

CANADA / JUDGMENT

N.M. v. G.L.

2025 BCSC 1403

COURT

Supreme Court of British Columbia

DECIDED

23 July 2025

Source: bccourts.ca · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

2025 BCSC 1403 N.M. v. G.L.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation:

N.M. v. G.L.,

2025 BCSC 1403

Date: 20250723

Docket: E251500

Registry: Vancouver

Between:

N.M.

Claimant

And

G.L. and B.D.E. Ltd.

Respondents

Before: Associate Judge Hughes

Reasons for Judgment

Counsel for the Claimant:

J. Murphy

Counsel for the Respondent, G.L.:

D.H. Goodwin

Place and Date of Hearing:

New Westminster, B.C.

July 2, 2025

Place and Date of Judgment:

New Westminster, B.C.

July 23, 2025

- [1] The respondent spouse, G.L., applies to set aside or vary a without notice protection order granted by Associate Judge Muir on June 11, 2025 (the "Protection Order"), and for parenting time with the parties' 4 year old son.
- [2] G.L. and the claimant, N.M., commenced cohabitation in May 2019, married in September 2024, and separated on May 28, 2025. They are the parents of one child, born in 2020 ("L.L." or the "Child"). The respondent also has three older children from a prior relationship, one of whom, 14 year old C.L., resided with the parties.
- [3] The corporate respondent (the "Company"), which is in some financial difficulty, is owned by G.L. and jointly operated by the parties.
- [4] In her affidavit #1 filed June 11, 2025 in support of her protection order application, the claimant details her concerns about the respondent's mental state and various incidents of family violence during the relationship. The allegations of family violence include verbal, emotional, sexual and financial violence and coercive and controlling behaviour. The claimant deposes that the respondent is volatile, has threatened her with violence throughout their relationship, and has threatened to kill himself and others on numerous occasions. Many of the claimant's allegations are supported by evidence of text message between the parties, in which the respondent uses vulgar, demeaning and derogatory language towards the claimant.
- [5] Due to the claimant's concerns about how the respondent would react to her decision to separate, she packed her car and left on May 28, 2025 with L.L., with no prior notice to the respondent. The claimant is currently staying at her parents' residence on Vancouver Island.
- [6] The Protection Order restrains the respondent from directly or indirectly communicating with the claimant or with the Child, with the exception of communication via email strictly in relation to the day-to-day operations of the Company. It also restrains the respondent from being within 300m of the claimant's parents' residence, place of work or the Child, from following the claimant or the Child, or from possessing a weapon or firearm.

- [7] The claimant alleges that the respondent committed four separate breaches of the Protection Order shortly after being served with it. On June 16, 2025, the respondent was arrested and charged with failing to comply with a court order under s. 127 of the Criminal Code of Canada. He was released on an undertaking which includes the same terms as the Protection Order with respect to N.M. The undertaking does not include any restrictions on the respondent's contact with L.L.
- [8] In his affidavit #1 filed June 18, 2025, the respondent denies most of the claimant's allegations against him. He does admit to using verbally abusive language towards the claimant, but says that these were arguments and that the abuse was mutual. I note that none of the text messages exhibited to the claimant's affidavit #1 show any evidence of mutual verbal abuse, as the foul language is all one-sided on the part of the respondent.
- [9] In the same affidavit, the respondent admits "I have expressed to the Claimant that my mental health is horrible as a result of the extreme stress from business and personal financial difficulties." He also told the claimant that he would undertake anger management counselling to address his anger, but there is no evidence that he has done so. He also admits to saying on occasion that he was "about to snap".
- [10] The claimant says that the respondent has, at times, threatened to kill himself and other family members. The respondent admits that he has made statements that he felt like he should kill himself, but denies meaning it. Even if the respondent did not mean that he wanted to kill himself, he does not acknowledge the impact that such threats had on N.M. He denies threatening to kill the claimant or L.L.
- [11] The respondent's affidavit also exhibits a series of affectionate text messages between the parties, replete with an abundance of kissing and heart emojis. He says that these messages contradict the claimant's alleged fear of him, and show that they have had a loving and affectionate relationship, even in the recent months leading up to their separation. His first affidavit expressed a desire to reconcile.
- [12] The claimant denies the respondent's allegations of mutual conflict. She says that the respondent was the aggressor and would fly into verbal rages, and that she would try to appease him in order to de-escalate the situation.
- [13] She describes the respondent's controlling behaviour in limiting her contact with her friends and family and demanding to always know where she was. The respondent's affidavit does not deny but rather attempts to justify his controlling actions.
- [14] As an example, the claimant says that the respondent would not allow her to study at a coffee shop on the Simon Fraser University campus, because she would be unsafe or putting herself in a position to cheat on him. The respondent, in reply, justifies telling the claimant not to study there because a friend told him that the coffee shop was a "meat market" where people would go to pick up dates.

- [15] The respondent acknowledges he insisted that the claimant keep her cell phone turned on and not silenced, so that she can immediately answer his calls or texts, and that he wanted the claimant to let him know where she was and what she was doing.
- [16] On the evidence before me, it is clear that the respondent has engaged in coercive and controlling behaviour, including isolating the claimant from others.
- [17] I reserved decision as counsel did not make extensive submissions on the claimant's first affidavit due to limited time. Now that I have had an opportunity to review the claimant's first affidavit and the exhibited text messages, it is clear that the respondent's communications with the claimant have been emotionally and verbally abusive with demeaning and derogatory name-calling. The fact that the respondent has communicated in this manner in text messages lends credence to the claimant's allegations that the respondent called her similar names in person, without regard to whether L.L. or C.L. were present.
- [18] The claimant alleges that the respondent has verbally raged at her, including in the presence of the children, and that he has also raged at C.L. in L.L.'s presence, including the use of foul and demeaning language. This behaviour appears to be increasing in frequency and severity with the stress that the respondent acknowledges he is under.
- [19] On the whole, after reviewing all of the affidavits, I am satisfied that there is merit to the claimant's allegations of verbal and emotional abuse and coercive, controlling behaviour on the part of the respondent. The affectionate texts relied on by the respondent do not negate this conclusion. There are different possible explanations for such texts, including that they are evidence of the claimant's further appeasement of the respondent.
- [20] There is evidence that L.L. has been exposed to family violence, in the form of abusive and vulgar language and threats directed towards the claimant and towards C.L., in L.L.'s presence. If the respondent has unsupervised parenting time, L.L. may continue to be so exposed unless the respondent takes active steps to learn how to manage his behaviour. Both the claimant and L.L. are at risk family members and in my view there is sufficient evidence that family violence is likely to occur in the future to justify a continuation of the protection order and that the respondent's parenting time be supervised.
- [21] Accordingly, the respondent's application to set aside the Protection Order in its entirety is dismissed.
- [22] Paragraph 1 of the Protection Order is varied to add two additional exceptions as follows:
- a) allowing for indirect communication with the claimant through counsel or a mutually agreed third party for the purpose of arranging, facilitating and exercising parenting time with L.L.; and
 - b) allowing for communication with L.L. for the purpose of exercising parenting time pursuant to court order or written agreement between the parties.

[23] The respondent may have interim parenting time with L.L. as follows:

- a) By telephone three times per week on times and days to be agreed upon through counsel; and
- b) In person parenting time once per week to be supervised by a professional parenting supervisor for a duration of up to 4 hours, with the specific times and dates to be agreed upon through counsel, taking into consideration the availability of the supervisor. The supervisor is to provide a written report of each session to counsel for both parents. The respondent shall pay the cost of the supervised parenting time and the supervisor's reports. The supervisor is to be mutually agreed upon.

[24] The parties have liberty to apply in the event that they are unable to reach agreement with respect to the timing or implementation of the respondent's parenting time.

[25] Either party may apply to vary the respondent's interim parenting time after a minimum of 8 supervised parenting sessions, with the supervisor's reports to be tendered in evidence on any such application.

[26] As the successful party, the claimant is entitled to her costs of this application in the cause.

"Associate Judge Hughes"

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://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/25/14/2025BCSC1403.htm>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/n-m-v-g-l-2025>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria