

COURT FILE NO:

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN

**STEVEN DUESING, NICOLE MATHIS, BARBARA SPENCER, SABRY BELHOUCHE,
BLAIN GOWING, DENNIS WARD, REID NEHRING, CINDY CRANE, DENISE THOMSON,
NORMAN THOMSON, JORDAN HAMMOND, AND MICHEL LAFONTAINE**

Applicants

-and-

**CANADA (MINISTER OF HEALTH)
and THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA**

Respondents

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 18(1) & 18.1 OF THE FEDERAL COURT ACT and
RULE 300 (a) OF THE FEDERAL COURT RULES

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

TO THE RESPONDENTS:

A PROCEDURE HAS BEEN COMMENCED by the Applicants. The relief claimed by the Applicants appears in the following pages.

THIS APPLICATION will be heard by the Court at a time and place to be fixed by Judicial Administrator, unless the Court orders otherwise, the place of hearing will be requested by the Applicant. The Applicant requests that this Application be heard at Toronto, Ontario.

IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION, to receive notice of any step in the Application or to be served with any documents in the Application, you or a solicitor acting for you must prepare a Notice of Appearance in Form 305 prescribed by the *Federal Court Rules* and serve it on the Applicants solicitor WITHIN 10 DAYS after being served with the Notice of Application.

Copies of the *Federal Court Rules*, information concerning the local officers of the Court and other necessary information may be obtained on request to the Administrator of this Court at Ottawa (telephone 613-992-4238) or at any local office.

IF YOU FAIL TO OPPOSE this Application, Judgement maybe given in your absence and without further notice to you.

Date: 22-FEB-2021

Issued By: JACQUELINE SMITH

(Registry Officer)

Address of local office: Federal Court Canada
180 Queen St W
Toronto, ON M5V 1Z4

TO: THE MINISTER OF HEALTH

Locator 0900C2

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9

Email: hcinfo.infosc@canada.ca

Telephone: 613-957-2991

Facsimile: 613-941-5366

AND TO: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Office of the Deputy Attorney General of Canada

284 Wellington Street

Ottawa, Ontario

K1A 0H8

APPLICATION

1. This is an Application for Judicial Review pursuant to section 18(1) and 18.1 of the *Federal Courts Act* against a decision of the Minister of Health dated February 14, 2021.¹ The Decision results in the detention of Canadian citizens in federal facilities grossly violating their *Charter* rights, and suspending their rights to due process.

THE APPLICANT SEEKS:

2. The Applicants seek the following relief:
 - a. An interlocutory injunction in the nature of *mandamus* pursuant to s. 18(1) and section 18.2 of the *Federal Courts Act* and section 24(1) of the *Charter* directing the Minister to immediately:
 - i. Suspend the requirement for the mandatory confinement of returning air travelers in federal facilities pending a determination of its constitutionality by this Honourable Court; and
 - ii. Release all such individuals who are currently so confined.
 - b. A Declaration pursuant to section 24(1) of the *Charter* that the Decision to forcibly quarantine asymptomatic Canadians, who are in possession of a negative Covid-19 test (Polymerase Chain Reaction [“PCR”] or Antigen) and have reasonable quarantine plans, in federal facilities without due process is a breach of sections 7, 9, 10(b), 11(d), 11(e) and 12 of the *Charter* and a breach of the principles of fundamental justice;
 - c. Further, a Declaration pursuant to section 24(1) of the *Charter* that the Decision is unreasonable because it does not proportionately balance rights and freedoms protected under the *Charter* including sections 6, 7, 9, 10 (b), 11(d), 11(e) and 12, and violates section 503 of the Criminal Code (right to appear before a Justice within 24 hours upon arrest);
 - d. An Order pursuant to section 18(1) of the *Federal Courts Act* and Section 24(1) of the *Charter* in the nature of *certiorari* quashing the Decision;
 - e. Costs; and

¹ <https://orders-in-council.canada.ca/attachment.php?attach=40249&lang=en> - PC Number: 2021-0075

f. Such further and other relief as counsel may advise and this Honorable Court considers just and necessary.

