IN THE MATTER OF:

Law Enforcement Review Act Complaint No.2359

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

An Application pursuant to Section 13 of The Law Enforcement Review Act

BETWEEN:

B. B.

Complainant/Appellant

- and -

CONSTABLE M. S # and CONSTABLE M. L # ,

Respondents.

REASONS FOR DECISION delivered by
His Honour Judge G. Joyal,
on Tuesday, November 30, 1999,
in Room 321, Law Courts Building,
Broadway & Kennedy Street,
in the City of Winnipeg, Province of Manitoba.

PRESENT:

MR. P.R. MCKENNA, counsel for the Respondents MR. D.G. GUENETTE, for the Commissioner, LERA MR. G. WRIGHT, Commissioner, LERA

Reported by: Rosemary E. Iwasienko, Official Examiner

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1999, 2:10 P.M.

2

1

- THE JUDGE: All right. Let me just deal with the
- 4 issue as I see it, then.
- Mr. Guenette, on behalf of the Commissioner, Law
- 6 Enforcement Review Agency, Province of Manitoba, has
- 7 indicated this afternoon that the complainant in this
- 8 matter, Mr. B spoke to him earlier today in a very
- 9 informal fashion, suggesting an adjournment might be
- 10 required because of his inability to understand the recent
- 11 question from both Mr. Guenette for his part, and Mr.
- 12 McKenna for his. No specific request was made of Mr.
- 13 Guenette, nor would such a request be appropriate. Mr.
- 14 Guenette certainly can, as agent for Mr. B , now make
- 15 that request on Mr. B 's behalf.
- 16 So what I have before me is an empty chair in
- 17 which Mr. B could have been seated, requesting
- 18 personally the adjournment which he earlier suggested he
- 19 needed. That request has not come, so I'm not going to deal
- 20 with the question of an adjournment. I don't think it's
- 21 appropriate that I speculate as to why or when that
- 22 adjournment might be necessary.
- Mr. B is not here, so I think I have to deal
- 24 now with Mr. McKenna's request.
- Mr. McKenna's request is that in the absence of

- 1 Mr. B , any submissions on his part with respect to an
- 2 adjournment or otherwise, the matter should be dismissed, as
- 3 the burden which rests on Mr. B , pursuant to section
- 4 13(4), has not been discharged.
- 5 The only hesitation I expressed in that regard was
- 6 whether or not I ought to be considering an ex parte
- 7 proceeding. But when I look at section 13(4), I think I
- 8 have to be mindful of the fact that there will be something
- 9 fundamentally incoherent about proceeding with this sort of
- 10 hearing, whereas Mr. McKenna quite correctly outlines he, in
- 11 an ex parte situation, would have no idea of what he would
- 12 be required to assert or submit in respect of his defence of
- 13 the initial ruling by the Commissioner. That, obviously, is
- 14 unacceptable and not a reason to proceed, and I don't think
- 15 that an ex parte hearing, for that reason, is viable.
- 16 Accordingly, I look at the wording in section
- 17 13(4), in the absence of Mr. B this afternoon, and I do
- 18 hereby, at this time, dismiss the application, as I find
- 19 that Mr. B has not discharged that onus pursuant to
- 20 13(4).
- Just one further order of business. I think I
- 22 should specifically indicate, unless counsel feel it is not
- 23 required, that there is, and will be, a ban on publication
- 24 pursuant to 13(4)(1).
- MR. MCKENNA: Yes. I would ask that, Your Honour.

6

Ţ	mank you.	•				
2		THE	JUDGE:	Anythir	ng else,	counsel?
3		MR.	MCKENNA:	Not f	from mys	elf.
4		THE	JUDGE:	Thanks	very mu	ch.
_						

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT

(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)

I, ROSEMARY E. IWASIENKO, a duly appointed

Official Examiner in and for the Province of Manitoba, do

hereby certify that the foregoing pages of typewritten

matter, numbered 1 to 3, were taken by me by Stenomask at

the time and place hereinbefore stated.

ROSEMARY E. IWASIENKO, CVR
OFFICIAL EXAMINER