

Ontario Court of Appeal reiterates judicial discretion to dismiss claims that are frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process

April 04, 2023

In [Sumner v. Ottawa \(Police Services\), 2023 ONCA 140](#), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered [rule 2.1.01 of the Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194](#), which gives power to courts to dismiss a proceeding that appears on its face to be frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court.

Claim background

The plaintiff, Sumner, brought a claim against the Ottawa Police Service (OPS) seeking:

1. injunctive relief to prohibit the OPS from interfering with Sumner's attempts to arrest Prime Minister Justin Trudeau;
2. an order requiring the OPS to "break down whatever door" the Prime Minister is behind to arrest him for extortion; and,
3. damages in tort resulting from the past failure of the OPS to arrest the Prime Minister, and because the OPS prevented Sumner from doing so himself.

Lower court's decision

The OPS was successful on their request to dismiss this action under rule 2.1.01.

In that decision, the motion judge relied on the well-established law that "in considering whether a claim ought to be struck under r. 2.1.01, the judge must read the statement of claim generously. They must assume that the assertions of fact are true unless they are obviously implausible or ridiculous...Drafting deficiencies may be overlooked and the plaintiff given the benefit of the doubt. This is particularly important if the plaintiff is self-represented."

The motion judge ultimately dismissed the action finding it to be frivolous, vexatious and **an abuse of the court's process**. The motion judge held that the applicant's action bore the hallmarks of vexatious litigation, including:

- bringing a proceeding “where no reasonable person would expect to obtain the relief sought”;
- a pleading that recites bare assertions and legal conclusions and argument as opposed to allegations of fact; and
- a pleading that uses rhetorical questions, pseudo-legal jargon with no meaning in Canadian law, and “rambling discourse characterized by repetition and a pedantic failure to clarify”.

Court of Appeal 's decision

Generally, the Court of Appeal noted that a decision made under rule 2.1 is a discretionary decision and is entitled to deference. Such decisions may be set aside where the court misdirects itself or comes to a decision that amounts to injustice because it is so clearly wrong.

In the present case, the Court of Appeal upheld the motion judge's decision, finding no legal basis for interfering with the motion judge's exercise of discretion to dismiss the action. The Court of Appeal held that the motion judge had carefully applied the procedure and accurately set out the law and policy in rule 2.1.01, including reading and interpreting the statement of claim generously. The Court of Appeal agreed that, upon a **generous reading of Sumner's statement of claim, the pleading bore hallmarks of frivolous and vexatious proceedings**.

Key takeaways

This decision highlights the importance of precise pleadings that conform to the Rules of Civil Procedure governing form and content of pleadings. While pleadings, especially from self-represented litigants, will be read and interpreted generously, courts will exercise their discretion under rule 2.1.01 to dismiss actions that misuse or abuse the **resources of the Ontario court system**.

For more information, please reach out to the key contacts below.

By

[Zoe Aranha, Jonathan Thoburn](#)

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.