THE GROUNDS OF THE APPLICATION ARE:

3. Section 58(d) of the Quarantine Act² states :

Order prohibiting entry into Canada

- (a) there is an outbreak of a communicable disease in the foreign country;
- (b) the introduction or spread of the disease would pose an imminent and severe risk to public health in Canada;
- (c) the entry of members of that class of persons into Canada may introduce or contribute to the spread of the communicable disease in Canada; and
- (d) no reasonable alternatives to prevent the introduction or spread of the disease are available.

4. Pursuant to section 58, the federal government must ensure that there is no reasonable alternative to prevent the introduction of disease before issuing an order to detain Canadians in federal facilities against their will and contrary to their constitutional rights and freedoms. According to section 58, the facilities are to be used as a last resort for travellers who have no other option of meeting quarantine requirements.
5. In the Case before this Honourable Court all Applicants had or have reasonable quarantine plans which involves quarantining in their own private residence where they would have access to necessities of life and would not be in contact with vulnerable persons as required by S. 4(1)-(c) of the June 29th 2020 Act.
6. However the Applicants were detained against their will or alternatively, will be detained upon arrival to Canada, and forced to quarantine in federal facilities in violation of their *Charter* including section 6 (of the *Charter* that protects the right to enter and leave Canada), section 7 (which protects liberty and security of the person), section 9 (protecting the right not be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned), section 10 (b) (the right to retain and instruct counsel without delay upon arrest and detention),

² S.C. 2005, c. 20

section 11(d) (the right to the presumption of innocence, section 11(e) (the right not to be denied reasonable bail) and section 12 (the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment), and violates section 503 of the Criminal Code (right to appear before a Justice within 24 hours.

Charter Right Violations:

Section 6: The Right to Leave and Enter Canada

7. The section 6 *Charter* right to be able to freely leave and re-enter Canada is not a right to be bestowed upon citizens when it is convenient. As the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled “the right of a Canadian citizen to enter and to remain in Canada is therefore a fundamental right associated with citizenship. The right applies equally to all Canadian citizens regardless of whether the reason they want to travel are considered more “essential” than others or otherwise considered more “valid” by the government.”³

Section 7: The Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person

8. Section 7 of the *Charter* protects individual liberty, including the right to be free of state interference with physical movement. Quarantining all citizens re-entering Canada, in addition to mandating negative test results in advance of boarding, impairs liberty in a manner that is arbitrary, disproportionate, and overbroad, and therefore violates the principles of fundamental justice. The government has not presented compelling evidence to demonstrate that asymptomatic Canadians are significant spreaders of the virus, or that there is any link between international travel and Covid deaths. The onus is on the government, not Canadian citizens, to justify its violation of *Charter* rights and freedoms with evidence.

Section 9: The Right not to be Detained Arbitrarily

³ *Divito v. Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)* 2013 SCC 47 at para 21.

9. Section 9 of the *Charter* protects individuals against arbitrary detention, however the Decision allows for the arbitrary detention of healthy, asymptomatic air travellers already in possession of negative Covid test results, which is not justifiable in a free and democratic society.

Section 10(b) The Right to Counsel

10. Section 10(b) guarantees the right to counsel without delay, when an individual is arrested OR detained. The courts have recognized that a situation of vulnerability relative to the state is created at the outset of a detention and accordingly, the concerns about self-incrimination and interference with liberty that section 10(b) seeks to address are present as soon as a detention begins.⁴ Because individuals are being arrested and detained in these facilities, their s.10(b) right to counsel is being violated as they are not being informed that they have the right to speak to a lawyer.

Section 11(d) The Right to be presumed innocent

11. Section 11(d) of the *Charter* reads that “any person charged with an offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal.”⁵ Section 11(d) helps to ensure that only those who are guilty are ultimately condemned by the criminal justice system. Section 11(d) guarantees the right of any person charged with an offence to be presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
12. However in the case before this Honourable Court the government presumes that individuals who are detained will not abide by quarantine rules and forces them into mandatory quarantine in federal facilities, therefore violating section 11(d) of the Charter.

Section 11(e) The Right to Reasonable Bail

⁴ *R. v. Suberu*, [2009] 2 S.C.R. 460

⁵ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-15.html>

13. This section guarantees the right to reasonable bail, however the Decision breach the right to reasonable bail by not allowing individuals to appear before a Justice to contest their detention and obtain reasonable bail. They are forced against their will to stay in these facilities for a minimum of three days, and in case of individuals who test positive for 14 days.

Section 12: The Right to be free from Cruel and Unusual Treatment

14. Section 12 of the *Charter* reads, “Everyone has the right not to be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.” Section 12 prohibits treatment or punishment that is “grossly disproportionate” in the circumstances. The federal government is disproportionately punishing Canadians who travel, something which they have a constitutional right to do. Moreover, the challenged measures and their implementation are calculated to intimidate Canadians. The threat of forced quarantine, away from family and their loved ones’ knowledge even of where they are, is meant to instill maximum fear. The removal of the ability to challenge detention and the profound infringement of their rights and freedoms elevates the measures to the level of cruel and unusual punishment and shocks the public conscience.
15. The uncertainty of the measures is causing stress and anxiety for Canadians. There is no transparency, accountability or oversight when it comes to these travel restrictions. At this point the public has no information about the new travel restrictions including whether there are medical personnel at these locations, information about how the special needs of individuals including medication or dietary needs will be met. There is no information about whether couples and families can quarantine together or if they will be separated and what will happen to individuals with pets who may have special needs.
16. Ordinary law-abiding Canadians are being detained at the border and detained in secret federal facilities without any due process and no justification. This is unacceptable in a free and democratic society such a Canada.
17. It is respectfully submitted that the Decision are unreasonable and unlawful. The infringement on individual *Charter* rights is not justifiable. They do not

proportionately balance the *Charter* right to leave Canada with any relevant statutory objective. There is no statutory objective achieved by continuing to force healthy law-abiding Canadians into forced quarantine in federal facilities and suspending all of their *Charter* protected rights and freedoms at their own expense. Any statutory objective the Minister could potentially rely on for the continuance of this situation is not proportionately balanced against the continued effective deprivation of section(s) 6, 7, 9, 10 (b) and 11(e) *Charter* rights. The Minister is obligated by section(s) 6, 7, 9, 10(b) and 11 (d) and (e) of the *Charter* to immediately cease the Orders allowing the arbitrary detention.

THIS APPLICATION WILL BE SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL:

18. Affidavit of Steven Duesing
19. Affidavit of Nicole Mathis
20. Affidavit of Barbara Spencer
21. Affidavit of Sabry Belhouchet
22. Affidavit of Blain Gowing
23. Affidavit of Dennis Ward
24. Affidavit of Reid Nehring
25. Affidavit of Cindy Crane
26. Affidavit of Denise Thomson
27. Affidavit of Norman Thomson
28. Affidavit of Jordan Hammond
29. Affidavit of Michel Lafontaine
30. Exhibits to the Affidavit of Steven Duesing
31. Exhibits to the Affidavit of Nicole Mathis
32. The affidavit of such other person as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court permit; and/or
33. Such other material as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

The Applicant requests that the Director General send a certified copy of the material that is in their possession and relevant to the appeal decision under review to the Applicant and to the Registry, pursuant to Rules 317 and 318 of the Federal Rules.

Dated at Toronto this Day of 19th February 2021.

Sayeh Hassan

Sayeh Hassan
Henna Parmar

Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms
#253, 7620 Elbow Dr SW
Calgary, Alberta T2V 1K2

