

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta sheds light on an arbitrator's discretion to voluntarily resign

August 08, 2022

The recent decision of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta in *SZ v JZ*, 2022 ABQB 493 provides guidance on the principles and factors an arbitrator should consider before voluntarily resigning from a domestic arbitration. Although decided in the context of a family law arbitration, the decision could have implications for the commercial arbitration community more generally.

Case overview and background facts

- SZ and JZ agreed to resolve a dispute regarding custody and parenting time pursuant to an arbitration presided over by a sole arbitrator. Among other things, the parties' arbitration agreement appointed a specific arbitrator by name and gave him discretion to "remove himself" pursuant to the *Arbitration Act*, RSA 2000, c A-43 (the *Arbitration Act*).
- The arbitration went on longer than initially anticipated and, during the arbitration, the arbitrator unilaterally resigned, citing a busy workload.
- Following the resignation of the arbitrator, the applicant, SZ, brought a special application before the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta seeking the relief sought in the arbitration, which was no longer proceeding due to the resignation of the arbitrator. The respondent, JZ, argued the Court did not have jurisdiction to deal with SZ's application because the parties agreed to resolve their dispute through the arbitration.
- One of the central issues before the Court was whether the dispute was still subject to arbitration or whether the arbitration had been terminated due to the resignation of the arbitrator.

Decision summary

What you need to know

Justice Michael Marion of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta ultimately concluded that the arbitration had been terminated once the arbitrator resigned. As such, the Court had jurisdiction to consider the merits of SZ's application.

In reaching his decision, Justice Marion emphasized that since voluntary arbitrator resignations can disrupt the dispute resolution process by causing delay, thrown-away costs and jurisdictional confusion, the arbitrator had to exercise his contractually bestowed discretion to resign reasonably and in good faith, in accordance with the principles set out in *Wastech Services Ltd v Greater Vancouver Sewage and Drainage District*, 2021 SCC 7.

Justice Marion went on to reason that when deciding whether to resign, an arbitrator should consider the following factors:

- i. whether resignation will cause unfairness, prejudice, or harm to the parties;
- ii. whether there are any matters that have arisen since the arbitrator's appointment such as emerging conflict of interest or lack of necessary qualifications that would preclude the arbitrator from continuing on;
- iii. whether resignation would undermine the underpinning purposes of arbitration agreements, which are to provide for expeditious, private and economical dispute resolution with allowance for more specialized expertise; and
- iv. whether the arbitration agreement includes any language curtailing an arbitrator's discretion to resign.

Applying those principles and factors to the facts of *SZ v JZ*, Justice Marion found there was no evidence the arbitrator was not acting in good faith when he resigned. Moreover, Justice Marion found that although the arbitrator's resignation disrupted a complex family dispute, the arbitrator contemplated potential prejudice to the parties and ultimately resigned because he did not want to get in the way of the matter proceeding in a timely fashion, which was essential due to the subject matter of the arbitration. Justice Marion further found that because the arbitrator was specifically named in the arbitration agreement, the arbitration terminated upon the arbitrator's resignation.

Implications

Although it was decided in the context of a family law dispute, *SZ v JZ* could have implications for any commercial arbitration subject to the *Arbitration Act*. In addition to setting out general principles regarding arbitrator resignations, *SZ v JV* exemplifies several factors parties should consider when negotiating an arbitration agreement after a dispute arises, such as whether to:

- i. specifically name an arbitrator in the arbitration agreement;
- ii. include language in the arbitration agreement limiting the arbitrator's discretion to resign from the arbitration; and/or
- iii. specify that the arbitration ends when the arbitrator resigns or that an alternate arbitrator may be appointed.

The outcome of *SZ v JZ* suggests that in some circumstances parties should consider addressing the prospect of an arbitrator resigning in their arbitration agreement to avoid the increased costs, delay and jurisdictional confusion that can arise after an arbitrator resigns.

By

[Zach Seymour](#), [Bailey Collins](#)

Expertise

[Disputes](#)

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.

© 2024 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.