

# Court of Appeal Requires Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment to Dismiss Medical Malpractice Claim to Include Evidence Going to The Merits of The Defence

August 05, 2016

In the recent decision of *Sanzone v. Schechter*,<sup>1</sup> the Ontario Court of Appeal provided insight regarding the evidentiary burden that a defendant must meet in moving to dismiss an action by way of summary judgment, and in particular what expert evidence may be required.

Sanzone involved the appeal of a successful summary judgment motion brought by the defendants, who were dentists, to dismiss a medical malpractice action. The summary judgment motion was granted at first instance on the basis that the self-represented plaintiff had not delivered an expert report in support of the allegation that the defendants had breached the standard of care required of them or that the purported breach had caused the plaintiff's injuries. In support of their motion, the respondent dentists filed an affidavit from one of their lawyers describing the procedural history of the action and stating that the appellant had not delivered an expert report in support of her claim. Neither of the respondent dentists filed an affidavit, nor did they file an expert's report on the issue of the standard of care. The appellant first filed a responding affidavit setting out the difficulties she faced as a self-represented litigant without legal training, and then ultimately a supplementary affidavit stating that she was looking to retain an expert and would comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure when she had retained one. Also filed was a one-page letter from a dentist stating that the respondent dentists had not met the standard of care in two respects, although the appellant admitted that the "letter is by no means complete, however."

The motions judge held that the appellant's "report" did not comply with the *Rules of Civil Procedure* surrounding expert reports and was therefore inadmissible. The motions judge then granted summary judgement by accepting the defendants' submissions on the basis of established case law (see *Kurdina v. Diet*, 2010 ONCA 288) holding that a plaintiff will not be successful in a medical malpractice action in the absence of supporting expert opinion.

On appeal, the Court of Appeal held that the defendants, as the parties moving for summary judgment, had the burden of persuading the Court that there was no genuine

issue requiring trial. Noting that Rule 20.01(3) allowed a defendant to move for summary judgment with supporting affidavit material or other evidence, the Court of Appeal interpreted this to mean that the defendants were required to put their "best evidentiary foot forward" to discharge their evidentiary burden. Only then would the onus shift to the plaintiff to prove that the claim had any real chance of success. The defendants could not simply rely on the plaintiff's failure to deliver an expert report as a basis for the dismissal of the action.

The Court of Appeal took issue with the defendants' failure to file any evidence going to the merits of their defence, including affidavits regarding the treatment they provided to the plaintiff or expert reports in support of their position. If the defendants had filed evidence regarding the merits of their defence as Rule 20.01(3) required, it would have then been open to the motions judge to dismiss the action based on the plaintiff's failure to deliver a compliant expert report.

The Court of Appeal also took issue with what it described as the defendants' strategy of using Rule 20 against a self-represented litigant to accelerate the requirements regarding service of an expert report. When the defendants brought a motion for summary judgment, the plaintiff was not in breach of Rule 53 regarding service of expert reports, and ought not to have been compelled to deliver a report without the defendants first meeting their evidentiary burden as the moving party. The appeal was ultimately granted and summary judgment was set aside.

Outside of the medical malpractice sphere, those defending products liability claims will want to carefully consider the strategic merits of leading with early opinion evidence on summary judgement versus waiting to respond to expert evidence first provided by a plaintiff. The result of *Sanzone* may be that, despite the Supreme Court's endorsement of summary judgment as a tool to deal expeditiously with cases, it will be deployed sparingly in medical malpractice and products cases.

<sup>1</sup> 2016 ONCA 566.

By

[George R. Wray, Matthew Gray](#)

Expertise

[Insurance Claim Defence](#)

---

## BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 800 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

[blg.com](http://blg.com)

### BLG Offices

#### Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower  
520 3rd Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, AB, Canada  
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500  
F 403.266.1395

#### Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street  
Ottawa, ON, Canada  
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160  
F 613.230.8842

#### Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre  
200 Burrard Street  
Vancouver, BC, Canada  
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744  
F 604.687.1415

#### Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West  
Suite 900  
Montréal, QC, Canada  
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555  
F 514.879.9015

#### Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000  
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing [unsubscribe@blg.com](mailto:unsubscribe@blg.com) or manage your subscription preferences at [blg.com/MyPreferences](http://blg.com/MyPreferences). If you feel you have received this message in error please contact [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at [blg.com/en/privacy](http://blg.com/en/privacy).

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.