele, [2006] O.J. No. 4580	ONCA	2006/11/17	Ontario Judgments
8	Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto v. P. (J.), [1989] O.J. No. 2564	ONProvCtFamD	1989/12/13	Ontario Judgments
9	Curtner v. McNally, [2002] O.J. No. 4636 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Defences or bars -- Practice -- Application, limitation period.	ONSupCtJus	2002/11/29	Ontario Judgments
10	Slipacoff v. Slipacoff et al., [1982] O.J. No. 3325	ONHCJ	1982/06/10	Ontario Judgments
11	S.R. v. M.R., [2002] O.J. No. 4238 <b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Practice -- Costs -- Party and party costs -- Entitlement to party and party costs -- Where party represented by legal aid.	ONSupCtJus	2002/10/18	Ontario Judgments
12	Tennant v. Tennant, [2002] O.J. No. 4333 <b>Family law</b> -- Divorce -- Corollary relief, maintenance, enforcement -- Appeals -- Defences -- Insurance -- Life insurance -- Beneficiaries -- Spouse defined.	ONCA	2002/11/15	Ontario Judgments

13	Murray v. Murray, [2005] O.J. No. 3563 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Appeals -- Quashing or dismissal of -- Motion by wife to dismiss husband's appeal from a spousal support order on the grounds of non-payment dismissed.	ONCA	2005/08/29	Ontario Judgments
14	R. v. Habel, [1980] O.J. No. 2384	ONCA	1980/10/10	Ontario Judgments
15	Campbell v. Campbell, [1981] O.J. No. 809	ONHCJ	1981/08/24	Ontario Judgments
16	Income Investments (Wentworth) Ltd. v. Elmore, [1981] O.J. No. 833	ONHCJ	1981/09/04	Ontario Judgments
17	Slipacoff v. Slipacoff, [1982] O.J. No. 586	ONHCJ	1982/06/10	Ontario Judgments
18	Hart v. Howse (Ont. C.A.), [1983] O.J. No. 100	ONCA	1983/04/29	Ontario Judgments
19	Elkind v. Elks Stores Ltd., [1983] O.J. No. 460	ONSC	1983/09/08	Ontario Judgments
20	Tessis v. Tessis, [1983] O.J. No. 773	ONProvCtFamD	1983/10/20	Ontario Judgments
21	Neilson v. Rustmar Investments Ltd., [1985] O.J. No. 1627	ONDistCt	1985/03/20	Ontario Judgments
22	Re Kern and Kern et al., [1986] O.J. No. 2356	ONHCJ	1986/02/17	Ontario Judgments
23	Oliver v. Oliver, [1990] O.J. No. 581	ONSC	1990/03/09	Ontario Judgments
24	Dunn v. Dunn Estate, [1992] O.J. No. 1276	ONCtGD	1992/06/18	Ontario Judgments
25	Oxy Petrochemicals Inc. v. Beresford Packaging Inc. (S.C.C.), [1992] S.C.C.A. No. 90  <b>Procedural law</b> -- Civil procedure -- Actions -- Commercial law -- Contracts -- Sale -- Guarantee -- Creditor and debtor -- Was motion for summary judgment the appropriate procedure in this case? -- Did the Court of Appeal err in law, after	CASCC	1992/03/02	Supreme Court of Canada Rulings on Applications for Leave to Appeal and Other Motions

characterizing the issue properly, in failing to determine the same? -- Does the motion for summary judgment before the Court of Appeal fall to be determined on a pure question of law, that is whether a guarantor who undertakes to pay the present liability of a primary debtor and who waives all defences, set-offs and counterclaims, avoids payment under the guarantee when the goods delivered to the primary debtor are so defective as to give rise to a fundamental breach of contract?

- 26 Murray v. Murray, [2005] S.C.C.A. No. 481 CASCC 2006/02/23 Supreme Court of Canada  
Rulings on Applications for  
Leave to Appeal and Other  
Motions
- Family law** -- Maintenance -- Separation Agreement -- Spousal release clause -- Review of terms of separation agreement -- Whether wife entitled to spousal support in the face of separation agreement -- Application of the principles in Miglin v. Miglin, [2003] SCC 24 and Marinangeli v. Marinangeli (2003), 66 O.R. (3d) 40 (C.A.) -- Whether an appellate court has a duty to determine a proper outcome and make an appropriate order, rather than require a near-destitute party to re-litigate issues after years of litigation which obviously impact adversely upon a family -- Whether the court of appeal should have made a decision on the merits of the stage-two Miglin test -- Whether the court of appeal erred in finding that the husband did not have an implied duty to disclose the increase in his annual income -- What is the nature of the duty for ongoing disclosure of financial information.
- 27 Slipacoff v. Slipacoff et al., (1982), 37 O.R. (2d) 375 ONHCJ 1982/06/10 Ontario Reports
- Family law** -- Infants -- Custody -- Evidence -- Questions tending to show commission of adultery -- Claim for custody in divorce action based on adultery -- Statutory privilege applied -- Evidence Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 145, s. 10. -- Evidence -- Privilege -- Questions tending to show commission of adultery -- Claim for custody in divorce action based on adultery -- Statutory privilege applied -- Evidence Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 145, s. 10.
- 28 Kern and Kern et al., 54 O.R. (2d) 11 ONHCJ 1986/02/17 Ontario Reports
- Professions** -- Barristers and solicitors -- Conduct -- Liability -- Solicitor acting in matrimonial dispute upon client's instructions -- Solicitor assisting client in sale and disposition of property -- Other party commencing action naming solicitor as defendant -- No cause of action disclosed against solicitor. -- Civil procedure -- Costs -- Punitive order -- Solicitor ordered to pay costs personally -- Solicitor acting upon instructions of client in matrimonial dispute assisting client in sale and disposition of property -- Order requiring solicitor to pay costs set aside -- Rule 57.07.
- 29 Oliver v. Oliver (Master's Ch.), 72 O.R. (2d) 275 ONSC 1990/03/09 Ontario Reports
- Family law** -- Property -- Restraining disposition -- Wife having title to matrimonial home -- Husband claiming one-half interest in matrimonial home by virtue of express trust, constructive trust or resulting trust -- Husband requesting certificate of pending litigation against matrimonial home -- Claim for constructive trust constituting claim to property interest -- Entitled to certificate -- Courts of Justice Act, 1984, S.O. 1984, c. 11, s. 116(1).
- 30 Sandra Elaine Dunn v. Estate of Nigel David Dunn, Imperial Life Assurance Co. of Canada and Dunn ONCtGD 1992/06/18 Ontario Reports  
[Indexed as: Dunn v. Dunn Estate], 9 O.R. (3d) 95
- Family law** -- Dependants -- Dependants' relief -- Property subject to award -- Proceeds of life insurance policy with designated beneficiary forming part of deceased's estate for purposes of charging order under Succession Law Reform Act -- Section 173(1) of Insurance Act to be read subject to provisions of s. 72(1)(f) of Succession Law Reform Act -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 218, s. 173 -- Succession Law Reform Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.26, s. 72. -- Insurance -- Life insurance -- Proceeds of life insurance policy with designated beneficiary forming part of deceased's estate for purposes of charging order under Succession Law Reform Act -- Section 173(1) of Insurance Act to be read subject to provisions of s. 72(1)(f) of Succession Law Reform Act -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 218, s. 173 -- Succession Law Reform Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.26, s. 72.
- 31 Ramcharitar v. Ramcharitar et al.; Legal Aid Ontario, Intervenor [Indexed as: Ramcharitar v. Ramcharitar], 62 O.R. (3d) 107 ONSupCtJus 2002/10/18 Ontario Reports
- Civil procedure** -- Costs -- Amendments to Rule 57 of Rules of Civil Procedure did not change interpretation to be given to s.

46 of Legal Aid Services Act -- Amount of costs to be awarded to party who has received Legal Aid not to be affected by fact that party is legally aided -- Bill of Costs filed pursuant to rule 57.01 should refer to solicitor's usual billing rate and not to billing rate of solicitor under Legal Aid tariff -- Legal Aid Services Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c. 26, s. 46 -- Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, rules 57, 57.01. -- Professions -- Barristers and solicitors -- Legal aid -- Amount of costs to be awarded to party who has received Legal Aid not to be affected by fact that party is legally aided -- No need exists for any fee arrangement between client and Legal Aid to be disclosed to other party -- Statutory extension of solicitor/client privilege granted by Legal Aid Services Act to communications between client and Legal Aid should not be overridden -- Legal Aid Services Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c. 26, ss. 89, 90.

- 32 *Tennant v. Tennant* [Indexed as: *Tennant v. Tennant*], 62 O.R. (3d) 185 ONCA 2002/11/15 Ontario Reports  
**Family law** -- Support -- Spousal support -- Former spouse is not "spouse" within meaning of s. 196(2) of Insurance Act -- Section 196(2) did not bar former spouse from enforcing order for spousal support against ex-husband's annuity contracts or annuity payments -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. I.8, s. 196(2). -- Insurance -- Life insurance -- Annuities -- All annuity payments are exempt from creditors' claims under s. 196(1) of Insurance Act where beneficiary is designated -- Exemption from creditors' claims not limited to moneys that are payable to beneficiary -- Section 196(1) precludes insured's ex-wife (who was also beneficiary under insured's annuity contracts) from enforcing order for spousal support against annuity payments -- Former spouse is not "spouse" within meaning of s. 196(2) of Insurance Act -- Section 196(2) did not bar ex-wife from enforcing order for spousal support against insured's annuity contracts or annuity payments -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. I.8, ss. 196(1), (2).
- 33 *Murray v. Murray\** [Indexed as: *Murray v. Murray*], 76 O.R. (3d) 546 ONCA 2005/08/29 Ontario Reports  
**Family law** -- Support -- Spousal support -- Separation agreement containing explicit release of spousal support -- Child support provisions of [page547] agreement providing for recalculation of husband's child support obligation if his income increased materially -- Trial judge implying term in agreement requiring husband to disclose material increases in his annual income and finding that husband was in breach of that term -- Trial judge finding that agreement linked release of spousal support to fulfillment of husband's obligations under child support provisions, including implied obligation to disclose material increases in his income -- Term should not be implied if it contradicts express term in agreement -- Term implied by trial judge contradicting express release of spousal support -- Trial judge erring in setting aside agreement and awarding wife retroactive and future spousal support.
- 34 *Murray v. Murray* [Indexed as: *Murray v. Murray*], 79 O.R. (3d) 147 ONCA 2005/12/15 Ontario Reports  
**Family law** -- Practice -- Costs -- Husband satisfying provisions of rule 18(14) and rule 24(1) of Family Law Rules -- Wife impecunious -- Court ordering each side to bear own costs -- Family Law Rules, O. Reg. 114/99, rules 18(14), 24(1).
- 35 *Dusome v. Maxwell*, [1987] O.J. No. 1795 ONProvCtFamD 1987/02/18 Ontario Judgments  
**Maintenance** -- Costs in enforcement proceedings and in application to rescind maintenance arrears not constituting support orders under Support and Custody Order Enforcement Act -- Enforcement proceedings dismissed -- Support and Custody Order Enforcement Act, S.O. 1985, c. 6, ss. 1(1), 11(1), (2), (6).
- 36 *Naumetz v. Naumetz*, [1988] O.J. No. 197 ONHcj 1988/02/08 Ontario Judgments
- 37 *Bourns v. Bourns*, [1988] O.J. No. 1829 ONHcj 1988/11/14 Ontario Judgments
- 38 *Casey v. Casey*, [1988] O.J. No. 1973 ONHcj 1988/12/09 Ontario Judgments
- 39 *Singh v. Singh*, [1992] O.J. No. 35 ONCtGDFamCt 1992/01/10 Ontario Judgments

<b>Family law -- Marital or matrimonial property -- Division -- Equalization -- Valuation date -- Assessment of debts and assets.</b>				
40	Oxy Petrochemicals Inc. v. Beresford Packaging Inc. (Ont. C.A.), [1992] O.J. No. 71 <b>Practice</b> -- Summary judgment -- Appeals -- Sale of goods -- Defective goods.	ONCA	1992/01/20	Ontario Judgments
41	Singh v. Singh, [1992] O.J. No. 3123 <b>Practice</b> -- Costs -- Party and party costs -- Entitlement -- Successful party, exceptions, conduct -- Solicitor and client costs -- Entitlement to solicitor and client costs -- Neglect or misconduct.	ONCtGDFamCt	1992/03/26	Ontario Judgments
42	L.A.C. v. R.E.J. (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), [1992] O.J. No. 654 <b>Family law</b> -- Paternity -- Credibility of witnesses -- Delay in applying for determination of paternity and child support.	ONCtGD	1992/04/02	Ontario Judgments
43	Chapman v. Chapman, [1993] O.J. No. 1744 <b>Family law</b> -- Separation agreement -- Variation -- Maintenance of children -- Retroactive maintenance -- Contribution and indemnity from third party.	ONCtGDFamCt	1993/07/27	Ontario Judgments
44	Garden Village Investments Inc. v. Lala, [1996] O.J. No. 467 <b>Practice</b> -- Appeals.	ONCA	1996/02/13	Ontario Judgments
45	Stewart v. Ryerson Polytechnic University, [1998] O.J. No. 5277 <b>Practice</b> -- Appeals -- Dismissal of appeals.	ONCA	1998/12/15	Ontario Judgments
46	Miller v. Schnier, [1999] O.J. No. 11 <b>Family</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of children -- Practice -- Costs -- Where wife not represented by lawyer.	ONCtGD	1999/01/05	Ontario Judgments
47	Miller v. Schnier, [1999] O.J. No. 3046 <b>Practice</b> -- Judgments and orders.	ONSupCtJusDivC t	1999/06/22	Ontario Judgments
48	Smith v. Pichler, [1999] O.J. No. 4708 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of children -- Consideration, support tables -- Custody and access -- Access -- Considerations in awarding access, conduct of parents -- Best interests of child.	ONSupCtJus	1999/09/27	Ontario Judgments
49	Pevato v. Ashton, [2000] O.J. No. 560 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of wives -- Effect of income or potential income of claimant -- Maintenance of children -- Corollary relief, maintenance, support guidelines -- Calculation of income -- Special or extraordinary expenses -- Child care expenses -- Changed circumstances.	ONSupCtJus	2000/02/18	Ontario Judgments
50	Voce v. Gibson, [2000] O.J. No. 4467 <b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Jurisdiction -- Separation agreements, domestic contracts and marriage contracts -- Variation.	ONSupCtJus	2000/11/01	Ontario Judgments

51	S.R. v. M.R., [2000] O.J. No. 4241 <b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Practice -- Contempt -- Practice -- Hearing -- Venue -- Procedure -- Appeals.	ONCA	2000/11/07	Ontario Judgments
52	Zaffino v. Zaffino, [2000] O.J. No. 4641 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of children -- Interim orders -- Custody and access.	ONSupCtJus	2000/12/06	Ontario Judgments
53	Anderson v. McWatt, [2001] O.J. No. 199 <b>Practice</b> -- Appeals -- Quashing or dismissal of appeals -- Grounds for.	ONCA	2001/01/23	Ontario Judgments
54	Voce v. Gibson, [2001] O.J. No. 5778 <b>Family law</b> -- Divorce -- Corollary relief -- Jurisdiction -- Practice -- Costs -- Solicitor and client costs.	ONSupCtJus	2001/03/05	Ontario Judgments
55	Anderson v. McWatt, [2001] O.J. No. 1429 <b>Family law</b> -- Husband and wife -- Actions between husband and wife, property -- Property, partition.	ONCA	2001/04/12	Ontario Judgments
56	West v. West, [2001] O.J. No. 2149 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Variation of -- Grounds -- Interim orders -- Husband and wife -- Marital property -- Matrimonial home, orders respecting, directions.	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2001/05/28	Ontario Judgments
57	Dalgleish v. Dalgleish, [2001] O.J. No. 2187 <b>Barristers and solicitors</b> -- Relationship with client -- Termination of relationship -- Conflict of interest -- Receipt of confidential information from other party.	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2001/05/29	Ontario Judgments
58	Tennant v. Tennant, [2001] O.J. No. 3609 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of wives -- Enforcement -- Execution -- Exemptions -- Annuities.	ONSupCtJus	2001/06/18	Ontario Judgments
59	M.C.P. v. R.J.P., [2001] O.J. No. 3042 <b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Interim custody -- Variation of -- Considerations -- Welfare of child paramount -- Status quo -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of children -- Considerations, support tables -- Shared custody -- Calculation of income.	ONSupCtJus	2001/07/20	Ontario Judgments
60	Barrett v. Kouril Estate, [2001] O.J. No. 3959 <b>Family law</b> -- Dependents' relief legislation -- What constitutes a spouse -- Persons entitled to relief -- Common law spouse -- Person cohabiting with deceased -- Entitlement -- Considerations in making awards -- Awards -- Lump sum payment -- Evidence.	ONSupCtJus	2001/10/11	Ontario Judgments
61	S.R. v. M.R., [2002] O.J. No. 1519 <b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Access -- Considerations in awarding access, contest between parents and nonparents -- Right to access, natural parents -- Access to adopted children -- Enforcement of orders -- Contempt proceedings.	ONSupCtJus	2002/04/09	Ontario Judgments
62	Dekroon v. Dekroon, [2002] O.J. No. 2982 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Practice -- Joinder of causes and consolidation -- Consolidation of actions -- Parties -- Adding or substituting parties -- Adding or substituting defendants -- Circumstances when denied.	ONSupCtJus	2002/07/09	Ontario Judgments

63	I.H. v. D.M., [2002] O.J. No. 2838	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2002/07/16	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Access -- Considerations on awarding access, welfare of child -- Access awards, variation by parties -- Access awards, time and place limitations -- Access awards, clarification.			
64	Simons v. Buck, [2002] O.J. No. 3120	ONSupCtJus	2002/08/01	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Estoppel</b> -- Estoppel by record (res judicata) -- Res judicata as a bar to subsequent proceedings -- Issues decided in prior proceedings (incl. validity of statutes).			
65	M.C.P. v. R.J.P., [2002] O.J. No. 3283	ONSupCtJus	2002/08/20	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Husband and wife -- Marital property, distribution orders -- Bars, unfair and inequitable -- Particular property, pensions -- Particular property, company shares, stock options, etc. -- Custody and access -- Considerations in awarding custody -- Welfare of child paramount -- Conduct of parents -- Conduct of persons other than parents -- Maximum contact with each parent -- Joint custody -- When available -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Interim relief -- Effect of wife's ability to work -- Maintenance of children -- Awards, periodic payments -- Retroactive maintenance -- Considerations, support tables -- Variation of award or agreement.			
66	I.H. v. D.M., [2002] O.J. No. 3496	ONSupCtJus	2002/09/10	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Practice -- Costs -- Costs on substantial indemnity basis -- Time for payment.			
67	Jordan v. Stewart, [2002] O.J. No. 4074	ONSupCtJus	2002/10/08	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of wives Considerations (incl. pensions) -- Maintenance of children -- Considerations, support tables -- Divorce -- Corollary relief, maintenance, support guidelines (incl. nondivorce cases) -- Calculation or attribution of income -- Practice -- Costs -- Suit money or interim costs.			
68	Jordan v. Stewart, [2002] O.J. No. 3965	ONSupCtJus	2002/10/11	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Practice -- Judgments and orders -- Reasons for judgment after trial or application -- Amendment of.			
69	R. v. M.R., [2002] O.J. No. 4239	ONSupCtJus	2002/10/18	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Access -- Access to adopted children -- Access order, noncompliance, punishment -- Contempt -- What constitutes contempt -- Judgments and orders.			
70	Jordan v. Stewart, [2002] O.J. No. 5200	ONSupCtJus	2002/12/10	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Practice</b> -- Appeals -- Leave to appeal.			
71	S.R. v. M.R., [2003] O.J. No. 205	ONSupCtJus	2003/01/09	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Practice</b> -- Costs -- Party and party costs -- Where success or fault divided -- Solicitor and client costs -- Entitlement to solicitor and client costs -- In contempt proceedings.			
72	Voce v. Gibson, [2003] O.J. No. 146	ONCA	2003/01/09	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Custody and access -- Practice -- Costs -- Offers to settle, effect of.			
73	Voce v. Gibson, [2003] O.J. No. 55	ONCA	2003/01/09	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Practice</b> -- Appeals.			
74	Simons v. Buck, [2003] O.J. No. 827	ONCA	2003/02/28	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Estoppel</b> -- Estoppel by record (res judicata) -- Issues decided in prior proceedings.			

75	Christakos v. Papamanolopoulos, [2003] O.J. No. 1378 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Interim relief -- Interim maintenance -- Maintenance of children -- Support guidelines -- Calculation of income -- Maintenance of wives -- Circumstances where order refused.	ONSupCtJus	2003/04/22	Ontario Judgments
76	Barrett v. Kouril Estate, [2003] O.J. No. 2376 <b>Family law</b> -- Dependents' relief legislation -- Entitlement -- Considerations in making awards -- Practice -- Appeals.	ONSupCtJusDivC t	2003/05/27	Ontario Judgments
77	M.C.P. v. R.J.P., [2003] O.J. No. 3704	ONSupCtJus	2003/09/19	Ontario Judgments
78	Agresti v. Hatcher, [2004] O.J. No. 910	ONSupCtJus	2004/03/04	Ontario Judgments
79	Paech v. Paech, [2004] O.J. No. 3040 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance and support -- Child support -- Support guidelines -- Special or extraordinary expenses -- Calculation or attribution of income.	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2004/07/15	Ontario Judgments
80	Munro v. Munro, [2004] O.J. No. 3837 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Costs -- Against solicitor personally -- Appeals -- Leave to appeal.	ONSupCtJus	2004/09/08	Ontario Judgments
81	Cundill v. Cundill, [2004] O.J. No. 3903 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Settlements -- What constitutes -- Offers -- Family law -- Separation agreements, domestic contracts and marriage -- Enforcement.	ONSupCtJus	2004/09/23	Ontario Judgments
82	Munro v. Munro, [2004] O.J. No. 4946 <b>Family law</b> -- Divorce -- Practice -- Costs -- Appeals from costs order.	ONSupCtJus	2004/11/19	Ontario Judgments
83	Paech v. Paech, [2004] O.J. No. 5067	ONSupCtJus	2004/12/13	Ontario Judgments
84	Munro v. Munro, [2005] O.J. No. 821 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Discovery -- Production and inspection of documents -- Reports and records -- Estoppel -- Estoppel by record (res judicata) -- Issue estoppel.	ONSupCtJus	2005/03/01	Ontario Judgments
85	Sciuk v. Sciuk, [2005] O.J. No. 2012 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance and support -- Awards -- Child support -- Support guidelines -- Calculation or attribution of income -- Financial disclosure by spouse -- Spousal support.	ONSupCtJus	2005/05/16	Ontario Judgments
86	Murray v. Murray, [2005] O.J. No. 3564 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance and support -- Appeals -- Motion to dismiss husband's appeal from judgment awarding spousal support to wife dismissed.	ONCA	2005/08/29	Ontario Judgments

87	Murray v. Murray, [2005] O.J. No. 5379 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Costs -- When not awarded -- Application by husband, successful in appealing spousal support award, for costs not allowed -- Each party to bear own costs where wife did not have financial means to pay husband's costs and appeal court did not dismiss her claim -- Family Law Rules, Rules 18(14), 24(1).	ONCA	2005/12/15	Ontario Judgments
88	Thomson v. Ludwick, [2006] O.J. No. 3707	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2006/06/30	Ontario Judgments
89	Weinrib v. Baker, [2006] O.J. No. 3470	ONSupCtJus	2006/08/29	Ontario Judgments
90	Balkou v. Morgan, [2007] O.J. No. 359 <b>Family law</b> -- Marital property -- Interim orders -- Equalization -- Application by the wife for an advance or equalization payment or for an advance payment of legal fees and disbursements allowed in part -- Wife was granted an advance payment towards disbursements to pay an expert to test the husband's expert and also to advance her own expert evidence regarding the child support issues. -- Family law -- Maintenance and support -- Awards -- Application by the wife for an advance or equalization payment or for an advance payment of legal fees and disbursements allowed in part -- Wife was granted an advance payment towards disbursements to pay an expert to test the husband's expert and also to advance her own expert evidence regarding the child support issues. -- Application by the respondent wife Morgan against the husband Balkou for the payment of child support arrears, an advance or equalization payment and child and spousal support or payment for legal fees and disbursements incurred -- Parties married in 1986 and separated in 1996 -- They had two children -- They signed a separation agreement in 1997 that included a mutual release of spousal support -- Husband commenced an action in 1998 and sought a declaration that the agreement was binding and that he was owed \$50,000 -- Wife counterclaimed for custody, child and spousal support, an order setting aside the agreement and an equalization payment -- Trial was scheduled to occur in June 2007 -- In 2003 the husband was ordered to pay the wife monthly child support of \$2,000 pending trial -- In 2004 the wife applied for the husband to pay child support arrears of \$83,000 -- Husband was ordered to pay the wife's lawyer \$80,000 in trust -- Of these funds \$50,000 were released to the wife by court order -- Child support that the husband had to pay was reduced to \$1,000 per month after one child started to live with him -- Wife owed \$13,000 to her lawyer and \$4,000 to her expert -- Her expert estimated it would cost up to \$30,000 to complete his report -- HELD: Wife's application was allowed in part -- Temporary orders that were made about child support did not consider the application of the child support guidelines -- Issue of the proper quantum and any further adjustment of child support would be for the trial judge who would have to determine the parties' incomes -- Child support arrears were therefore left to the trial judge -- This was not a proper case for an advance on the equalization payment since there was a dispute regarding the validity of the agreement -- Husband's income was complex -- Wife would require expert evidence in the areas of property and in determining the husband's income for guideline purposes -- No valuations or expert reports were produced at the time of the negotiations that led to the agreement or during this litigation -- Wife was entitled to an advance of \$30,000 to retain an expert to test the husband's expert and also to advance her own expert evidence regarding the child support issues -- Payment would be made out of the funds that were held by her lawyer -- Court would not grant the wife an advance on legal fees because her evidence in this regard was inadequate.	ONSupCtJus	2007/02/02	Ontario Judgments
91	Jordan v. Stewart, [2007] O.J. No. 1359 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance and support -- Agreement -- Motion by the mother to amend a consent order allowed -- The order provided the father would pay for a psycho-educational assessment of the parties' high-school aged child, named a particular psychologist -- The mother sought to amend the order to name a different psychologist -- The father's claim that the assessment was unnecessary was wrong; the special needs child would require the assessment for post-secondary education -- The father was ordered to pay for the assessment with the psychologist suggested in the amendment.	ONSupCtJus	2007/04/12	Ontario Judgments
92	Elieff v. Elieff, [2007] O.J. No. 1802 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Costs -- Assessment or fixing of costs -- Special orders -- For reprehensible or inefficient conduct -- Where wife largely successful in matrimonial litigation involving support and custody issues, wife awarded \$15,000 of \$20,000 bill of costs -- Although bill was high considering temporary orders were issued, costs not sharply discounted due to husband's inappropriate conduct in failing to provide adequate disclosure of his income, in failing to adhere to court's instructions regarding length of costs submissions, and in attempting to reargue wife's entitlement to support during costs submissions. -- Determination of costs payable following motions regarding child custody, support, and valuation of property -- Wife was largely successful in proceedings, although she was not awarded sole custody of youngest child of marriage -- Court ordered	ONSupCtJus	2007/05/07	Ontario Judgments

hared custody of children with primary residence with wife -- Wife awarded exclusive possession of family home and contents -- Wife awarded advance payment of \$40,000 to perform valuation of husband's business where husband was not forthcoming in disclosing true business income -- Court unable to determine quantum of child and spousal support payable to wife until after her valuation done -- Husband made further submissions regarding wife's ineligibility for support during costs submissions -- Failed to adhere to three-page limit regarding costs submissions -- Took position he had greater success on argued issues -- Submitted bill of costs of \$12,000 -- Wife's bill of costs amounted to just over \$20,000, representing 38 hours of lawyers' time, 9.5 hours of law clerks' time, \$600 in disbursements and \$1,140 in GST -- HELD: Wife entitled to costs of \$15,000, plus \$500 penalty imposed on husband for failing to adhere to court's instructions and trying to use costs hearing to re-argue issues already ruled upon by court -- Although normally \$20,000 bill of costs for temporary order would be sharply discounted as being not proportional to issues at stake, husband's failure to equip wife with information necessary needlessly complicated matters -- Husband's submission he had more success than wife was ridiculous. | **Civil procedure** -- Costs -- Entitlement -- Misconduct in or abuse of litigation process -- Unreasonable behaviour -- Advocacy of position against which court had already ruled -- Where father had resisted disclosure of his true business income and value of his business, motions judge allowed mother to perform her own analysis of his income and business valuation to which end, father was ordered to lend her \$40,000 that would later be characterized as advance on property, support or costs -- Motions judge had also determined that mother was entitled to support and then invited written submissions on quantum -- In submissions on father's behalf, however, father's lawyer chose to question correctness of decision on \$40,000 advance, suggesting that he might be unable to comply with order and offering to get considerably cheaper valuation -- Motions judge found this attempt to re-argue court's decision impertinent -- If father had felt aggrieved, he should have made motion for permission to appeal -- For this and other unreasonable litigation behaviour, motions judge assessed penalty of \$500 against father in addition to costs order against him. -- Civil procedure -- Costs -- Entitlement -- Misconduct in or abuse of litigation process -- Unreasonable behaviour -- Disregard for order of precedence -- Motions judge had already determined that mother was entitled to support and had invited written submissions on quantum -- In calculations submitted on father's behalf, however, father's lawyer chose to include further submissions on merits of mother's entitlement to support -- Motions judge found this behaviour inappropriate, as issue of entitlement had already been fully argued -- Mother had been proponent of that motion and therefore she (and not father) had right of reply -- For this and other unreasonable litigation behaviour, motions judge assessed penalty of \$500 against father in addition to costs order against him. -- Civil procedure -- Costs -- Entitlement -- Misconduct in or abuse of litigation process -- Unreasonable behaviour -- Disregard of court's practice directions -- Motions judge had instructed parties to limit their written submission on costs to 3 pages, but father's lawyer filed 6 pages that included highly improper attempt to re-argue substantive case on its merits -- For this and other unreasonable litigation behaviour, motions judge assessed penalty of \$500 against father in addition to costs order against him.

93	J.C. v. A.M.M., [2007] O.J. No. 3887	ONSupCtJus	2007/09/26	Ontario Judgments
	<p><b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance and support -- Child support -- Dependant child -- Where child has income -- Quantum -- Payor's annual income -- Over \$150,000 -- Payee's annual income -- Over \$150,000 -- Number of children -- 3 -- Monthly award -- \$3,001 to \$5,000 -- Special or extraordinary expenses -- Education -- Payor's obligation (percentage) -- 51 to 60 -- Based on applicant's annual income of \$248,338, and respondent's annual income of \$229,375, applicant was to pay child support of \$4,046 per month for three children, eldest of whom had completed undergraduate degree and was attending medical school -- Given parties' own post graduate studies, they would have had similar expectations for children -- Eldest child's decision to attend medical school prevented her from withdrawing from parents' care -- Guideline support was payable year round, not just while children were home from university -- Children were to contribute 30 per cent of their summer or part-time income. -- Determination of child support and extraordinary expenses payable by applicant to respondent in respect of parties' three children; EC, born May 30, 1984, N.C., born June 5, 1986, and A.C., born October 26, 1989 -- Minutes of settlement entered into on August 24, 2000 provided applicant was to pay child support of \$2,400 per month until September 2002 when EC was to attend university, at which time child support obligations would be reviewed and varied if warranted -- Applicant had continued to pay child support at same level on understanding that any adjustments for over or underpayments would be made after satisfactory agreement had been reached -- EC had completed undergraduate degree and was currently attending medical school -- NC had one year of university left to complete for an undergraduate degree -- AC had completed grade 12 and would be attending university in the fall -- They continued to maintain respondent's home as their primary residence -- Applicant's 2006 income was \$248,338, while respondent's was \$229,375 -- Applicant claimed EC was no longer a child of the marriage -- HELD: Given parties' successful, lucrative careers, and their own post graduate studies, they would have had similar high expectations for their children -- There was no evidence that EC's decision to attend medical school was contrary to her parents' wishes -- That decision was sufficient cause to prevent her from withdrawing from her parents' care, and she was therefore still a child of the marriage -- As to table amount of support, Court was to begin with presumption that s. 3(2)(a) of Guidelines applied to children over age of majority attending university unless there was evidence demonstrating otherwise -- Any party arguing that s. 3(2)(a) was inappropriate was required to provide clear and compelling evidence that some amount other than table amount was appropriate -- Applicant failed to discharge onus of showing that respondent benefited or experienced a "windfall" while children were at university -- Accordingly, applicant was required to pay arrears of amounts owing in excess of \$2,400 per month, which came to \$44,908, based on applicant's increased income over the years -- As to s. 7 expenses, children were required to contribute 30 per cent of their own summer or part-time income toward their own expenses -- NC was</p>			

required to contribute \$6,000, and EC had satisfied her requirement to contribute by having paid \$15,000 toward her first year of medical school -- Applicant was required to reimburse respondent \$50,921 for extraordinary expenses, and to pay 52 per cent of ongoing extraordinary expenses -- Applicant was to pay ongoing child support of \$4,046 per month based on annual income of \$248,338.

- 94 Lynch v. Segal, [2007] O.J. No. 4983 ONSupCtJus 2007/12/19 Ontario Judgments  
**Civil procedure** -- Judgments and orders -- Amendment, rescission and variation -- After judgment entered -- Enforcement -- Stay of -- Motion by respondents to vary or stay enforcement of judgment dismissed -- Applicant obtained monetary judgment which was to be satisfied by transfer of certain lands to her -- Lands were now worth significantly more than judgment -- Court had no jurisdiction to stay order since there was no proceeding in existence in which respondents could move for stay, as final order had been made and appeals exhausted -- Even if Court had jurisdiction to grant stay, it would not have exercised its discretion to do so given respondents' failure to pay prior costs orders. -- Civil procedure -- Estoppel -- Estoppel by record (res judicata) -- Cause of action -- Issue estoppel -- Finality of judgment or order -- Motion by respondents to vary or stay enforcement of judgment dismissed -- Applicant obtained monetary judgment which was to be satisfied by transfer of certain lands to her -- Lands were now worth significantly more than judgment -- Respondents were precluded by issue estoppel from re-litigating issue of vesting order, which had already been litigated at trial -- Cause of action estoppel also applied inasmuch as respondents could have put forth arguments about value of land at trial, but failed to do so. -- Family law -- Maintenance and support -- Practice and procedure -- Orders -- Enforcement of orders -- Transfer of assets -- Motion by respondents to vary or stay enforcement of judgment dismissed -- Applicant obtained monetary judgment which was to be satisfied by transfer of certain lands to her -- Lands were now worth significantly more than judgment -- Court had no jurisdiction to stay order since there was no proceeding in existence in which respondents could move for stay, as final order had been made and appeals exhausted -- Even if Court had jurisdiction to grant stay, it would not have exercised its discretion to do so given respondents' failure to pay prior costs orders. -- Motion by respondents for order staying enforcement of judgment or alternatively varying judgment -- Respondent Segal lived with applicant Lynch for seven years and they had two children together -- After separation, Lynch commenced family law action against Segal and against corporate respondents that were beneficially owned by him -- Lynch was awarded custody, lump sum support, and a restraining order -- Monetary part of judgment, totalling \$11,137,631, was to be satisfied by transfer and vesting of certain lands that were owned beneficially by Segal -- Segal left jurisdiction and did not defend, but corporate respondents defended -- Trial judge found there was an expectation that property acquired during relationship would be considered a joint asset, and Segal and Lynch would share rewards equally -- Trial judge determined lump sum support owed by Segal was more than what was paid by corporate respondents to acquire lands -- In bringing this motion, respondents argued that vesting lands in Lynch would constitute unjust enrichment in that she would receive lands with significantly more value than monetary judgment -- Respondents presented appraiser's affidavit indicating lands were now worth about \$26.3 million -- Respondents argued Court could vary method by which monetary portion of judgment was to be enforced, and allow them to pay judgment -- HELD: Motion dismissed -- This was not a proper case in which to vary or set aside a portion of judgment -- Respondents could have introduced evidence at trial as to value of lands but did not do so -- Unjust enrichment argument could not succeed because there was a juristic reason for Lynch's enrichment, which was the judgment -- Also if respondents believed vesting order would cause unjust enrichment they should have made that argument before trial judge -- Further, Court had no jurisdiction to grant a stay because there was no proceeding in existence in which respondents could move for a stay, as a final order had been made, and appeals had been exhausted -- Even if Court had jurisdiction to grant stay, it would not have exercised its discretion to do so given Segal's arrogant conduct and respondents' failure to pay prior costs orders -- Finally, respondents were barred by issue estoppel from re-litigating issue of vesting order, which had already been litigated at trial -- Cause of action estoppel also applied inasmuch as respondents could have put forth arguments about value of land at trial, but failed to do so.
- 95 Tennant v. Tennant, [2003] I.L.R. I-4192 ONCA 2002/11/15 Canadian Insurance Law Reporter  
**Life insurance** -- Annuity -- Exemption from seizure by creditors -- Order for spousal support not enforceable against husband's annuity income -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. I.8, s. 196.
- 96 R. v. Levkoe, [1980] O.J. No. 657 ONHCJ 1980/02/26 Ontario Judgments
- 97 Rathbone Herman v. Rathbone, 46 O.R. (3d) 678 ONSupCtJus 2000/01/27 Ontario Reports  
**Family law** -- Support -- Wife obtaining support judgments in 1997 -- Writs of execution filed by wife's counsel in 1997 but rescinded by court order in July 1998 -- Family Responsibility Office not filing writ of execution in respect of support judgment until January 1999 -- Bank bringing about mortgage sale of matrimonial home in meantime -- Section 4(1) of Creditors' Relief Act recognizing priority of support orders before any distribution made under legislation -- Priority for support orders existing

regardless of when enforcement process issued or served -- Wife encumbrancer under Mortgages Act -- Wife entitled to payment out of court of proceeds of mortgage sale -- Creditors' Relief Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.45, s. 4(1) -- Mortgages Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.40.

98	Borins et al. v. Honest Ed's Ltd., [1980] O.J. No. 3635	ONHCJ	1980/06/05	Ontario Judgments
99	Solmon v. Elkind, [1979] O.J. No. 984	ONHCJ	1979/08/28	Ontario Judgments
100	Solmon v. Elkind, [1980] O.J. No. 447	ONHCJ	1980/01/11	Ontario Judgments
101	Sea-Land Service Inc. v. Knight's Appleden Fruit Ltd., [1980] O.J. No. 651	ONHCJ	1980/02/25	Ontario Judgments
102	Nunan v. Nunan, [1980] O.J. No. 1377	ONHCJ	1980/10/08	Ontario Judgments
103	International Mogul Mines Ltd. v. White & Co. Bailiffs Ltd., [1981] O.J. No. 520	ONHCJ	1981/03/26	Ontario Judgments
104	Diamond v. Kaufman, [1985] O.J. No. 1653	ONHCJ	1985/05/27	Ontario Judgments
105	Borins et al. v. Honest Ed's Ltd., 29 O.R. (2d) 79 <b>Practice</b> -- Discovery -- Jurisdiction of Master -- Application for order requiring reattendance on discovery -- Master has jurisdiction to make order -- Rules 330, 351 (Ont.).	ONHCJ	1980/06/05	Ontario Reports
106	Doblinger v. Doblinger, [1987] O.J. No. 700	ONHCJ	1987/07/03	Ontario Judgments
107	Lee-Chin v. Lee-Chin, [2005] O.J. No. 4447 <b>Civil procedure</b> -- Discovery -- Examinations for discovery -- Range of examination -- Wife was entitled to question husband without restrictions on matters relating to issue of nondisclosure of assets and unconscionability of separation agreement -- Husband could not be questioned on matters of opinion or matters subject to solicitor and client privilege. -- Determination of several motions brought in an application by wife to set aside a separation agreement and for other relief and an application by the husband for summary judgment dismissing wife's claims -- Wife claimed husband failed to disclose significant increase in his business assets between date of separation and time of settlement -- Wife claimed she would not have completed the settlement negotiations by the separation agreement if she had known of increase in husband's business interests -- Motions related mainly to questioning of husband - Motions allowed in part -- Husband could be questioned without restrictions, except on matters of opinion and privilege -- Questioning of husband was of great importance for both parties in respect of their presentations on the motion for summary judgment -- Questioning was a right of a party -- Questioning of husband ought not to be limited to the issue of nondisclosure at time of settlement negotiation -- Interrelationship between nondisclosure and unconscionability of agreement necessitated complete questioning to present full evidentiary record on summary judgment motion -- Husband ordered to answer questions relating to his financial circumstances since the settlement was reached --	ONSupCtJus	2005/07/21	Ontario Judgments

Questions as to husband's opinion as to the fairness of the negotiations and support provisions were not proper -- Husband did not waive privilege and could not be questioned on matters protected by solicitor and client privilege.

- 108 Lee-Chin v. Lee-Chin, [2005] O.J. No. 4108 ONSupCtJus 2005/09/26 Ontario Judgments  
**Civil procedure** -- Actions -- Application and interpretation of practice rules -- Application by the wife for directions on costs submissions allowed -- Counsel for the party seeking costs was to serve their submissions within 14 days of the within endorsement -- The responding party then had 14 days to serve their submissions -- The party seeking costs then had seven days to serve reply submissions -- The submissions were not to exceed 10 pages in length and were to include a bill of costs. -- Civil procedure -- Costs -- Application by the wife for directions on costs submissions allowed -- Counsel for the party seeking costs was to serve their submissions within 14 days of the within endorsement -- The responding party then had 14 days to serve their submissions -- The party seeking costs then had seven days to serve reply submissions -- The submissions were not to exceed 10 pages in length and were to include a bill of costs.
- 109 Pileggi v. Cortese, [2006] O.J. No. 4046 ONSupCtJus 2006/10/10 Ontario Judgments
- 110 Pileggi v. Cortese, [2006] O.J. No. 4412 ONSupCtJus 2006/11/02 Ontario Judgments
- 111 Green v. Green, [2007] O.J. No. 454 ONSupCtJus 2007/02/08 Ontario Judgments  
**Family law** -- Marital property -- Equalization -- Valuation of assets -- Business, commercial or non-family assets -- Pensions and investments -- Valuation date -- Application by the wife for equalization of family assets allowed -- At issue was valuation and inclusion of the wife's supplementary executive pension, valuation of the husband's business, and the date of separation -- The court held that the date of separation occurred upon a mutual recognition that the wife was leaving the marriage -- The wife's pension was properly analogized to a registered pension plan, and thus constituted family property for valuation purposes -- A market-based methodology was favoured over a capitalized earnings approach for valuation of the husband's business. -- Family law -- Maintenance and support -- Child support -- Calculation or attribution of income -- Quantum -- Special or extraordinary expenses -- Education -- Application by the wife for contribution to the children's post-secondary education expenses allowed -- The oldest child was estranged from his father following an argument post-separation -- The court held that the child withdrew from the care of his father two years after the argument when he refused to provide contact details -- The parties were responsible for the youngest child's boarding school costs, as the situation amounted to a shared custody situation - - The parties were ordered to contribute to education expenses on a pro rata basis. -- Application by the wife for an equalization payment and contribution to the children's post-secondary education expenses -- The parties separated after the husband conducted an extra-marital affair -- At issue was the correct valuation date -- The wife confronted the husband and consulted a lawyer in May -- She paid a retainer in June -- The wife testified that she did not tell the husband that she was leaving until June because she was physically afraid of him -- She left the family home in July after her daughter finished exams -- The wife was an insurance executive and the husband operated an insurance benefits agency -- Also at issue was whether the wife's unvested supplementary executive pension constituted family property, and the value of the husband's business -- Both children attended university, although the youngest resided at boarding school at the time of separation -- The oldest child was estranged from his father following an argument post-separation -- HELD: Application allowed -- The valuation date was June upon a mutual recognition that the wife was leaving the marriage -- As of the valuation date, there was a greater than 90 per cent probability that the wife's pension would vest -- The pension was properly analogized to a registered pension plan, and thus constituted family property for valuation purposes -- The expert that valued the husband's business on behalf of the wife used a more balanced market-based methodology than the capitalized earnings approach used by the husband -- The husband's income for support purposes was calculated by adding back home office expense deductions, plus a gross-up for a dividend received from his company -- The oldest did not initially cease to be a child of the marriage despite estrangement from his father, but withdrew when he refused to contact his father two years later -- The parties were responsible for the youngest child's boarding school costs, as the situation amounted to a shared custody situation with neither party having physical custody -- The parties were ordered to contribute to education expenses on a pro rata basis.
- 112 Green v. Green, [2007] O.J. No. 4613 ONSupCtJus 2007/11/27 Ontario Judgments  
**Family law** -- Maintenance and support -- Enforcement of orders -- Arrears of maintenance -- The court clarified a prior judgment in a family law proceeding, and found arrears of child support amounted to \$44,050 -- The father was ordered to produce all documentation in his possession, under his control or available to him concerning certain bank accounts opened in the children's names.

