CANADA

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK

PROVINCIAL COURT

5

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

SEARCH WARRANT HEARING

10

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE CHIEF JUDGE R. LESLIE JACKSON AT SAINT JOHN, N.B. ON DECEMBER 16TH, 2011.

15

APPEARANCES:

PROSECUTION: P. WILBUR & J. HENHEFFER

INTERESTED PARTIES - W. TEED - G. MILLER -

CBC & BRUNSWICK NEWS - D. COLES

20

COPYRIGHT, 2011

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THE COURT: The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which was later joined by Brunswick News, and I'm going to refer to them as the media application, have applied for a variation of a sealing order made by Judge — sealing orders made by Judge McCarroll in respect of search warrants issued in relation to the Richard Oland homicide investigation. Now initially this application was in respect of one sealing order but later expanded to include all sealing orders issued in respect of all other search warrants issued by Judge McCarroll related to the said investigation.

The interested parties represented by Messers

Miller and Teed applied for and by consent were

granted standing in the application and participated

in the hearing. The interested parties also request a

variation of the sealing order and ask that any

information in relation to the search warrant be

released to them before it is released to the media

applicants.

The Crown opposes both applications on the basis that the ends of justice would be subverted by the disclosure of any information relating to the warrant because of the grounds in 487.3(2)(a)(ii) and (iv).

That is that disclosure would compromise the nature and extent of an ongoing investigation and or would prejudice the interests of an innocent person or persons.

5

I decided to follow the proceeding somewhat like the Winnipeg Free Press case, and ordered that the crown would proceed in an in camera hearing in order to allow them to attempt to persuade me that the disclosure would compromise the nature and extent of an ongoing investigation, or the other ground.

After hearing submissions yesterday, as you know,

10

It was in that hearing at which it was heard exparte - or in camera, that I heard from a former police officer, primary investigator in the Richard Oland homicide until his recent retirement. I reviewed the five - or the information to obtain in the five search warrants and one production order issued by Judge McCarroll at various times from July 13<sup>th</sup> to November 15<sup>th</sup> in relation to the homicide investigation.

15

20

From that hearing it is apparent that the crown's objection is based on two broad themes. Firstly the "Hallmark Evidence" as it was referred to, that is

evidence which is so unique to this case and not widely known which if released would compromise the continuing investigation, and secondly the privacy concerns of numerous persons whose names, personal information, and in some cases details of some of the most intimate aspects of their lives are set out in the I.T.O.'s. And when I refer to I.T.O.'s, just for the record, that's Informations To Obtain.

If one were only dealing with the second issue this would be a relatively easy task and the documents could be redacted so as to protect innocent parties and the rest of the information disseminated.

The allegation of compromise of an investigation is a more difficult one. Although there are six informations to obtain, each essentially builds on the other and often in the case of the latter ones, only add information obtained from previous warrants. The first in time Information To Obtain is sworn July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011, it runs for about 17 pages containing some 51 paragraphs, many with subparagraphs and sub-clauses, that is - it's detailed.

The law is clear that a broad assertion by the crown that disclosure would compromise the ongoing

10

15

investigation is insufficient. Justice Iacobucci in Mentuck said:

"One required element is that the risk in question be a serious one, or as Chief Justice Lamer put it in Dagonais, a real and substantial risk. That is it must be a risk to the reality of which is well-grounded in the evidence, it must also be a risk that poses a serious threat to the proper administration of justice. In other words, it is a serious danger sought to be avoided that is required, not a substantial benefit or advantage to the administration of justice sought to be obtained."

Similarly in the Toronto Star, in Ontario,

Justice Fish pointed out that - they're talking at
this point about the onus and evidentiary grounds
necessary to rebut the presumptive right to access.

"The freedoms I have mentioned, though fundamental, are by no means absolute. Under certain conditions, public access to confidential or sensitive information related to court proceedings will endanger and not protect the integrity of our system of justice. A temporary shield will in some cases suffice; in others, permanent protection is warranted."

Going on to paragraph 9;

"Even then the parties seeking to limit public access to legal proceedings must rely on more than a generalized assertion that publicity could compromise investigative efficancy."

"Section 487.3(2) is of particular relevance to this case" -

I'm still quoting from Toronto Star Limited v Ontario,
It's from Mr. Millers' brief at paragraph 27;

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

"..is of particular relevance to this case. It contemplates a sealing order on the ground that the ends of justice would be subverted, in that the disclosure of the information would compromise the nature and extent of an ongoing investigation. That is what the crown argued here. It is doubtless a proper ground for a sealing order with respect to an information used to obtain a provincial warrant and not only to informations under the Criminal Code. In either case, however, the ground must not just be asserted in the abstract; it must be supported by particularized grounds related to the investigation that is said to be imperiled."

As Mr. Cole also agreed in his brief - his letter brief of December  $14^{\rm th}$ , the evidence must be real, substantial and grounded in the evidence.

Now in this case the Crown contends that there is evidence contained in these sealed materials related to the murder which would not have been made known to the public and which would be known uniquely to the person or persons who murdered Mr. Oland. In broad themes this includes details surrounding the finding of the body; its' condition; and evidence, if any, of trauma.

It's clear from the evidence that I heard that this is still an active and ongoing investigation. It is not a "cold case" to use that term. It is also clear that some items which have been obtained have

been sent elsewhere to be dealt with, either forensic and or technical processing. The evidence satisfies me that the Saint John Police Force are proceeding diligently with the investigation.

In the course of this ongoing investigation,

5

by the police. These people are not necessarily persons of interest or suspects, but may be only witnesses involved perhaps peripherally. It is not uncommon that these persons would be questioned on more than one occasion. That happened in this case in relation to a person or persons mentioned in the I.T.O. The witness or witnesses had been cooperative and the investigator believed he/she had established a good rapport, however when asked to do a second interview the persons were very upset with the Saint John Police Department because they had been approached by another person or persons whom they

supposed to be police and had been questioned.

anything wrong. I realize full well there is no

to be very clear here, I'm not saying that anybody did

propriety right in a witness, but the end result is up

to that point cooperative witness or witnesses became

10

15

less so, and that's the allegation of compromising the investigation.

If all persons who are named in the I.T.O. were similarly approached and took offence as in the example above, there is no doubt in my view that the investigation would be compromised.

When I add this to the fact that I am satisfied that there is information in the I.T.O.'s which in some cases only the murderer or murderers would know, or other information which may be known by them or a small group of professionals who dealt with the situation, I'm satisfied that temporary continuation of the sealing order should be made, and I intend to order that the sealing orders continue for a period of six months from todays' date. My idea is that at that time the Crown may apply for an extension of the order, or if they do not the other parties may apply for an order to redact the information or to come back for redacting of that information.

20

15

5

10

## DISCUSSIONS WITH COUNSEL CONTINUES

## CERTIFICATE

RECORDING OF EVIDENCE ACT

I, Sharon Lowe, of the City of Saint John, County of Saint John and Province of New Brunswick, certify that the sound recording tapes/ compact discs labelled: December 16, 2011, initialed by me, are the record of the evidence, or a portion thereof, recorded on an audio/video recording apparatus pursuant to Section 3 of the General Regulation -Recording of Evidence Act at the court proceedings held on December 16, 2011, at the Provincial Court, Saint John, N.B., and that I was the person in charge of the audio/video recording apparatus at the time the evidence and proceedings were recorded.

DATED at Saint John, N.B. on December 16, 2011

## CERTIFICAT

LOI SUR L'ENREGISTREMENT DE LA PREUVE

de Je, , de la , dans le comté de et province du Nouveau-Brunswick, certifie que les bandes d'enregistrement sonores/disques compacts marqués , 16 décembre 2011 que j'ai paraphés, sont l'enregistrement des témoignages, ou d'une partie de ceux-ci selon le cas, enregistré à l'aide d'un appareil d'enregistrement sonore/vidéo en application de l'article 3 du Règlement général - Loi sur l'enregistrement de la preuve dans les instances tenues le 16 décembre 2011 à la

, au Nouveau-Brunswick,
et que j'étais la personne
préposée à l'appareil
d'enregistrement sonore/vidéo
lorsque les instances et les
témoignages ont été
enregistrés.

FAIT à , Nouveau-Brunswick, le

16 décembre 2011.

Sharon Lowe

Court Stenographer / Stenographe judiciaire

CANADA PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK CANADA

PROVINCE DU NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

Her Majesty the Queen and HEARING WARRANT SEARCH DECEMBER 16, 2011

et

AFFIDAVIT

I, Sharon Lowe from

the City of Saint John, County

of Saint John and Province

of New Brunswick, make oath

and say as follows:

- 1. THAT I am a stenographer duly appointed or deemed to have been appointed under the Recording of Evidence Act.
- 2. THAT this transcript is a true and correct transcription of the record of these proceedings made under Section 2 and certified pursuant to Section 3 of the Act.
- THAT a true copy of the certificate made pursuant to Section 3(1) of the Act and accompanying the record at the time of transcription is appended hereto as Schedule "A" to this affidavit.

AFFIDAVIT

, de la Je,

> , comté de de

et province du

Nouveau-Brunswick, déclare

sous serment :

- QUE je suis une sténographe judiciaire dûment nommée ou réputée avoir été nommée en application de la Loi sur l'enregistrement de la preuve.
- 2. QUE la présente transcription ) effectuée en à (page application de l'article 2 et certifiée en vertu de l'article 3 de la Loi est bien une transcription fidèle de la cause ci-haut mentionnée.
- QU'UNE copie conforme certificat établi en application du paragraphe 3(1) de la Loi qui accompagnait le procès verbal est annexée et intitulée Annexe « A ».

SWORN TO at the City of Saint John, in the Province of New Brunswick, this 16TH DECEMBER, 2011. day of

ASSERMENTÉ devant moi, dans la , dans la de province du Nouveau-Brunswick 20 le

BEFORE ME:

DEVANT MOI :

KARYL M. MCLEOD Court Sterographer / Sténographe judici SOMMISSIONER OF OATHS December 31, 2042

Commissioner of oaths / Commissaire aux serments My commission expires on the  $\!\!\!/$  Ma commission se termine le :