



Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORM /  
FORMULAIRE D'ACHEMINEMENT PARTÉLÉCOPIEUR**

**BENOÎT LABELLE**

**Courts Administration Service / Service administratifs des tribunaux judiciaires  
Registry Officer / Agent du greffe  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(613) 992-4238 telephone/ téléphone  
(613) 952-3653 facsimile / télécopieur  
Email : [benoit.labelle@cas-sati.gc.ca](mailto:benoit.labelle@cas-sati.gc.ca)**

**DATE: February 13, 2013**

**DELIVER TO / DESTINATAIRE:**

**PAGE (S): 5**

**(Including this page - incluant cette page)**

<b>James Zibarras / John Philpott</b>	<b>Fax no.: (416) 362-8410</b>
<b>Nicholas McHaffie</b>	<b>Fax no.: (613) 230-8877</b>
<b>David Fewer</b>	<b>Fax no.: (613) 562-5417</b>
	<b>Fax no.:</b>

**File Number / Numéro de dossier :**

**T-2058-12**

**Comments / Remarques:**

**Order of the Court rendered February 13, 2013.**

**If you do not receive all pages being transmitted, please call at the above number.  
S'il manque des pages, prière de communiquer avec l'expéditeur au numéro susmentionné.**

FEDERAL COURT  
Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20130213

Docket: T-2058-12

Ottawa, Ontario, February 13, 2013

**PRESENT:** Madam Prothonotary Mireille Tabib

**BETWEEN:**

**VOLTAGE PICTURES LLC**

**Plaintiff**

**and**

**JOHN DOE AND JANE DOE**

**Defendants**

**ORDER**

**UPON** the motion of the Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic (“CIPPIC”), made in writing pursuant to Rule 369 of the *Federal Courts Rules* for an order granting it leave to intervene in this proceeding.

**UPON** considering the motion record of CIPPIC, the responding motion record of the Plaintiff, and the reply of the CIPPIC, and noting that the Respondent TekSavvy Solutions Inc. has not taken a position on this motion.

**CONSIDERING** that the Proposed Intervener must, on a motion to intervene, describe how it wishes to participate in the proceeding and how that participation will assist in the

determination of a factual or legal issues related to the proceeding (Rule 109 of the *Federal Courts Rules*).

**CONSIDERING** that the Court, through Justice Mandamin's Order dated January 18, 2013, has already identified several issues of fact and law on which the Court would benefit from further information or submissions.

**CONSIDERING** that, notwithstanding CIPPIC's failure to fully and specifically set out the type of evidence it might lead if it were given leave to introduce evidence, or the factual issues it would contest if it were granted leave to cross-examine on the Plaintiff's affidavit, it is clear from the record before me that only CIPPIC is in a position to assist the Court in understanding the deficiencies that may exist in the Plaintiff's evidence and fill any gaps in that evidence that may be necessary for the Court to determine the issues before it, and that only CIPPIC is willing to do so.

**CONSIDERING** that the order sought by the Plaintiff on its discovery motion could possibly affect thousands of defendants.

**CONSIDERING** that the issues raised on the Plaintiff's motion, if determined without opposition, will not likely be contested or revisited by the Court at the request of the newly identified and served Defendants, since, by then, their identity will have been communicated to the Plaintiff and the issue might be moot.

**CONSIDERING**, therefore, that Justice Mandamin's comment in the Order of January 18, 2013 to the effect that the Court is better served in coming to a proper decision having heard from different sides is fully applicable here and that I agree with it.

**CONSIDERING** that I am, however, not satisfied that the determination should be made on this motion as to whether CIPPIC should be made subject to any order for costs.

**CONSIDERING** that since the issue of whether CIPPIC should be the subject of an order for costs is deferred to the Judge who will be hearing the Plaintiff's motion, it is also appropriate that the issue of whether CIPPIC should be able to seek or benefit from an order for costs should also be deferred to the hearing Judge.

**CONSIDERING** that the record before me justifies the intervention of CIPPIC on the Plaintiff's discovery motion, but at this time, on no other aspect of the Plaintiff's action against the Defendants, subject to the right of CIPPIC to seek leave for further intervention as and when it may be justified or necessary.

**THIS COURT ORDERS that:**

1. CIPPIC is hereby granted leave to intervene in respect of the Plaintiff's motion for an order under Rule 238 of the *Federal Courts Rules* as against TekSavvy Solutions Inc. on the following terms:
  - a. CIPPIC shall be permitted to produce affidavit evidence and to cross-examine the Plaintiff's affiant.

- b. CIPPIC shall be permitted to make arguments on points of law.
- c. The rights of CIPPIC to seek or its liability to be made subject of any order for costs on the motion shall be determined by the Judge seized of the motion.
- d. CIPPIC shall be served with all materials filed and to be filed by other parties, non-party respondents and Interveners, if any.
- e. The schedule for proceeding on the Plaintiff's motion pursuant to Rule 238 of the *Federal Courts Rules* shall be as set out in sub-paragraph 3 of the Order of January 18, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
"Mireille Tabib"

Prothonotary