113	R. v. Schmidt, [1995] B.C.J. No. 2397	BCCA	1995/10/26	British Columbia and Yukon Judgments
	<b>Criminal law</b> -- Sentencing -- Appeals, variation of sentence -- Grounds for refusing to vary sentence.			
114	Spencer v. Spencer, [2000] B.C.J. No. 1313	BCSC	2000/06/21	British Columbia and Yukon Judgments
	<b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Maintenance of wives -- Effect of income or potential income of claimant -- Considerations -- Variation -- Time-limited order.			
115	Dusome v. Maxwell (Ont. Dist. Ct.), [1987] O.J. No. 1714	ONDistCt	1987/12/17	Ontario Judgments
116	Chapman v. Chapman, [1980] O.J. No. 1478	ONCA	1980/11/06	Ontario Judgments
117	Mintz v. Mintz, [1982] O.J. No. 863	ONHCJ	1982/04/02	Ontario Judgments
118	Collacott v. Collacott (Ont. C.A.), [1983] O.J. No. 137	ONCA	1983/09/14	Ontario Judgments
119	Diamond v. Kaufman, [1984] O.J. No. 452	ONHCJ	1984/06/08	Ontario Judgments
120	Diamond v. Kaufman, [1984] O.J. No. 419	ONHCJ	1984/07/06	Ontario Judgments
121	Dunn v. Dunn Estate, [1993] O.J. No. 458	ONDivCt	1993/02/26	Ontario Judgments
122	Dusome and Maxwell Indexed as: Dusome v. Maxwell (Dist. Ct.), 62 O.R. (2d) 785	ONDistCt	1987/12/17	Ontario Reports
	<b>Family law</b> -- Support -- Enforcement -- Whether order for costs enforceable as support order under provincial enforcement legislation -- Definition of support order including order for payment of legal fees -- Definition including order for costs -- Support and Custody Orders Enforcement Act, 1985 (Ont.), c. 6, s. 1(1)(n).			
123	Dunn v. Estate of Dunn et al. [Indexed as: Dunn v. Dunn Estate], 12 O.R. (3d) 601	ONDivCt	1993/02/26	Ontario Reports
	<b>Wills and estates</b> -- Dependants' relief -- Property subject to award -- Section 196 of Insurance Act subject to s. 72(1)(f) of Succession Law Reform Act -- Insurance proceeds forming part of estate of deceased for purposes of Part V of Succession Law Reform Act -- Insurance Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. I.8, s. 196 -- Succession Law Reform Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.26, s. 72(1) (f).			
124	Binkley v. Binkley (Ont. C.A.), [1988] O.J. No. 414	ONCA	1988/04/28	Ontario Judgments
	<b>Matrimonial home</b> -- Interim order of immediate sale set aside -- Immediate sale would substantially impair right to trial of			

property issue.

125	Naumetz v. Naumetz, [1988] O.J. No. 833	ONHCJ	1988/06/09	Ontario Judgments
126	Higgott v. Higgott, [1989] O.J. No. 1290 <b>Solicitor's lien for costs</b> -- Solicitors Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 478, s. 35(a).	ONHCJ	1989/07/28	Ontario Judgments
127	Grafstein v. Chernick, [1990] O.J. No. 1573 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of children -- Awards -- Effect of income tax liability.	ONHCJ	1990/08/09	Ontario Judgments
128	Stravrakos v. Stravrakos, [1991] O.J. No. 1481	ONCtGD	1991/08/19	Ontario Judgments
129	Stavrakos v. Stavrakos, [1992] O.J. No. 1874 <b>Family law</b> -- Interim maintenance -- Child and spousal support -- Children of marriage -- Responsibility to pay income tax on support received.	ONCtGD	1992/08/24	Ontario Judgments
130	Herman v. Rathbone, [2000] O.J. No. 2417 <b>Family law</b> -- Maintenance of wives and children -- Enforcement -- Director of Maintenance Enforcement, actions against -- Practice -- Costs.	ONSupCtJusFam Ct	2000/06/19	Ontario Judgments
131	Marchese Estate v. Marchese, [2002] O.J. No. 3867 <b>Family law</b> -- Husband and wife -- Marital property, considerations in making distribution orders -- Valuation (incl. time for) - - Dissipation or disposal of assets -- Financial disclosure by spouse.	ONCA	2002/10/11	Ontario Judgments
132	Marchese Estate v. Marchese, [2003] O.J. No. 25 <b>Practice</b> -- Costs -- Appeals -- Costs of appeal -- Successful party.	ONCA	2003/01/14	Ontario Judgments
133	Boris v. Boris, [2005] O.J. No. 971	ONSupCtJus	2005/01/04	Ontario Judgments
134	Weinrib v. Baker, [2006] O.J. No. 2713	ONSupCtJus	2006/04/28	Ontario Judgments