



Legal Education
Society of Alberta

62139.00

Questioning

Edmonton, Alberta

Calgary, Alberta

Chair

Patrick D. Kirwin

Kirwin LLP
Edmonton, Canada

Faculty

Master A.R. Robertson QC

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta
Calgary, Alberta

Jeffrey B. Champion QC

Bishop & McKenzie LLP
Edmonton, Alberta

Joseph V. Miller QC

Weir Bowen
Edmonton, Alberta

Donna C. Purcell QC

Warren Sinclair LLP
Red Deer, Alberta

Vivian R. Stevenson QC

Duncan Craig LLP
Edmonton, Alberta

LEGAL EDUCATION SOCIETY OF ALBERTA

These materials are produced by the Legal Education Society of Alberta (LESA) as part of its mandate in the field of continuing education. The information in the materials is provided for educational or informational purposes only. The information is not intended to provide legal advice and should not be relied upon in that respect. The material presented may be incorporated into the working knowledge of the reader but its use is predicated upon the professional judgment of the user that the material is correct and is appropriate in the circumstances of a particular use.

The information in these materials is believed to be reliable; however, LESA does not guarantee the quality, accuracy, or completeness of the information provided. These materials are provided as a reference point only and should not be relied upon as being inclusive of the law. LESA is not responsible for any direct, indirect, special, incidental or consequential damage or any other damages whatsoever and howsoever caused, arising out of or in connection with the reliance upon the information provided in these materials.

This publication may contain reproductions of the Statutes of Alberta and Alberta Regulations, which are reproduced in this publication under license from the Province of Alberta.

© Alberta Queen's Printer, 2019, in the Statutes of Alberta and Alberta Regulations.

The official Statutes and Regulations should be consulted for all purposes of interpreting and applying the law.

© 2019. Legal Education Society of Alberta. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the Legal Education Society of Alberta.

ISBN-10: 1-55093-734-0
ISBN-13: 978-1-55093-734-3

The Role of Questioning in the Summary Judgment and Summary Trial Environment

Prepared by:

Donna Purcell QC

Warren Sinclair LLP



Legal Education
Society of Alberta

For: *Questioning*
Edmonton, Alberta – November 6, 2019
Calgary, Alberta – November 12, 2019

THE ROLE OF QUESTIONING IN THE SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND SUMMARY TRIAL ENVIRONMENT

Introduction2

Creating a Record for Summary Judgment Applications2

 Summary Judgment – Rules 7.2-7.4.....2

Hryniak v Mauldin (2014) SCC3

Stefanyk v Sobeys Capital Incorporated, 2018 ABCA 125.....3

 Summary Trial – Rules 7.5-7.11 and Form 36.....4

Choice Between Questioning on Affidavits and for Discovery.....5

The Use of Alberta Rules of Court Rule 6.8.....6

Conclusion7

INTRODUCTION

This paper will address options and issues to approaching questioning where summary judgment or summary trial is or may be relevant. Further, this paper will address the use of Alberta Rules of Court Rule 6.8 and the advantages that potentially lie within its use.

CREATING A RECORD FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT APPLICATIONS

Summary Judgment – Rules 7.2-7.4

These rules authorize a court to issue **Judgment via a Chambers Application** because the merits of the claim or defence are sufficiently clear that a trial is not required.

Rule 7.3 authorizes a **court** to give **part or full judgment** in an action if:

- (a) There is **no defence to the claim** or part of it;
- (b) There is **no merit to the claim** or part of it;
- (c) The **only real issue is as to amount**.

Affidavit evidence in support is required and must be based on personal knowledge (cannot be based on information and belief: R. 7.3 requires an affidavit “swearing positively” to the facts).

The respondent does not bear the same positive evidential burden. In *Court v Campbell*, 2012 CarswellAlta 1798 (Q.B.), the applicants argued that hearsay evidence is not allow on summary judgment applications but the court agreed that while that was true, it was permitted from the respondents.

Summary Judgment is issued when the court is satisfied that a full trial is not required to resolve the issue(s) because there is **no merit (or no defence in the case of a defendant)** to the respondent’s case.

Currently, the courts employ a **two-step analysis** to determine if a matter can be decided by Summary Judgment:

1. Procedural: is there sufficient evidence to determine the issue(s)?
2. Substantive: does the evidence make clear that the respondent’s case has no merit?