

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

JEFFREY BOGAERTS

Applicant

-and-

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

The Applicant intends to question the constitutional validity of sections 1, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 11.4, 12, 12.1, 13, 14 and 18.1 of the *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act*, RSO 1990, c O.36, and claim a remedy regarding same under subsection 24 (1) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and section 52(1) of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

The question is to be argued on a date and at a time to be set by the Registrar of the Superior Court of Justice at the Perth Courthouse, 43 Drummond Street east, Perth, Ontario, K7H 1G1.

The following are the material facts giving rise to the constitutional question:

1. A copy of the Notice of Application dated October 18, 2013 is attached and sets out the relevant facts and evidentiary basis of the Application.

The following is the legal basis for the constitutional question:

1. Section 18.1 of the *OSPCA Act*, by providing for a term of imprisonment following a conviction for an offence under the *Act*, restricts the liberty of people, animal owners and animal custodians in the province of Ontario, as defined under section 7 of the *Charter*;
2. The provisions of the *OSPCA Act* which restrict the liberty of people, animal owners and animal custodians in Ontario do not accord with the principles of fundamental justice and, therefore, breach section 7 of the *Charter*;

3. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSCPA Act* is unconstitutionally vague in that it does not provide sufficient guidance for legal debate;
4. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSCPA Act* does not provide fair notice to the residents of Ontario respecting minimally acceptable care and treatment of animals in Ontario.
5. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSPCA Act* does not provide sufficient direction to those enforcing the law to prevent arbitrary exercise of their discretion;
6. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSPCA Act* does not provide sufficient direction to those issuing warrants or orders, as authorized by to the *Act*, to prevent arbitrary exercise of their discretion;
7. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSPCA Act* is unconstitutionally overbroad in that it may capture acceptable and /or normal care and treatment of animals in Ontario;
8. The definition of "distress" in section 1 of the *OSPCA Act* violates section 7 of the *Charter* and cannot be saved under section 1 of the *Charter* because it is not rationally connected to the purpose of the legislation and does not impair the rights of Ontario residents as little as possible;
9. To the extent that sections 1, 11.2(1), 11.2(2), 12, 12.1, 13 and 14 of the *OSPCA Act* rely on and incorporate the definition of "distress" from section 1 of the *Act*, these sections are unconstitutionally vague and overbroad and cannot be saved by section 1 of the *Charter*;
10. To the extent that section 12 the *OSPCA Act* relies on and incorporates the definition of "distress" from section 1 of the *Act*, it is unconstitutionally vague and overbroad and, in turn, violates sections 7 and 8 of the *Charter* because it fails to adequately specify an appropriate standard for the issuance of warrants.
11. To the extent that section 12 the *OSPCA Act* relies on and incorporates the definition of "distress" from section 1 of the *Act*, it cannot be saved by section 1 of the *Charter* because it is not rationally connected to the purpose of the legislation, the means

chosen are not proportional to the limits put on peoples' rights, and it does not impair the rights of Ontario residents as little as possible;

12. Sections 11.4, 13 and 14 of the *OSPCA Act* grant powers of search and seizure which are unreasonable in their extent and contravene the constitutional standard of reasonableness prescribed by section 8 of the *Charter*;
13. To the extent that section 11.4 of the *OSPCA Act* confers upon OSPCA Officers the power to search private property at the complete discretion of the Officer, including property where a dwelling unit may be located, either alone or accompanied by any number of other persons as he or she considers advisable, and irrespective of any situation of urgency which makes judicial authorization impracticable, it is not reasonable and violates section 8 of the *Charter*;
14. To the extent that section 13(6) of the *OSPCA Act* confers upon OSPCA Officers the power to enter private property at the complete discretion of the Officer, including a dwelling unit, at any hour of the day or night into the future forever, either alone or accompanied by any number of other persons as he or she considers advisable, at any time and irrespective of any situation of urgency, it is not reasonable and violates section 8 of the *Charter*;
15. To the extent that sections 13(1) and 13(6) of the *OSPCA Act* conjunctively confer upon OSPCA Officers warrantless entry powers, subject only to an initial "reasonable grounds for believing that an animal is in distress" on the part of an OSPCA officer, and irrespective of taking any reasonable steps to confirm with a veterinarian that an animal is in distress, and irrespective of whether there is any situation of urgency which makes the obtaining of a search warrant impracticable, it is not reasonable and violates section 8 of the *Charter*;
16. To the extent that sections 13(1) and 13(6) of the *OSPCA Act* conjunctively confer upon OSPCA Officers warrantless entry powers, and an appeal of an Order issued under section 13(1) expires after only 5 business days, and while the entry powers prescribed under 13(6) go on forever, it is not reasonable and violates section 8 of the *Charter*;

17. To the extent that section 14 of the *OSPCA Act* confers upon an OSPCA Officer the power to seize private property, irrespective of any situation of urgency which makes judicial authorization impracticable, it is not reasonable and violates section 8 of the *Charter*;
18. Warrantless search and seizure powers provided by sections 11.4, 13 and 14 of the *OSPCA Act* cannot be saved by section 1 of the *Charter* because the means chosen are not proportional to the limits put on peoples' rights and do not impair the rights of Ontario residents as little as possible;
19. To the extent that section 11 of the *OSPCA Act* confers "the powers of a police officer" upon Officers of a private organization, with no public oversight, accountability or transparency, it does not accord with principles of fundamental justice and, therefore, breaches section 7 of the *Charter*;
20. To the extent that section 11 of the *OSPCA Act* confers "the powers of a police officer" upon OSPCA Officers, without statutorily prescribed restraints afforded to police officers in Ontario, it does not accord with the principles of fundamental justice and, therefore, breaches section 7 of the *Charter*;
21. To the extent that section 11 of the *OSPCA Act* confers "the powers of a police officer" upon OSPCA Officers, and the OSPCA and /or its Officers are not subject to:
 - a. *Police Services Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15 and regulations passed thereunder;
 - b. *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, RSO 1990, c F.31 and regulations passed thereunder;
 - c. *Ombudsman Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.6 and regulations passed thereunder;it does not accord with the principles of fundamental justice and, therefore, breaches section 7 of the *Charter*;
22. To the extent that section 11 of the *OSPCA Act* confers "the powers of a police officer" upon Officers of a private organization, an organization which is also trusted to raise its own revenues to fund its investigations and salaries of the same Officers, and which raises said revenues by selling seized animals and other products of its investigations, it does not accord with the principles of fundamental justice and, therefore, breaches section 7 of the *Charter*;

23. Conferral of police powers upon Officers of a private organization, as prescribed by section 11 of the *OSPCA Act*, violates section 7 of the *Charter* and cannot be saved under section 1 of the *Charter* because the means chosen are not proportional to the limits put on peoples' rights and do not impair the rights of Ontario residents as little as possible;
24. The pith and substance of the *OSPCA Act*, and especially sections 11.1, 11.2 and 18.1 of the *Act*, is of a moral issue related to criminal law, and constitutes an attempt by the province of Ontario to legislate in the area of criminal law;
25. To the extent that the *OSPCA Act* intrudes into criminal law, an area which is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, the *Act* is *ultra vires* the Province of Ontario for violating sections 91 and 92 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*;
26. The *OSPCA Act*, and especially sections 11.1, 11.2 and 18.1 of the *Act*, exposes Ontario residents to criminal prosecution while bypassing the protection provided by criminal law and procedure;
27. Sections 11.1, 11.2 and 18.1 of the *OSPCA Act* effectively duplicates the "Cruelty to Animals" section of the *Criminal Code*, namely sections 445.1 to 447.1, and said overlap supports an inference that the *OSPCA Act* serves a criminal law purpose;
28. The severity of penalties prescribed by section 18.1 of the *OSPCA Act* further characterizes the *Act* as criminal law; and
29. Such further and other grounds as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

DATED: October 21, 2013

GREEN & ASSOCIATES

Barristers & Solicitors

712 - 170 Laurier Avenue West

Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5V5

Kurtis R. Andrews (LSUC # 57974K)

Tel: 613-560-6565

Fax: 613-560-0545

e-mail: krandrews@greenandassociates.ca

Lawyers for the Applicant

TO: The Attorney General of Ontario
Constitutional Law Branch
4th floor, 720 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2K1
Fax: 416-326-4015

AND TO: The Attorney General of Canada
Justice Building
234 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8
Fax: 613-954-1920

JEFFREY BOGAERTS
Applicant

-and-

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO
Respondent

Court File No. 749/13

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
PERTH , ONTARIO**

NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

GREEN & ASSOCIATES LAW OFFICES

Barristers & Solicitors

712 - 170 Laurier Avenue West

Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5V5

Kurtis R. Andrews (LSUC # 57974K)

Tel: 613-560-6565

Fax: 613-560-0545

e-mail: krandrews@greenandassociates

Lawyers for the Applicant