

Ontario court clarifies law for the commencement of limitation periods for prosecutorial torts

November 20, 2020

In the recent decision of *MacKinnon v. Halton Regional Police Services Board et al*, 2020 ONSC 6908, the Ontario Superior Court dismissed a plaintiff's claim on a motion for summary judgment for being commenced outside of the two-year limitation period. BLG represented the defendants.

Background

On September 6, 2014, the plaintiff, Robert MacKinnon, was charged with respect to three allegedly fraudulent wire transfers. The Crown eventually stayed the charges on March 27, 2015 pursuant to s. 579 of the Criminal Code.

On March 23, 2018, Mr. MacKinnon commenced an action against the Halton Regional Police Service and several named officers alleging malicious prosecution, negligent investigation and breach of his Charter rights.

The defendants brought a summary judgment motion on the basis that Mr. MacKinnon's action was statute barred as the limitation period for the commencement of the plaintiff's action expired on March 27, 2017 but he did not commence his action until March 23, 2018.

In response, the plaintiff argued that the limitation period did not start to run until one year after the Crown stay. This is because, pursuant to s. 579(2) of the Criminal Code, the Crown has one year to reinstate the charges. Accordingly, the plaintiff submitted that it was appropriate for him to wait for that one-year period to expire before commencing his civil claim.

Outcome

Justice Gibson confirmed that a stay of proceedings entered by the Crown constitutes a favourable termination of proceedings for the purpose of prosecutorial torts, such as

negligent investigation. Therefore, the appropriate start date for the limitation clock is the date that criminal charges are stayed.

Although the Crown may recommence proceedings in a one-year period, the Crown does not have carte blanche to reinstate the charges and indeed, may be subject to attack based on abuse of process and section 11(b) Charter arguments. In any event, Justice Gibson found that the date of the stay is the date that the plaintiff should know that a proceeding would be an appropriate means to seek a remedy and there was no valid juridical reason to wait beyond this date. Of note, Justice Gibson also commented that such an argument has been considered and dismissed in other provinces (Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia) and that the law should therefore be the same in Ontario.

Takeaway

This case clarifies that the limitation period for prosecutorial torts begins to run on the day that charges are resolved in favour of an accused, which includes a Crown stay pursuant to s. 579 of the Criminal Code. Accordingly, the one-year period following the stay does not extend the plaintiff's statutory timeframe to commence his or her claim.

By

[Douglas O. Smith](#), [Samantha Bonanno](#)

Expertise

[Disputes](#), [Police Law & Liability](#), [Municipal Liability](#)

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 725 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

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 or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2025 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.