



Legal Education  
Society of Alberta

62098.00

## Appellate Advocacy

**Edmonton, Alberta**

**Calgary, Alberta**

### Co-Chairs

**Hon. Justice J.D.B. McDonald**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice J. Strekaf**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice B.L. Veldhuis**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

## Faculty

**Hon. Justice R. Brown**  
Supreme Court of Canada

**Hon. Justice M. Rothstein (Retired)**  
Supreme Court of Canada

**Hon. Chief Justice C.A. Fraser**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice P.T. Costigan**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice M.S. Paperny**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice P.W.L. Martin**  
Alberta Court of Appeal

**Hon. Justice J. Watson**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice F.F. Slatter**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice P.A. Rowbotham**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice B.K. O'Ferrall**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice T.W. Wakeling**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice F.L. Schutz**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice S.J. Greckol**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice M.G. Crighton**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Justice R. Khullar**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Hon. Judge J.B. Hawkes**  
Provincial Court of Alberta

**Laurie Baptiste**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Dane Bullerwell**  
Legal Aid Alberta

**Bobbi Jo McDevitt**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Ileen Moore**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Heidi Schubert**  
Court of Appeal of Alberta

**Jeffrey E. Sharpe**  
Burnet, Duckworth & Palmer LLP

**Danielle Umrysh**  
Court of Appeal 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, 2018, 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.

© 2018. 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: 1-55093-698-0  
ISBN-13: 978-1-55093-698-8

# **Digest of Alberta Court of Appeal Cases Considering *R v Oland***

*Appellate Advocacy*

LESA LIBRARY

Prepared by:  
**Hon. Justice P.A. Rowbotham**  
**Court of Appeal of Alberta**  
**Calgary, Alberta**

**Hon. Justice M.G. Crighton**  
**Court of Appeal of Alberta**  
**Edmonton, Alberta**

For presentation in:  
Calgary, Alberta – October 12, 2018  
Edmonton, Alberta – November 2, 2018



Legal Education  
Society of Alberta

**DIGEST OF ALBERTA COURT OF APPEAL CASES CONSIDERING *R v Oland***

Introduction .....	2
The Legal Test .....	2
Section 515(10)(c) of the <i>Code</i> Informing the Public Confidence Analysis.....	3
Enforceability.....	4
Reviewability.....	4
Final Considerations When Balancing Enforceability Against Reviewability .....	5
Case Summaries .....	5
Alberta Court of Appeal.....	5
Ontario Court of Appeal .....	19
British Columbia Court of Appeal .....	24
New Brunswick Court of Appeal .....	24
Cases That Followed <i>Oland</i> but Did Not Comment.....	25
Appendix	
PowerPoint –Single Justice Applications – Criminal Matters	

**DISCLAIMER:** The views expressed in this digest represent solely the views of the authors and do not represent the views of the Court of Appeal of Alberta en banc.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This digest provides a summary of *R v Oland*, 2017 SCC 17, [2017] 1 SCR 2015 [*Oland*], followed by summaries of appellate decisions regarding bail pending appeal since *Oland*. The majority of these decisions are from the Alberta Court of Appeal. The decisions summarized in Part III have elaborated on or interpreted *Oland*. The decisions summarized in the Appendix have applied *Oland* in a straight-forward manner without elaboration. The decisions are presented in chronological order, from earliest to most recent, with the exception that subsequent decisions involving the same parties will be directly sequential.

### ***R v Oland*, 2017 SCC 17, [2017] 1 SCR 2015**

In *Oland*, Justice Moldaver clarified the principles and policy considerations appellate courts should apply in determining whether bail pending appeal should be granted.

At trial, the applicant was convicted of the second degree murder of his father (at para 1). Mr. Oland appealed the conviction to the New Brunswick Court of Appeal, and applied for bail pending appeal. The Court of Appeal denied Mr. Oland's application for bail pending appeal, asserting that public confidence in the administration of justice would not be maintained if he were released. Mr. Oland appealed this decision to the Supreme Court, which held that detaining Mr. Oland on the public interest criterion was clearly unwarranted as the reviewability interest outweighed the enforceability interest (at paras 4-5).

### **The Legal Test**

Justice Moldaver set out the three-part test for bail pending appeal in s 679(3) of the Criminal Code, RSC 1985 c C-46 [Code]. An applicant is no longer entitled to the presumption of innocence (at para 35); therefore, they bear the burden of meeting all three criteria on a balance of probabilities (at para 19):

**679(3)** In the case of an appeal [against conviction], the judge of the court of appeal may order that the appellant be released pending the determination of his appeal if the appellant establishes that

- (a) the appeal ... is not frivolous;
- (b) he will surrender himself into custody in accordance with the terms of the order; and
- (c) his detention is not necessary in the public interest.

The first and second criteria are briefly discussed in the decision. The Supreme Court clarified that the first criterion requires a determination that the grounds of appeal are “not frivolous” – the bar to meet this criterion is very low (at para 20). The second criterion requires the applicant to satisfy the appeal judge that they will not flee the jurisdiction and will surrender into custody as required (at para 21).

The third criterion was the focus of the Court in *Oland*. The Court agreed with the approach applied by Justice Arbour in *R v Farinacci* (1993), 86 CCC (3d) 32 (Ont CA) [*Farinacci*], which was that the public interest criterion consists of two components: (1) public safety and (2) public confidence in the administration of justice (at para 23). She elaborated on the public confidence component, and stated that two competing interests were to be balanced: enforceability and reviewability (at para 24). Both will be discussed in detail below.

### **Section 515(10)(c) of the Code Informing the Public Confidence Analysis**

Section 679(3) of the *Code* does not provide any direction as to how bail pending appeal may affect public confidence in the administration of justice; however, s 515(10)(c) does in the context of bail pending trial. Section 515(10)(c) identifies four factors that, with appropriate post-conviction modifications, should be applied when assessing the public confidence component (at paras 31-32):

**515(10)** For the purposes of this section, the detention of an accused in custody is justified only on one or more of the following grounds:

- (c) if the detention is necessary to maintain confidence in the administration of justice, having regard to all the circumstances, including
  - (i) the apparent strength of the prosecution's case,
  - (ii) the gravity of the offence,
  - (iii) the circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence, including whether a firearm was used, and