

# Limitation Period Began to Run When Plaintiff Threatened Class Action

26 septembre 2019

In [Asfar v. Sun Life](#), Justice Nakatsuru of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice granted summary judgment in favour of the defendant and dismissed the plaintiffs' claim on the basis that the plaintiffs discovered that they had a claim against the defendant nearly 10 years prior to commencing their action. In particular, the court considered the fact that the plaintiffs threatened the defendant with a class action and therefore understood that they had potentially suffered loss or damage at the hands of the defendant.

## Facts

The plaintiffs, Mr. Jean-Pierre Asfar and Equity Cheque Card Corporation Ltd. (ECCC), commenced an action in April of 2018 against Sun Life for a host of issues relating to five mortgages by Sun Life, the last of which discharged in 2006. In the Statement of Claim, the plaintiffs attacked the various aspects of the mortgage process, the conditions of the mortgage, the fees and interest charged, and the profits made by Sun Life. The plaintiffs claimed them to be fraudulent, forged, deceitful, and illegal. In response, Sun Life moved to have the plaintiffs' action dismissed, on the basis that the action was frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process. Sun Life also moved for summary judgment on the ground that the plaintiffs' claims were statute-barred.

## Outcome

Justice Nakatsuru was not satisfied that the plaintiffs' claim ought to be dismissed on the grounds that that the action was frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process. Although the Court noted that the plaintiffs threatened to start a class action against Sun Life and even went so far as to publish an alleged libelous Class Action Notice in the *Globe and Mail* newspaper, the Court found it more appropriate to dispose of the plaintiffs' action by granting summary judgment in favour of the defendants.

In that regard, the Court considered whether or not there was a genuine issue requiring a trial with respect to all or part of the claim. Sun Life argued that the plaintiffs' claim was statute-barred and was commenced outside the applicable limitation period. The plaintiffs, on the other hand, argued that they only discovered they had a claim against Sun Life in 2016.

Upon review of the plaintiffs' own affidavit evidence, the Court was satisfied that by May of 2006, the plaintiffs knew that they suffered loss or damages and could bring a legal claim against the defendant. Indeed, in 2006, the plaintiffs created legal documents to try to enforce their claims against Sun Life. Specifically, the individual plaintiff wrote to Sun Life and threatened to commence a class action if his demands were not met.

The plaintiffs, however, argued that their claims were not statute barred, because they included claims of fraud, forgery, and various criminal acts, which, in the plaintiffs' view, suspended the limitation period. The Court did not agree, and remained satisfied that the plaintiffs discovered the "fraud" in May of 2006 and that the limitation period began to run on that date.

## Takeaway

Justice Nakatsuru's decision serves as insight into the Court's analysis regarding discoverability. The Court considered, among other things, the fact that the plaintiffs threatened the defendant with a class action nearly 10 years earlier. Although a claim was not formally commenced at that time, the Court was satisfied that the plaintiffs were aware several years prior they had suffered injury, loss, or damages and a legal proceeding was the appropriate way to remedy it.

An interesting question, not addressed in the decision, is what would have happened if a different individual (not the one who had threatened the class action) had commenced a class proceeding more than two years (the applicable limitation period) after the threat. Arguably, the fact that a class action notice had been published in a major newspaper could mean that the claim of any class member who had seen the notice at the time would be statute-barred. At a minimum, the defendants could argue that the question of whether or not particular class members' claims would be statute-barred would be an individual issue that would make the case unsuitable for certification.

### Par

[Samantha Bonanno](#)

### Services

[Actions collectives, Litiges](#)

## BLG | Vos avocats au Canada

Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. (BLG) est le plus grand cabinet d'avocats canadien véritablement multiservices. À ce titre, il offre des conseils juridiques pratiques à des clients d'ici et d'ailleurs dans plus de domaines et de secteurs que tout autre cabinet canadien. Comptant plus de 725 avocats, agents de propriété intellectuelle et autres professionnels, BLG répond aux besoins juridiques d'entreprises et d'institutions au pays comme à l'étranger pour ce qui touche les fusions et acquisitions, les marchés financiers, les différends et le financement ou encore l'enregistrement de brevets et de marques de commerce.

[blg.com](http://blg.com)

### Bureaux BLG

#### 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, rue De La Gauchetière Ouest  
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

Les présents renseignements sont de nature générale et ne sauraient constituer un avis juridique, ni un énoncé complet de la législation pertinente, ni un avis sur un quelconque sujet. Personne ne devrait agir ou s'abstenir d'agir sur la foi de ceux-ci sans procéder à un examen approfondi du droit après avoir soupesé les faits d'une situation précise. Nous vous recommandons de consulter votre conseiller juridique si vous avez des questions ou des préoccupations particulières. BLG ne garantit aucunement que la teneur de cette publication est exacte, à jour ou complète. Aucune partie de cette publication ne peut être reproduite sans l'autorisation écrite de Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Si BLG vous a envoyé cette publication et que vous ne souhaitez plus la recevoir, vous pouvez demander à faire supprimer vos coordonnées de nos listes d'envoi en communiquant avec nous par courriel à [desabonnement@blg.com](mailto:desabonnement@blg.com) ou en modifiant vos préférences d'abonnement dans [blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe](http://blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe). Si vous pensez avoir reçu le présent message par erreur, veuillez nous écrire à [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). Pour consulter la politique de confidentialité de BLG relativement aux publications, rendez-vous sur [blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels](http://blg.com/fr/ProtectionDesRenseignementsPersonnels).

© 2025 Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Borden Ladner Gervais est une société à responsabilité limitée de l'Ontario.