

Court of Appeal Clarifies “Some Basis in Fact” Requirement for Common Issues in Class Actions

October 25, 2018

In its recent decision in [Fehr v Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada](#), the Ontario Court of Appeal, overturning in part certain holdings of the lower court, certified a class-action lawsuit brought on behalf of former policyholders respecting the sale of universal life policies issued by predecessors of the defendant.

The ruling represents the most recent appellate statement with respect to the extent to which courts should delve into the merits of a proposed class action at the certification stage. In particular, the Court has clarified that, in considering the "common issues" criterion for certification, the certification judge should determine whether the plaintiff has established **some basis in fact** for the existence of an issue that can be decided on behalf of all class members. The certification judge should not determine whether there is a basis to conclude that the proposed common issue should be decided in the plaintiff's favour. The Court accordingly effectively reaffirmed the purpose of a certification motion as a "meaningful screening device" as opposed to a test on the merits. The ruling also illustrates the strict approach taken to interpretation, construction, and effect of insurance policies with respect to terms relying on industry custom for meaning (as evidence to prove such custom may have limited admissibility on such motions).

The decision relates to a class action proceeding against Sun Life commenced in the Ontario Superior Court in 2010, on behalf of holders of certain universal life policies (which were acquired decades earlier as investments with returns tied to the vagaries of interest rate fluctuations). The class proceeding alleged, among other things, misrepresentation (chiefly regarding investment return), breach of contract, and fraudulent concealment (regarding ability of policy-holders/ investors to timely discover the alleged breach(es) in question). The class proceeding spawned a series of decisions in which the lower court ruled in favor of the defendant, declining to certify the class action on the basis that the claims were not properly constituted as a class action, e.g. not raising "common issues" (in respect of the misrepresentation claims), invalid, "inchoate" (i.e. premature), and, in respect of some of the claims (the misrepresentation and some of the breach of contract claims), time-barred.

On appeal, the court upheld some of these findings by the lower court (e.g. the misrepresentation claims) and overruled others (e.g. the breach of contract and fraudulent concealment claims) and, incidentally, found that some of the claims were not time-barred. The class action proceeded on the "breach of contract" and "fraudulent concealment" claims.

On the breach of contract (of insurance) claims, the court provided a reminder of the procedural nature of a certification motion: namely, that this is not a step inviting analysis and determination of the merits of the dispute. The Court of Appeal further concluded that the lower court's approach to the "common issue" criterion (that there be **common - but not necessarily identical - issues of fact or of law arising therefrom**) did not withstand appellate scrutiny. The lower court had "decided the proposed common issue by interpreting the contract and making a finding that there was no breach" as opposed to deciding whether there was some basis in fact to conclude that the question of whether a breach had occurred could be decided on a class-wide basis. By deciding the issue of whether a breach had occurred, the certification judge usurped "a task for the judge at the common issues trial, not the judge dealing with certification," as the appellate court put it. This is consistent with the limitation on admissibility of evidence proffered for merits of the claim as opposed to for pure certification criteria (in this case, the lower court had considered evidence of industry practice tendered by Sun Life in support of a specific interpretation of the insurance contract).

By

[Martin Abadi](#)

Expertise

[Class Action Defence, Appellate Advocacy, Disputes](#)

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 800 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

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 De La Gauchetière Street West
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

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2026 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.