

CANADA / JUDGMENT

Hud v. West Nipissing (Municipality)

2026 ONCA 260

COURT

Court of Appeal for Ontario

DECIDED

9 April 2026

Source: norma.lexum.com · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Hud v. West Nipissing (Municipality) Collection Decisions of the Court of Appeal Date 2026-04-09
Neutral citation 2026 ONCA 260 Docket numbers COA-25-CV-0842 Judges Paciocco, David M.;
Thorburn, Julie; Dawe, Jonathan Subject Civil Decision Content COURT OF APPEAL FOR
ONTARIO CITATION: Hud v. West Nipissing (Municipality), 2026 ONCA 260 DATE: 20260409
DOCKET: COA-25-CV-0842 Paciocco, Thorburn and Dawe J.J.A. BETWEEN Lorence Hud Plaintiff
(Appellant) and The Corporation of The Municipality of West Nipissing, 10306398 Canada Ltd.,
Chris Amon, His Majesty the King in Right of Ontario, The West Nipissing Police Services Board,
Louise Laforge, Charles Seguin, Raymond St. Pierre, Nathalie Rifou, Peter Mantha, Francois
Savage, David Van Dusen, Craig Furtney, Ryan Naismith, Greg Walsh, Daniel Bellefeuille, Jason
Veley, E.P. Lefebvre, Jason Perpich, Brendan Clarke, and John Doe Defendants/Moving Parties
(Respondents) Lorence Hud, acting in person Rose Muscolino, for the respondents, The
Corporation of the Municipality of West Nipissing, The West Nipissing Police Services Board,
Louise Laforge, Charles Seguin, Raymond St. Pierre, Nathalie Rifou, Peter Mantha and Francois
Savage Ashlee Barber, for the respondents, Chris Amon and 10306398 Canada Ltd. Liam Dart, for
the respondents, His Majesty the King in Right of Ontario, David Van Dusen, Craig Furtney, Ryan
Naismith, Greg Walsh, Daniel Bellefeuille, Jason Veley, E.P. Lefebvre, Jason Perpich, Brendan
Clarke and John Doe Heard and rendered orally: April 8, 2026 On appeal from the order of Justice
M. Gregory Ellies of the Superior Court of Justice, dated June 12, 2025. REASONS FOR DECISION

- [1] The appeal before us is from a June 12, 2025, scheduling order made in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in connection with longstanding litigation initiated by Mr. Hud against numerous defendants. A scheduling order is an interlocutory order because it does not determine the merits of the dispute: *Ontario College of Teachers v. Bouragba*, 2021 ONCA 8. The appeal should therefore have been brought to the Divisional Court. Since this is not a final order, this court does not have jurisdiction to hear the appeal. The appeal is therefore quashed. The issues of concern to Mr. Hud will be dealt with in the summary judgment motion.
- [2] We have decided, in our discretion, not to award costs. “David M. Paciocco J.A.” “Thorburn J.A.” “J. Dawe J.A.”

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://norma.lexum.com/coa/coa/en/item/24085/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/hud-v-west-nipissing-municipality-2026>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria