

CANADA / JUDGMENT

Loughlin v. Canada (Attorney General)

2026 FC 116

COURT

Federal Court

DECIDED

27 January 2026

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

Loughlin v. Canada (Attorney General) Court (s) Database Federal Court Decisions Date 2026-01-27 Neutral citation 2026 FC 116 File numbers T-2469-25 Decision Content Date: 20260127 Docket: T-2469-25 Citation: 2026 FC 116 Toronto, Ontario, January 27, 2026 PRESENT: Madam Justice Whyte Nowak BETWEEN: MONICA LOUGHLIN Applicant and ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA Respondent JUDGMENT AND REASONS I. Overview [1] The Applicant, Monica Loughlin [Applicant], is a self-represented litigant who seeks judicial review of a decision dated June 25, 2025 [Decision] of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada [PSIC Commissioner]. The Decision responds to a complaint made by the Applicant against the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada [Registrar] who in 2023 refused the Applicant's motion for reconsideration of a dismissal of her application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

- [2] In the Decision, the PSIC Commissioner determined that the complaints made against the Registrar concerned an adjudicative decision by the Registrar and that pursuant to subsection 24(2) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, SC 2005, c 46 [PSDPA], she was therefore required to refuse to commence an investigation into the Applicant's disclosure.
- [3] The Applicant has admitted that her application is directed at the decision of the Registrar and not the Decision, with which she candidly admits she takes no issue. Accordingly, this application is dismissed as there is no basis for this Court's intervention. II. Preliminary Issues [4] The Respondent raised issues related to the Application Record and the style of cause, upon which the Applicant took no position.
- [5] First, the Respondent objected to the Notice of Application [NOA] contained in the Application Record as it is not the same as the Notice of Application that was originally served and filed on July 17, 2025 [Original NOA]. I agree that the Application Record should be considered to include only the Original NOA as the Applicant did not bring a motion to amend the Original NOA as she was required to do under Rule 75(1) of the Federal Courts Rules, SOR/98-106 [Federal Courts Rules].

[6] Second, the style of cause in this proceeding names the Registrar personally. I agree that the style of cause should be amended to name the Attorney General of Canada as the sole respondent to this application in accordance with Rules 76 and 303(2) of the Federal Courts Rules. III. Analysis [7] The standard of review of the Decision, including the PSIC Commissioner's interpretation of section 24 of the PSDPA, is reasonableness (Canada (Attorney General) v Canada (Public Sector Integrity Commissioner), 2016 FC 886 at para 74) and given that the Applicant has not only failed to raise an issue going to the reasonableness of the Decision in her written materials, but admitted at the hearing that she is "not challenging any omission or decision of [the PSIC Commissioner]," I am dismissing this application without any examination of the merits of the Decision as the Applicant has not met her onus of demonstrating a basis for this Court's intervention (Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov, 2019 SCC 65 at paras 99-101). IV. Costs [8] The Respondent has asked for \$3,000 in costs based on a calculation under Tariff B of the Federal Courts Rules. I am mindful that the Applicant is a self-represented litigant, albeit one with a year of law school and a career as a paralegal. I have considered as well, what I perceived at the hearing to be a genuine belief on the part of the Applicant that she had been wronged and that she was seeking to improve access to justice for the greater good. However, the Applicant's proceeding was fundamentally misconceived, and she should bear the costs associated with the wasted cost in time, fees and court resources associated with this proceeding. I am awarding costs in the lump sum amount of \$1,500 payable forthwith. V. Conclusion [9] The Applicant has not met her onus on this application and therefore it is dismissed with costs. JUDGMENT in T-2469-25 THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that: The style of cause is amended to name the Attorney General of Canada as the named Respondent; The Application for judicial review is dismissed; and The Applicant shall pay the Respondent the lump sum cost award of \$1,500 payable forthwith. "Allyson Whyte Nowak" Judge FEDERAL COURT SOLICITORS OF RECORD DOCKET: T-2469-25 STYLE OF CAUSE: MONICA LOUGHLIN v ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA PLACE OF HEARING: EDMONTON, ALBERTA DATE OF HEARING: JANUARY 21, 2026 JUDGMENT AND REASONS: WHYTE NOWAK J. DATED: JANUARY 27, 2026 APPEARANCES: Monica Loughlin For The Applicant (ON HER OWN BEHALF) Barry Benkendorf For The Respondent SOLICITORS OF RECORD: Attorney General of Canada Edmonton, Alberta For The Respondent

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/fc-cf/decisions/en/item/529784/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/loughlin-v-canada-attorney-general-2026>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria