

Mayers V. Khan — Summary Judgment Can Be Appropriate to Determine Liability Even When Key Facts Are in Dispute

23 février 2017

In [Mayers v. Khan, 2017 ONSC 200](#), the Superior Court of Justice concluded that a motion for summary judgment can be appropriate in motor vehicle accident claims involving liability disputes even when there are disagreements as to key facts, particularly when the costs of a trial on damages and liability would be significant.

The defendant moved for summary judgment seeking a dismissal of the plaintiff's claim on the basis that he was not liable for an accident that was caused when his truck collided with the plaintiff's left-turning vehicle.

The plaintiff was travelling eastbound on Lawrence Avenue in Scarborough. The defendant was travelling Westbound on Lawrence Avenue. The plaintiff's evidence was that she made a left turn onto Birchmount road on an "advance green" light and claimed that the defendant struck her vehicle as he drove through a red light. The defendant's evidence was that his traffic light was green and turned amber when he was in the middle of the intersection. An independent witness had no evidence as to the colour of the light when the defendant entered into the intersection but gave evidence that the traffic light was amber for the plaintiff's vehicle when it turned left and that is when the defendant's truck entered the intersection.

The plaintiff, seeking a full trial, relied on a comment in *Cadogan v. Lavigne*, 2000 CarswellOnt 2191 (SCJ) that "the occasion would be rare in which a motion for summary judgement would succeed in a motor vehicle negligence claim," although the judge in that case noted that "circumstances, however, are so myriad and idiosyncratic that the circumstances for such a successful motion may well arise."

The motions judge relied on the general principles set out in [Hryniak v. Mauldin, 2014 SCC 7](#) in determining that there should be no presumption against the availability of summary judgment for motor vehicle negligence cases. Under the Hryniak principles, summary judgment is appropriate given the time and costs involved to address damages, causation and threshold issues at trial.

The plaintiff submitted that there was a genuine issue requiring a trial because she had two theories as to liability of the defendant:

1. The plaintiff turned left on an advance green and the defendant drove through the intersection on a red light. On that basis the defendant could be liable; or
2. If the trial judge does not accept the plaintiff's evidence of an "advance green light", there is a genuine issue requiring a trial to determine whether the plaintiff turned on the yellow light, with the defendant contributorily liable for failing to take reasonable precautions to avoid the collision.

After considering the applicable summary judgment principles and motor vehicle negligence law, the motions judge concluded that neither theory raised a genuine issue requiring a trial. It is not simply because there is a conflict in evidence that a case must proceed to trial. The court must consider the evidence as a whole to determine whether it is an appropriate case for summary judgment.

The motions judge relied heavily on the evidence of the independent witness in rejecting the plaintiff's "contributory negligence" theory. The witness' evidence was that the plaintiff turned on the amber light and immediately thereafter the defendant's truck collided with the plaintiff's vehicle. The witness said it happened "so fast" since the defendant's truck was "already there" when the plaintiff turned on the amber light. The defendant's evidence was that the plaintiff's vehicle attempted to turn directly in front of his vehicle. In the circumstances, there was no genuine issue requiring a trial to determine whether the defendant could have avoided the collision, a finding which would be required in order for the plaintiff's "contributory negligence" theory to be **successful. The only reasonable evidence to accept was that the collision occurred "too fast" for the defendant to do anything to avoid the collision.**

In reaching this decision and granting the motion, the court confirmed that motions for summary judgment can be effective when the cost and time required to resolve the same issue at trial would be grossly disproportionate. The court further confirmed that **following Hryniak** there should be no presumption about which types of cases are or are not suited for summary judgment.

Par

[Michelle Doody, Dalton McGuinty Jr.](#)

Services

[Contestation de réclamations d'assurance](#)

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

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 ou en modifiant vos préférences d'abonnement dans blg.com/fr/about-us/subscribe. Si vous pensez avoir reçu le présent message par erreur, veuillez nous écrire à communications@blg.com. Pour consulter la politique de confidentialité de BLG relativement aux publications, rendez-vous sur 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.