COURT OF APPEAL OF ALBERTA

COURT OF APPEAL FILE NUMBER:

COURT FILE NUMBER:

1803 0076AC 1103 14112

REGISTRY OFFICE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT.

JUN 04 2018

RSA 2000, c T-8, AS AMENDED, and

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO. 19 now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION, ON APRIL 15,

1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS:

MAURICE FELIX STONEY AND HIS

BROTHERS AND SISTERS

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Interested Party

RESPONDENTS (ORIGINAL

Fast Track

APPLICANTS):

ROLAND TWINN. CATHERINE TWINN. FELIX WALTER TWIN. BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the

"Sawridge Trustees")

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Respondents

RESPONDENT

STATUS ON APPEAL:

PUBLIC TRUSTEE OF ALBERTA (the "OPGT")

Not a Party to the Appeal

INTERVENOR:

STATUS ON APPEAL:

SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

Respondent

INTERESTED PARTY:

PRISCILLA KENNEDY, Counsel for Maurice

Felix Stoney and His Brothers and Sisters

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Appellant

DOCUMENT:

EXTRACTS OF KEY EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENT, SAWRIDGE TRUSTEES

Appeal from the Case Management Order of The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas Dated March 20, 2018 Filed the 2nd day of May, 2018

EXTRACTS OF KEY EVIDENCE OF THE RESPONDENT, SAWRIDGE TRUSTEES

FOR THE APPELLANT, Priscilla Kennedy

Field LLP

2500 Enbridge Centre 10175 – 101 Street NW Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3

Attn: P. Jonathan Faulds, Q.C.

Phone: (780) 423-7625 Fax: (780) 429-9329

Email: ifaulds@fieldlaw.com

File No.: 65063-1

FOR THE RESPONDENT, Sawridge Trustees

Dentons Canada LLP

2900 Manulife Place 10180 – 101 Street Edmonton, AB T5J 3V5

Attn: Doris Bonora & Mandy England

Phone: (780) 423-7188 Fax: (780) 423-7276

Email: doris.bonora@dentons.com

File No.: 551860-1-DCEB

FOR THE RESPONDENTS, Sawridge First Nation

Parlee McLaws LLP

1700 Enbridge Centre 10175 – 101 Street, NW Edmonton, AB T5J 0H3 Attn: Edward Molstad, Q.C.

Phone: (780) 423-8500 Fax: (780) 423-2870

Email: emolstad@parlee.com

File No.: 64203-23

INTERESTED PARTY

Maurice Felix Stoney 500 4th Street NW Slave Lake, AB T0G 2A1 Phone: (780) 516-1143

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABS	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NUMBER	
1.	Letter from Maurice Stoney to the Court of Appeal dated April 23, 2018	R1	
2.	Factum of the Respondent, Sawridge First Nation (filed February 28, 2018, appeal of Sawridge #7) at paras 24-31	R2	
3.	Transcript of questioning on Affidavit of Maurice Stoney (Sept 23, 2016) at p. 25, lines 19-27; p.26, p. 27, lines 1-3 and p. 61, 63-64		
4.	Correspondence to the Court of Appeal from Maurice Stoney:		
	Civil Notice of Appeal	R12	
	 Fax – Attn: Registrar's office filed December 4, 2017 	R15	
	 Fax – Attn: Judge Watson filed December 4, 2017 	R16	
	 Fax – Attn: Case Management filed February 20, 2018 	R17	
	 Fax – Attn: Court of Appeal dated February 26, 2018 	R18	
5.	Copies of correspondence with Court of Queen's Bench and Court of Appeal regarding Sawridge #9:		
	 Letter from Justice Thomas dated December 20, 2017 	R19	
	Email from Jon Faulds to Nicole Stansky dated	R20	
	December 20, 2017		
	 Email from Nicole Stansky to Jon Faulds dated December 22, 2017 	R21	
	 Letter from Edward Molstad to the Court of Queen's Bench dated January 12, 2018 	R23	
	 Letter from Justice Thomas dated March 20, 2018 	R25	
	 Letter from Doris Bonora to Court of Appeal dated March 29, 2018 	R26	
	 Letter from Doris Bonora to Maurice Stoney dated March 29, 2018 	R27	
	 Letter from Justice Thomas dated May 2, 2018 	R28	

TAB 1

		ENT
04 2018 09:52AM 7808493128	NICOLET INSURANCE SC 7804224127-APX 23/8	PAGE 01/01
* Fa	SC 780 4274127 ADL 23/6	
, , , , , ,	700 1000 1107 17 778	
COL	int of Appral of AB.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nogement officer	
Altern	1 BJ me Devitt	
Lusit	a year to say, I	
am en	agreement with	
		and designed opposition with a control of a 11 hard opposition of the control opposition of the control opposition opposition of the control opposition op
the slet	mission Ko:	د و در موهد و در در محاصيده ميسر د ميسد وميست يه د
	1	المراجع ويتواجع معامد مداوع ويتواجع المراجع ال
Salley	2 # 9. This is the	emologi galgar pilpilan sin son former er
applal 1	Les Priscilla Konnedil	
regigned	by Priscilla Kennedy	
# fell 1863	0076 AC of which	
V	والمرابع والمنازي والمنازي والمناز والمناز والمناز والمنازي والمناز والمناز والمنازي والمنازون والمنازون	
will be	Abacd on June 718.	name to a security of the second
	The second secon	
Jon l	isted as a interested	
Peoles	march Thembe	
J. orang E.	flour Thinky	
No. of the last of	m. Stoney-	
	780 516 1143	
ee- 780 428 9	329	and the second of the second second second
CISTRAD K. PREHT	1 01	- 1 A
FILED	500 Yat NW Shaw	e jako
APR 2 3 2018 E	AB 75-9-OAL	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
APR 23 2010 E	: D. Bonora 780-423-7276	, per vien, es s que de la (mineral)
Con A De To	E. Molstad, O.C. 780- 423- 2870	11/18/10/
Our of Appeal	——————————————————————————————————————	

TAB 2

COURT OF APPEAL OF ALBERTA

COURT OF APPEAL FILE NUMBER:

1703 0239AC

COURT FILE NUMBER:

1103 14112

REGISTRY OFFICE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT, RSA 2000, c T-

8, AS AMENDED, and

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND, NO. 19 now known as SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION, ON

APRIL 15, 1985 (the "1985 Sawridge Trust")

APPLICANTS:

MAURICE FELIX STONEY AND HIS BROTHERS AND

SISTERS

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Interested Party

RESPONDENTS (ORIGINAL

APPLICANTS):

ROLAND TWINN, CATHERINE TWINN, WALTER FELIX TWIN, BERTHA L'HIRONDELLE and CLARA MIDBO, as

Trustees for the 1985 Sawridge Trust (the "Sawridge

Trustees")

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Respondents

RESPONDENT

PUBLIC TRUSTEE OF ALBERTA (the "OPGT")

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Not a Party to the Appeal

INTERVENOR:

SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Respondent

INTERESTED PARTY:

PRISCILLA KENNEDY, Counsel for Maurice Felix Stoney

and His Brothers and Sisters

STATUS ON APPEAL:

Appellant

DOCUMENT:

FACTUM OF THE RESPONDENT, SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

Appeal from the Case Management Order of The Honourable Mr. Justice D.R.G. Thomas Dated the 31st day of August, 2017 Filed the 6th day of October, 2017

FACTUM OF THE RESPONDENT, SAWRIDGE FIRST NATION

abusive litigation that was a collateral attack on prior decisions and did so in the face of prior unpaid costs awards against his client;33 where counsel attempted re-litigate the causes of action and the issues that were settled in prior proceedings;34 where counsel attempted re-litigate earlier actions and collaterally attack court orders and where the claims were known to counsel to have been raised (or were capable of being raised) in earlier actions;35 and where counsel knew or ought to have known that the client he represented lacked standing to bring a motion and that the motion was frivolous and amounted to a collateral attack as the issues raised were previously adjudicated and res judicata.36 While recognizing that the specific rules are worded differently across provinces, these cases are nevertheless of assistance in considering the nature of misconduct that may attract such an award, particularly since the Courts in those cases applied the same or a similar test and recognized the rare and exceptional nature of such awards.

Kennedy's misconduct constituted serious abuse.

- 24. Kennedy acknowledges the Stoneys' "claim to potential beneficiary status was grounded in their assertion of entitlement to membership";37 however, her suggestion that she advanced this position on a legal basis never previously raised, argued, or adjudicated is disingenuous. It ignores the substance of the submissions made by Kennedy to the CMJ, which clearly assert acquired rights membership on the basis of Bill C-31 and the 2003 decision of Justice Hugessen in Sawridge Band v Canada,38 which was upheld by the Federal Court of Appeal in 2004.39 Justice Barnes rejected this very argument in the 2012 Action.40
- A review of the written submissions made on the Stoney Application reveals that the argument now described is not what was presented to the CMJ. To give but a representative example, we refer the Court to those submissions, where she asserts the Stoneys' membership in Sawridge on the basis of the Bill C-31 amendments to the Indian Act and on the basis that they fall within the category of persons contemplated by Justice Hugessen's order, an argument previously rejected by Justice Barnes.41
- 26. It is difficult to conceive how the CMJ and all counsel could be found to have misconstrued Kennedy's argument. She made the same arguments in submissions filed September 28, October 27, and

In Scderstrom v Hoffmar-La Roche Limited, 2008 Cant. II 15778 (ON SC) at paras 24, 27, 59, 66-68 and 60 [Tab 8 Sawridge's BOA], the Court awarded costs on a substantial indemnity basis to be paid jointly and severally by the Plaintiff and his counsel.

15 In Donmor Industries Ltd. v Kremlin Canada Inc. (No. 2), 1992 Can'l 17543 (ON SC) [Tab 9 Sawridge's BOA], the Court awarded solicitor-client costs of \$29,087.32 to be paid jointly and severally by the Plaintiff and its counsel.

36 In 2403177 Onlario Inc. v Bending lake Iron Group Limited, 2017 CNSC 3566 (CanLII) at paras 32-34, 37-39 [Tab 10 Sawridge's BOA], the Court awarded costs to be paid jointly and severally by the client and its counsel.

37 Appellants Factum at para 7.

38 Sawridge Band v Canada, [2003] 4 FC 748, 2003 FCT 347 (CanLII) [Tab 11 Sawridge's BOA]

39 Sawridge Band v Canada, 2004 FCA 16 (CanLII) [Tab 12 Sawridge's BOA]

³³ In Best v Ranking, 2015 ONSC 6279 (CanLil) at paras 20, 39-41 [Tab 6 Sawridge's BOA], affid Best v Ranking, 2016 ONCA 492 (CanLil) at paras 41, [Tab 7 Sawridge's BOA], leave to appear refid Paul Slansky v Kingsland Estates Limited, et al., 2017 CanLII 4178 (SCC), the Court awarded full indemnity costs of \$84,000.00 to be paid jointly and severally by the Plaintiff and his counsel

⁴⁰ Stoney at paras 8-17 [Tab 19 Appel ant's BOA] 41 Kennedy's September 28, 2016 submissions at paras 14-16, 19-21, 28 [Sawridge's EKE at R273-R277]; Kennedy's October 27, 2016 submissions at paras 4, 19-21, 36, 39-40, 42-43, and 53 [Sawridge's EKE at R282, R265-R286, R291-R294]; Kennedy's November 15, 2016 submissions at paras 2-3 [Sawridge's EKE at R299-R300]

November 15, 2016, the latter two of which were filed after Sawridge's September 28, 2016 submissions, and the final of which was filed after of Sawridge's and the Trustees' October 21, 2016 submissions.

- 27. It is also problematic that Kennedy waited until this Appeal to raise this issue. Neither she nor her counsel addressed the apparent misconstruing of her submissions during the July 28, 2017 hearing which was convened specifically by the CMJ to provide her with an opportunity to explain why she ought to not bear personally liability for costs. Instead, her counsel admitted she had prosecuted Stoney's claim too far in bringing the Stoney Application. These admissions were not lost on the CMJ, who noted that Kennedy's counsel admitted the Stoney Application was hopeless and constituted an abuse of process.42The admissions should not be ignored on this Appeal, although Sawridge acknowledges that, to the extent any admissions may be characterized as admission of law, they do not bind this Court. 43
- Furthermore, section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 and Treaty No. 8, which relied upon as a new 28. basis on which to assert membership, were raised by Kennedy in the grounds for the application for judicial review she filed on behalf of Stoney in the 2012 Action and in her written submissions in that court.44
- In any event, the argument now advanced by Kennedy fails to distinguish between indigenous 29. persons' right to recognized status under the Indian Act as compared to any right to membership in Sawridge. Bill C-31 gave Stoney the right to have his Indian status restored, but gave him nothing more than the right to apply for membership in Sawridge, as conceded and determined in prior proceedings.45
- The question of Stoney's automatic right to membership was res judicata having been denied by 30. the Justice Barnes. It was not, and is not, open to Kennedy to circumvent that unappealed decision by making the same or alternative arguments on membership to the CMJ (or now to the Court of Appeal).
- The effect of the Stoney Application was a collateral attack on the Federal Court's decision and authority, as it was "an attack made in proceedings other than those whose specific object is the reversal, variation, or nullification of the order or judgment."45 The effect of accepting Kennedy's position would be to reverse or nullify Justice Barnes' decision by recognizing Stoney as a member of Sawridge. There is no denying she was re-litigating the same ultimate subject – membership – as noted by the CMJ. 47

Sawridge #7 at para 130 [Tab 11 Appellant's BCA]
Transcript from July 28, 2017 [Tab 19 Appeal Record at p.4. lines 38-40, p.5, lines 18-21, p.6 lines 22-26, p.7 lines 15-19, and p.6 lines 23-28], R. v. Barros, 2010 ABCA 115 (CanLII) at para 47 [Tab 13 Sawridge's BOA]

⁴⁴ May 11, 2012 Application for Judicial Review [Sawridge's EKE at R253-R257]; Affidavit of Maurice Stoney on Judicial Review [Sawridge's EKE at R258-R259]; Kennedy's Written Submissions on the Judicial Review at paras 20-24 [Sawridge EKE at R264-R265]

⁴⁵ Huzar paras 4-5 [Tab 20 Appellant's EOA]. Stoney at paras 15-17 [Tab 19 Appellant's BOA]

⁵ Sawridge #7 at para 125 [Tab 11 Appellant's BCA]

⁴⁷ Sawridge #7 at para 126 [Tab 11 Appellant's BOA]. In its decision ordering security for costs against Stoney on his appeal of Sawridge #6, the panel noted "(ti) here is no obvious reviewable error in the conclusion of the case management judge that the proposed arguments are barred by issue estoppel. The merits of the appeal are questionable". Storey v Truslees for the 1965 Sawriage Trust, 2017 ABCA 437 at para 5 [Tab 10 Appellant's BOA]

TAB 3

ORIGINAL

COURT FILE NUMBER:

1103 14112

COURT:

Clerk of the COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE:

EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRUSTEE ACT, RSA 2000, c. T-8, as am.

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAWRIDGE BAND INTER VIVOS SETTLEMENT CREATED BY CHIEF WALTER PATRICK TWINN, OF THE SAWRIDGE INDIAN BAND NO. 19

QUESTIONING ON AFFIDAVIT

OF

MAURICE STONEY

P. E. Kennedy, Ms.

For Maurice Stoney

D. C. Bonora, Ms.

E. M. Lafuente, Ms.

For the Trustees of the Sawridge Band Inter Vivos

Settlement

C. C. Osualdini, Ms.

For Cathrine Twinn

Joanne Lawrence, CSR(A)

Court Reporter

Edmonton, Alberta September 23, 2016

— A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc. — Certified Court Reporters

1	as it asserts or assumes that the
2	respondents are entitled to band
3	membership without the consent of
4	the band. It is clear that until
5	the band's membership rules are
6	found to be invalid, they govern
7	membership of the band, and the
8	respondents have, at best, a right
9	to apply for the band for
10	membership sorry, to the band for
11	membership. Accordingly, the
12	Statement of Claim against the
13	appellants, Walter Patrick Twinn as
14	chief of the Sawridge Indian band
15	and the Sawridge Indian band, will
16	be struck as disclosing no
17	reasonable cause of action.
18	Do you see that, sir?
19	MS. KENNEDY: Those are what the words on
20	the page say, and what the legal argument means and
21	the intent that it has with respect to this
22	particular proceeding are legal questions, and I
23	will be making argument on them.
24	MS. LAFUENTE: Okay.
25	MS. KENNEDY: And Mr. Stoney will not be
26	answering questions about legal interpretation.
27	MS. LAFUENTE: Okay. I think my question to

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

Certified Court Reporters

```
Mr. Stoney was, had he ever been told by the
 1
 2
            Federal Court that he did not have an automatic
 3
            right to membership, to which --
       MS. KENNEDY:
       MS. LAFUENTE:
 5
                                 Just a second, Ms. Kennedy.
            To which he indicated he had not been told that.
 6
 7
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 No, and he had not. This is a
 8
            judgment. He doesn't read --
       MS. LAFUENTE:
 9
                                 Of the Federal Court.
10
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                  -- judgments of the Federal
            Court. His lawyer may very well. What his lawyer
11
12
            says to him is a question of solicitor-client
            privilege, and I am telling you that, as his
13
            lawyer, I will be making legal arguments.
14
15
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 okay.
       MS. KENNEDY:
16
                                 That's the end of the
17
            questions on that.
       MS. LAFUENTE:
18
                                 Well, I have a couple more
19
            questions.
            MS. LAFUENTE:
20
                                 sir --
21
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 Fine, but we're not going to
22
            be answering them.
23
                                 Sir, did you read the Federal
           MS. LAFUENTE:
24
            Court of Appeal decision?
       MS. KENNEDY:
25
                                 Don't answer that.
       MS. LAFUENTE:
26
                                 You're objecting to the
            question of whether he read it?
27
```

— A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

Certified Court Reporters

= 27

```
MS. KENNEDY:
                                 Yes, I am.
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Okay. We'll put your
 3
            objection on the record.
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 That's right.
                   OBJECTION TO QUESTION:
 6
                   Sir, did you read the Federal Court of
 7
                   Appeal decision?
8
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 I'd ask that this Federal
9
            Court of Appeal decision be marked for
10
            identification.
11
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 It doesn't need to be marked
12
            for identification. It's clear what it is, and you
13
            can cite it any time you want.
14
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 I'm going to ask for it be
            marked for identification because we're going to
15
            probably need to proceed with these objections and
16
17
            deal with them, and it is going to be much easier
            for the Court if we can identify what document we
18
            were each looking at. And there is no prejudice to
19
20
            you of marking it for identification purposes.
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 No, and there is no need to do
21
            it either. Go ahead and do it.
22
23
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Thank you.
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 You don't need one with an
24
            Exhibit 'D' stamp on it that's from Roland Twinn's
25
            Affidavit --
26
                                 That's the one that I have, so
27
       MS. LAFUENTE:
```

= 61 =

```
to the 1986 trust, beneficiary status is
 2
                   restricted to members?
       Q
            MS. LAFUENTE:
                                Okay. Sir, have you ever read
            the 1985 trust?
            I won't answer that.
            why won't you answer that question? It's factual,
            sir. Have you read it?
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 No.
      MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Sorry --
10
            No.
       MS. LAFUENTE:
11
                                  -- Ms. Kennedy, are you
12
            saying "no" as in he shouldn't answer the question,
13
            or are you providing him an answer?
14
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 I'm telling him no because
           it's a legal -- we're talking about legal arguments
15
           with respect to these documents.
16
                                 So your word "no" is meant to
17
       MS. LAFUENTE:
            advise him not to answer the question, the factual
18
            question, as to whether he has read the trust deed?
19
                                 That's right.
20
       MS. KENNEDY:
21
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Okay.
                   OBJECTION TO QUESTION:
22
23
                   Sir, have you ever read the 1985 trust?
24
           MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Sir, have you read the 1986
       Q
            trust deed?
25
26
            I won't answer that.
27
```

```
MS. KENNEDY:
                                 In one particular portion,
 2
            yes.
 3
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 okay.
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 And what it says with respect
            to the rest of it is the wording in the trust deed
 5
            which is what we're arguing about before the Court.
 6
       MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 And that's what you're
            attempting to bring before this Court by being
 8
 9
            added as a party.
10
       MS. KENNEDY:
                                 That's what we're arguing in
11
            terms of our ability to be before the Court as a
12
            beneficiary.
13
       Q - MS. LAFUENTE:
                                 Okay. Sir, going back to
14
            paragraph 12 of your Affidavit, we talked about
15
            this first sentence here before, "All of our
            applications for membership in Sawridge were
16
17
            ignored," and we were focussing on your
18
            application. Can you tell me whose applications
19
            you mean when you say "our applications," the word
            0-U-R?
20
            I won't answer it.
21
22
            Why won't you answer that, sir? It's your
23
            Affidavit, and I want to know what you mean when
            you say, "Our applications were ignored."
24
25
            Did you ask that question before?
            No. I'm asking what you mean by the word, "Our" --
26
       Q
27
            the words, "our applications." Whose applications?
```

Į	1	Α	No, I won't answer that.		
	2	Q	Sir, why aren't you answering that question?		
	3	А	I'll leave it up to the courts.		
	4	Q	You I'm going to point out that your counsel did		
	5		not put an objection on the record but that you are		
	6		refusing the answer the question because you want		
	7		to leave it up to the courts.		
	8	MS.	KENNEDY: That's what he said.		
	9	Q	MS. LAFUENTE: Okay. So, sir		
1	10	MS.	KENNEDY: You don't have to repeat it.		
Ì	11	Q	MS. LAFUENTE: how is the Court supposed		
	12		to how is the Court supposed to understand what		
	13		you mean by the word "our" if you won't tell us		
	14		what you mean?		
	15	MS.	KENNEDY: Okay. Now, let's not get into		
	16		arguments with him, and that's what you're doing by		
	17		characterizing the way he has made an answer. He		
	18		has made an answer. You may not like it, but he		
	19		has made an answer.		
	20	MS.	LAFUENTE: Okay.		
	21		OBJECTION TO QUESTION:		
	22		Okay. Sir, going back to paragraph 12 of		
	23		your Affidavit, we talked about this		
	24		first sentence here before, "All of our		
	25		applications for membership in Sawridge		
	26		were ignored," and we were focussing on		
	27		your application. Can you tell me whose		

TAB 4

T.	08/11/2017 01	:44PM 7808493128	/11/201/ 12:35H4 /305ET INSU	RANCE	PAG R 12 01/03
,	7804224127	COARegistry		12:14:32 p.m. 08-11-2017	2/4
					£ 1 °r
	98/11/ 11-/	2017 11:04AM 7828493129	######################################	NOE NICOLET INSURANCE	31/93 2/4
		c	OURT OF APPEAL OF ALBERT.	A	
		COURT OF APPEAL FILE NUMBER:	1763-0195AC	Form AP-1 [Pule 14.5 and 14.12]	
		TRIAL OCURT FILE NUMBER:	1103 14112	1617	
	,	REGISTRY OFFICE	Edmonton	FILED S	
		PLAINTIFF/APPLICANT:	Maurice Felia Stoney and His Brothers and Sisters	(AUG 1 1 2017)	
		STATUS ON APPEAL:	Appellant	COLD ST RE	
		** DEFENDANTIRESPONDENT	Roland Twinn, Catherina Twim, Walter Felix Twin, Bertha L'Hirondollo and Clara Midbe, As Trusteea for the 1985 Sawridge	Appeal of Am	
		STATUS ON APPEAL:	Trust Respondent	9	
		DEFENDANT/REDPONDENT:	Public Trustee of Alberta		
	*	STATUS ON APPEAL			
		DEFENDANTIAESPONDENT	Note Party to the Appeal The Servidge Board	the the appropriate	pals
	4)	ETATUS CH APPEAL:	-Octor ne C ≈	party to appoin	
			F	ルー	
		COCUMENT:			
		AFPELLANT® ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION;	Meurice Stoney 500 4th Street NW	180 516 119	(5
			Sleve Lake, AB, TOG 2A1	780	
		1	(/(/		
		WARNING			
		will be decided in your absence on	espond to this appeal as provided for in the Albi d without your input.	erts Rules of Court, the appost	l c
		1. Particulars of Judgment, Orde	ir of Daciston Appealed From:	File	t lot
		Gata pronounced: July 1	2, 2017	int	1.5
		Cate satement July 1	2, 2017	corre	3-63
	cı	752010 (2014.00)	ç,	3	
	*		Doris Bo	nora	
	*	(Doris Bo	423 7276	

08/11/2017 01:44PM 7808493128 MICOLET INSURANCE PACR1302/03 RECEIVED 08/11/2017 13:66PH 7686493128 HICOLET INSURANCE 7804224127 COA Registry 12:14-49 p.m. 08-11-2017 3 /4 11:12:76 w.m. 62-11-22:17 | 2 | 785-25:12: 69/11/2017 11:04AM 7809493128 11-Aug-2017 10:43 AM DLA Fiper (Canada) LLP 750-428-1056 PAGE 62/23 HIGHET INSURANCE 3/4 Date served July 12, 2017 Official nautral dilation of reasons for decision, Honey, (do reliation copy) 2017 ABQB 436 (Attach a copy of order or judgment: Rule 14.12(3). He copy is not attached, infinate under them 14 and file a copy as 9501 65 possibler Rule (4 18(2).) 2. Indicate where the matter originaled; Court of Quean's Bench Judicial Contac Ediconton 15/4 Mr. justice D.R.G. Thomas On appeal from a Quezaria Bench Mauler or Provincial Courl Judgo?; 🔲 Yas Official neutral classes of reasons for declasor, if a সু, of the Master of Provincial Court Judge. (עם הסל בולבטו מועץ) (If ariginating from an order of a Qt aprile Saroh Master or Frotingial Court Judge, a copy of that order is elected that Au'a 15 *E(1)(c)) Esers, Mibunal or Professional Decision Sody 5. Details of Permission to Appear it required (Rules 14.5 and 14.12(3)(a)): Parmise an not requised, or Granted Date: (Altaut a copy of order, but not receous for dachlen.) 4. Portion being appealed (Rujes 14.12(2)(c)): Whole, or ि तथरी specific parts (if specific part, indicate which part): Provide a brief description of the issues: Whether or not I and my brothers and slaters are beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries of the 1985 6. Provide a brief description of the relief claimed: To find that I and my brothers and sistem are bacefrieness or potential beneficiaries of the 1985 CT62010 (2014/03) Page 2 cf 4

If any document is not evadable, it should be appended to the faction, or inquided absorbate in the oppositional to the contract of the contra

[] Order grapting permission ত opposit (Rule 14.42(3)(e))

☐ Copy of any contribute কেইছাৰ চন্দ্ৰণ (মিচাই 14.12(2)(e))

" Fspa 강스크

03.37.31 p.m. 12-04-2017 | 1 7868493128 12/04/2017 03:30PM 7868493128

NICOLET INSURANCE

PAGE 01/01 APPEAL NO.: 1703-0195AC

Fox 1.780 422 4127

atten! Registral's Office Doct, 7 Case Monagment, B.J. McDevitt

Dear Bobbi Jo,

Would it be possible for me tig set on extention for the court of appeal Dead line which is Dac "/17 levtel the court hearing is over on Dec 14/17



Hausie Stories
PH 780 5161143

D1.38 07 p m. 12-04-2017 1 T808493 128		
12/04/2017 01:51PM 7808493128	NICOLET INSLRANCE	PAGE 31/31
to Registrars office	Fanc 780	422 4127
Law Courts Bul	" L I Diskits is to F	anel
Bobbi Jo MeD	evill	. /
3	Don	4/.7
December 04, 2017	l 1 m D	GISTA
December 04, 2017 Court o	1 Applal	FILED 3
	17.19	(04 Dec 2017)
Atten: Judge	eleatson	(3)
		of Appeal of All
To whom	This may con	clin
· ·	1 1 6	,
	Maurice of Ston	
of & Shave Lake,		es.
Tom a Sou	reage Gordman	docum
1941, & am	receiving old	ago-
pension from	1 Tello Fachiel /	5025-
my sendion	I not in aga	Nex.
18 111737 25 a Mont	I my assets	are
Lating Theiler	of Justock 1	Day 440.
July & Sulling	The state of the s	47.
ay moragal	10 LKU ZICO	no a
Band. 4 U	uch worth 34	applace,
I pay \$1000. @	month, to B.M	7.0,
I work as	a cab di	cor,
The make on	ids meets. I t	are a
To make en 4x4 quad, 500 by afte mont worth 1000. pull	of Im paying.	for
Les The MONT	L. A comper of	raila
The total of the same of the	tim	•
will have , putter	The .	
	0 (0.184)	
- Iridge Band	12 m	ρ
Sowridge Band Treaty 454001101	yours true	'ly
Treaty 454001101	197	DW.
1	Jallande Score	L

02/20/2018 10:15AM 7808493128 NICOLET INSURANCE PAGE 31/01 From 422 4127 APPEAL NO.: 1703-0195AC Case Management Alteri B. J. Mc Devitt 20 Feb 2018 Dear Modom, I have until Feb %8. Jor 10,000, money I don't faces need an extionsion until July. We have a court in June 1/8, That is my lawyer Pricilla Kerndey, I'm orking for more time Place next, after the June 1/18 Thank Hore 780 516 (143.

2/2

Felo 18

Hegistrar, Court of Appeal Law Courts Building 1-A Sir Winston Churchill Square Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5J 0R2

Re! Appeal I 1703-0195AC

Dear Court of Appell

I'm ooking Her an omergency applic:

to be Reard this WK. a 9:30 Am ;...

The or Wed more time the deal

with the Feb 3/8, deadling for costs

socurity, I'll need with July 3/8.

I am calling the other parties as well.

K.A. Platlen QC. CCP Molstod QC

McLennan Ross LLP Parlee Mclaus LLP

*Forci 780-482-9100 + Oc 780-423.2870

PHI) 1 - 482-9200 (ac.)

Denton's Con, LLP

Thanking Stoney *Fax - 780 423 7276

TAB 5

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DENNIS R. THOMAS



THE LAW COURTS EDMONTON, ALBERTA T5J OR2 TEL: (780) 422-2200 FAX: (780) 427-0334

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

December 20, 2017

Edward Molstad, Q.C. Parlee McLaws LLP

Email: emolstad@parlee.com

Jon Faulds, Q.C. Field Law LLP

Email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com

Dear Counsel:

Re: Solicitor and own client full indemnity costs award in Sawridge #6,

Sawridge #7 and Sawridge #8

Action No. 1103 14112

I have received a request for resolution of a dispute between some of the parties in respect to solicitor-client costs. The communications on this subject are reflected in Mr. Molstad's letter of November 15, 2017 and Mr. Faulds' letter of November 16, 2017.

These issues will be resolved at a case management session to be held at 2:00 p.m. on January 5, 2018. This is the only time slot that I have available to deal with the file in the foreseeable future.

I am copying this letter to the other counsel who are involved in this file.

I have also included Mr. Stoney, who will be notified by regular mail.

At the case management meeting set for that time, I will also want an update on the status of this litigation and a report as to what progress counsel may be making in reaching a settlement of this long outstanding dispute.

I look forward to seeing you on the afternoon of January 5, 2018.

D.R.G. Thomas

DRGT/pa/ns

Yours tru

cc: Doris Bonora and Anna Loparco (via email)

Karen Platten, Q.C. (via email)

Janet Hutchison (via email)

Maurice Felix Stoney (via regular mail)

Sharon Hinz, Case Management Coordinator (via email)

England, Mandy

From:

Jon Faulds < jfaulds@fieldlaw.com>

Sent:

20-Dec-17 4:15 PM

To:

'Nicole Stansky'; emolstad@parlee.com

Cc:

Sharon Hinz; Loparco, Anna; Bonora, Doris; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; kplatten@mross.com

Subject:

RE: Stoney, et al v Sawridge, et al 1103 14122

Ms. Stansky,

Could you kindly bring the following to the attention of Justice Thomas:

Dear Justice Thomas,

Thank you for your letter of today's date scheduling a case management session on January 5, 2018 at 2 p.m. to address, inter alia, the costs issue identified in your letter.

Unfortunately I will be out of the country on holiday from January 5 to 14, 2018. Accordingly I am writing to ask if the costs issue in question might be dealt with separately from the case management session at some other time.

I apologize for the inconvenience this request may cause to the court and other counsel and will make myself available at any other possible time.

Jon Faulds .

FIELD LAW

P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | <u>ifaulds@fieldlaw.com</u> 2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

"Field Law" and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Nicole Stansky [mailto:Nicole.Stansky@albertacourts.ca]

Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 3:17 PM

To: Jon Faulds; emolstad@parlee.com

Cc: Sharon Hinz; anna.loparco@dentons.com; doris.bonora@dentons.com; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; kplatten@mross.com

Subject: Stoney, et al v Sawridge, et al 1103 14122

Counsel,

Attached is a letter from Justice Thomas for your information and attention.

Nicole Stansky

Judicial Assistant 780-422-1867

England, Mandy

From:

Nicole Stansky < Nicole.Stansky@albertacourts.ca>

Sent:

22-Dec-17 9:09 AM

To:

jfaulds@fieldlaw.com; emolstad@parlee.com

Cc:

Sharon Hinz; Loparco, Anna; Bonora, Doris; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; kplatten@mross.com

Subject:

RE: Stoney, et al v Sawridge, et al 1103 14122

Counsel

Justice Thomas advised that it will remain on January 5 for the time being because of his limited availability. He will revisit the request when he gets back into the office on January 2.

Merry Christmas,

Nicole Stansky

Judicial Assistant 780-422-1867

>>> Jon Faulds <<u>jfaulds@fieldlaw.com</u>> Dec 20, 2017 04:15 PM >>> Ms. Stansky,

Could you kindly bring the following to the attention of Justice Thomas:

Dear Justice Thomas,

Thank you for your letter of today's date scheduling a case management session on January 5, 2018 at 2 p.m. to address, inter alia, the costs issue identified in your letter.

Unfortunately I will be out of the country on holiday from January 5 to 14, 2018. Accordingly I am writing to ask if the costs issue in question might be dealt with separately from the case management session at some other time.

I apologize for the inconvenience this request may cause to the court and other counsel and will make myself available at any other possible time.

Jon Faulds



P. Jonathan Faulds, QC | Partner T 780-423-7625 | F 780-428-9329 | <u>ifaulds@fieldlaw.com</u> 2500 - 10175 101 ST NW, Edmonton AB T5J 0H3

"Field Law" and the Field Law logo are registered trademarks of Field LLP. All rights reserved.

From: Nicole Stansky [mailto:Nicole.Stansky@albertacourts.ca]

Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 3:17 PM

To: Jon Faulds; emolstad@parlee.com

Cc: Sharon Hinz; anna.loparco@dentons.com; doris.bonora@dentons.com; jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca; kplatten@mross.com

Subject: Stoney, et al v Sawridge, et al 1103 14122

Counsel,

Attached is a letter from Justice Thomas for your information and attention.

Nicole Stansky

Judicial Assistant 780-422-1867



January 12, 2018

EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C. DIRFCT DIAL 750-423-8506 DIRFCT DIAL 750-423-2870 EMAI: emoistadar antecenit UCR HEE 64203-7-1-11M

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta 6th Floor Law Courts Building 1A Sir Winston Churchill Square Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0R2

HAND DELIVERED AND DELIVERED VIA EMAIL AT nicole.stansky@albertacourts.ca

Attention: Ms. Nicole Stansky

Dear Madam:

Re: In the Matter of the Trustee Act, RSA 2000, e T-8, as Amended et al v. Roland

Twinn, Catherine Twinn et al.

Court of Queen's Bench Action No: 1103 14112

Please find enclosed the written submissions on behalf of the Sawridge First Nation in relation to costs, which we would kindly ask that you provide to Mr. Justice Thomas.

We have copied Mr. Faulds. Ms. Precht, Ms. Bonora, Ms. Platten, and Ms. Hutchison on this letter via e-mail and have provided all counsel with a copy of our written submissions via e-mail. We are also providing a copy of this letter and our written submissions via fascimile and ordinary mail to Mr. Stoney at his address for service.

Additionally, a hard copy of this letter with the enclosed written submissions will be hand delivered to the Court this afternoon and we would kindly ask that you provide the same to Mr. Justice Thomas.

Yours truly,

PARLEE McLAWS LLP

EDWARD H. MOLSTAD, Q.C.

EHM/DJC

Encl.

CC:

Jon Faulds, Q.C., Field LLP

Via email: jfauldsta fieldlaw.com

ce: Kimberiy Precht, Field LLP
Via email: kprecht/a fieldlaw.com

- ce: Doris Bonora, Dentons Canada LLP Via email: doris.bonora@dentons.com
- ce: Karen Platten, Q.C., McLennan Ross Via email: <u>kplatter/amross.com</u>
- ce: Janet Hutchison, Hutchison Law Via email: jhutchison@jlhlaw.ea
- ce: Maurice Stoney
 Via facsimile: (780) 849-3128

Via ordinary mail: 500 4 Street Slave Lake, AB 10G 2A1 THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DENNIS R. THOMAS



THE LAW COURTS EDMONTON, ALBERTA TSJ OR2 TEL: (780) 422-2200 FAX: (780) 427-0334

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

March 20, 2018

Via Email:

Edward Molstad, Q.C. Parlee McLaws LLP

Email: emolstad@parlee.com

Jon Faulds, Q.C. Field Law LLP Email: jfaulds@fieldlaw.com

Doris Bonora Dentons Canada LLP Email) doris.bonora@dentons.com Dear Counsel:

Re: Memorandum of Decision on Costs (Sawridge #9)

Action No. 1103 14112

I enclose a copy of my Memorandum of Decision on Costs (Sawridge #9) which was filed today.

Please forward a formal order to document this decision as soon as possible.

I am copying the other counsel involved by email and Mr. Stoney by ordinary mail.

Yours truly,

D.R.G. Thomas DRGT/bn

Encl.

cc:

Karen Platten, Q.C. (via email) kplatten@mross.com Janet Hutchison (via email) jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca

Maurice Felix Stoney (via regular mail) (500 4 Street, Slave Lake, AB TOG 2A1) Sharon Hinz, Case Management Coordinator (via email)



Doris C.E. Bonora

doris.bonora@dentons.com D +1 780 423 7188 Dentons Canada ELP 2900 Manulife Place 10180 - 101 Street Edmonton, AB, Canada T5J 3V5

File No.: 551860-8

denions.com

March 29, 2018

N/EDER

DELIVERED

Court of Appeal of Alberta Registrar's Office Law Courts Building 1A Sir Winston Churchill Square Edmonton, AB T5J 0R2

Attn: Bobbi Jo McDevitt, Case Management Officer

Dear Ms. McDevitt;

RE: Court of Appeal File Number 1803 0076AC

Re: Priscilla Kennedy, Sawridge First Nation and the Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust

We write on behalf of our clients, the Trustees of the 1985 Sawridge Trust ('Trustees"), in respect of the application in this matter that is returnable on April 4, 2018.

We have reviewed the written submissions filed on behalf of the appellant. Ms. Kennedy, and our corespondent, the Sawridge First Nation ("SFN"). We write this letter, pursuant to Rule 14 41(b), to advise the Court that we concur with the position advanced by the SFN, we rely on their submissions, and we do not intend to file further materials.

We ask that this letter be filed on the Court record and thank you in advance for your assistance

Yours truly,

Dentons Canada LLP

Doris C.E. Bonora

c.c. P. Jonathan Faulds, Q.C. (e-mail)

Edward H. Molstad, Q.C. (e-mail)

Maurice Stoney (recorded mail)



Doris C.E. Bonora

doris.bonora@dentons.com D +1 780 423 7188 R27
Dentons Canada LLP
2900 Manulife Place
10180 - 101 Street
Edmonton, AB, Canada T5J 3V5

dentons com

March 29, 2018

File Nc. 551860-6

EXPRESS POST

Maurice Felix Stoney
500 - 4th Street NW
Slave Lake AB T0G 2A1

Dear Sir:

RE:

In the Matter of the Sawridge Band Inter Vivos Settlement

Court of Appeal: 1803 076AC

We enclose a copy of our letter to the Court of Appeal filed March 29, 2018 with respect to the Priscilla Kennedy's Application for Permission to Appeal in Appeal Action 1803 0076AC.

Yours truly.

Dentons Canada LLP

Doris C.E. Bonora

DCEB/sh

Enclosures

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DENNIS R G THOMAS



THE LAW COURTS BUILDING 1 A SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL SQUARE EDMONTON, ALBERTA CANADA, T5J 0R2 780.122.2200 780.422.8854 (FAX)

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

May 2, 2018

Kimberly Precht Field Law LLP

Sent by email: kprecht@fieldlaw.com

Dear Ms. Precht:

Re: Stoney v Twinn (Sawridge #9)

Court of Queen's Bench Action No. 1103 14112

Further to your letter of May 1, 2018, I am returning, by way of your Court agent, a filed certified copy of the formal Order dealing with the costs on Sawridge #9, along with a PDF copy.

I am copying all counsel involved with the PDF version of the filed form of Order. I am also copying Mr. Stoney by regular mail.

Yours truly,

D.R.G. Thomas

Du R. Thomas

DRGT/ns

Edward Molstad Parlee McLaws LLP

emolstad@parlee.com

Doris Bonora

Dentons Canada LLP

Doris.bonora@dentons.com

Karen Platten, QC

McLennan Ross

kplatten@mross.com

Donald Wilson

DLA Piper LLP

Donald.Wilson@dlapiper.com jhutchison@jlhlaw.ca

Janet Hutchison

Hutchinson Law LLP

Maurice Stoney 500 - 4 Street

Slave Lake, AB TOG 2A1