

# Municipal statutory defences remain alive and well: *Hamilton-Dawkins v Town of Ajax*

16 mai 2024

The Ontario Superior Court of Justice recently released a decision in [\*Hamilton-Dawkins v Ajax\*](#). This claim involved a trip and fall over a municipal sidewalk in the Town of Ajax (the Town) due to a surface discontinuity. It was uncontroverted at trial that the sidewalk **surface discontinuity constituted a state of non-repair and caused the plaintiff's injuries**. Damages were also agreed upon.

The only issue to be decided at trial was whether the Town could rely on the statutory defences afforded to municipalities in section 44(3) of the Municipal Act (which are replicated in the City of Toronto Act). Ultimately, the court held that the defence under section 44(3)(a), the reasonable knowledge defence, applied and dismissed the plaintiff's claim on this basis.

## The accident

On May 9, 2011, the plaintiff was walking on the sidewalk in the Town, when she tripped and fell due to a surface discontinuity in front of 38 Clements Road East. The plaintiff and her husband called the City on May 12 or 13, 2011, to report the accident (incorrectly stated as “2022” in the decision). The plaintiff also filled out an accident form for the Town on May 13, 2012.

The plaintiff drove by the loss location with her husband one day after her fall and noticed there was neon painting by the area of her fall. She subsequently returned to the loss location about one week later to take a photograph and saw that the sidewalk bay and slab had been completely replaced.

## Evidence of the Town

The Town's witness testified that the Town inspected its sidewalks once per year between May and August. During these inspections, students would patrol the sidewalks and mark on a GPS device any issues, including cracked panels and surface discontinuities. Any height discrepancy of 19mm or more was marked with orange paint and forwarded for repair.

The sidewalk at issue was inspected a year before the accident on May 27, 2010. No height discrepancy over 19mm was noted. There was some cracking, but it did not meet the standard for repair. Following the plaintiff's report of her accident, the Town repaired the sidewalk within one week.

## Court's decision

The court began by reiterating the four-step test for analyzing the statutory cause of action against a municipality: (i) non-repair, (ii) causation, (iii) statutory defences; and (iv) contributory negligence.

As the Town had conceded the first two steps, the court turned to the Town's statutory defences under section 44(3) of the Municipal Act: (a) the reasonable knowledge defence, (b) the reasonable steps defence, and (c) the minimum standards defence. The court re-iterated that the Town need only establish, on the balance of probabilities, that one of the defences applies to avoid liability.

The Town argued that the prevailing caselaw established that a court has to determine whether or not the municipality knew or ought to have known of the specific condition which justified a finding there was a failure to keep the highway in a reasonable state of repair.

The court however noted that caution had to be taken that a municipality should not readily benefit from its own failure to document or circulate complaints properly and noted that, at the time of the trip and fall, the Town knew there was a concern with the sidewalk (the crack noted on the sidewalk patrols).

Ultimately however, the court found that there was no evidence the Town knew or could have known of the surface discontinuity that caused the plaintiff's fall or that the Town did not follow their own policy of inspection and repair. The court therefore held that the Town had established the first defence in section 44(3)(a) of the Municipal Act and dismissed the claim on this basis, noting that there was no need to conduct an analysis of the defences found in 44(3)(b) and 44(3)(c).

## Key takeaways

### Statutory Defences remain Alive and Well

Municipalities should continue to plead and rely on the statutory defences in the Municipal Act as this case emphasizes that the courts seriously consider these defences and continue to recognize that each establishes a full and complete defence to a claim against a municipality.

### Continue to Ensure Compliance with Inspections

In this case, the Town's evidence of its sidewalk walkover inspections completed just less than a year prior to the accident was key to showing the court that the Town complied with its required inspections and was unaware of any issue with this area prior to the accident.

**Par**

[Jonathan Thoburn, Christine Kucey](#)

**Services**

[Litiges, Responsabilité municipale](#)

---

**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 800 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 sopesé 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).

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L. Borden Ladner Gervais est une société à responsabilité limitée de l'Ontario.