

CANADA / JUDGMENT

Singh v. Seth

2026 ONCA 276

COURT

Court of Appeal for Ontario

DECIDED

17 April 2026

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

Singh v. Seth Collection Decisions of the Court of Appeal Date 2026-04-17 Neutral citation 2026 ONCA 276 Docket numbers COA-24-CV-0593 Judges Huscroft, Grant; Copeland, Jill M.; Wilson, Darla A. Subject Family Decision Content COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO CITATION: Singh v. Seth, 2026 ONCA 276 DATE: 20260417 DOCKET: COA-24-CV-0593 Huscroft, Copeland & Wilson JJ.A. BETWEEN Jag Jayden Singh Appellant and Mona Seth Respondent Jag Jayden Singh, acting in person Amandeep S. Dhillon and Rida Malik, for the respondent Heard: April 8, 2026 On appeal from the judgment of Justice George Czutrin of the Superior Court of Justice, dated June 11, 2024. REASONS FOR DECISION

- [1] The appellant appeals from the judgment of Czutrin J. which followed an uncontested family law trial. He advances two grounds of appeal. First, he argues that the trial judge erred in his calculation of equalization and spousal support payments. Second, he submits that the trial judge failed to provide reasons that are capable of meaningful appellate review and, consequently, the judgment must be set aside.
- [2] The appellant's application was struck. In this case, we have exercised our discretion to consider his appeal: *Peerenboom v. Peerenboom*, 2020 ONCA 240, 446 D.L.R. (4th) 418, at para. 56. The appellant challenges the findings of the trial judge and asks this court to redo them, which is not our role. There is no merit to his submissions and, for the reasons that follow, we dismiss the appeal. A. Background [3] The parties married in 2008 and separated in 2012. They had no children. The appellant issued an application in 2014, seeking a divorce and various other relief. The issues for determination included equalization of net family property and spousal support. The application did not proceed efficiently. After much delay, a trial date was set for 2022.
- [4] Because the appellant failed to make the requisite financial disclosure and had not complied with orders of the court, on February 27, 2022, the motion judge, Faieta J., struck the application and permitted the respondent to proceed in the matter to an uncontested trial. He found the appellant's conduct during the litigation "outrageous". Ample opportunity had been afforded to the appellant to comply with court orders and his obligations under the Family Law Rules, O. Reg. 114/99, and he had repeatedly chosen not to do so. An appeal from the motion judge's order was dismissed by this court: *Singh v. Seth*, 2022 ONCA 837.

- [5] The uncontested trial proceeded on the basis of the respondent's affidavit evidence. Over 400 pages of documentation, including financial records, were appended to her affidavit in support of her claim. Relying on this evidence, the trial judge ordered the appellant pay the sum of \$471,963.12 for equalization of net family property, a lump sum spousal support payment of \$89,460, and costs. B. Analysis [6] The appellant argues that the trial judge decided the application on an incomplete picture of the parties' financial affairs and, as a result, made errors in his calculations. In determining equalization and spousal support, the trial judge was entitled to rely on the financial evidence provided by the respondent, since the appellant's application had been struck for his failure to produce his own financial documentation. The respondent tendered bank statements, tax returns, and documentation relating to various properties the parties had purchased during the course of their marriage. The trial judge made no error in the equalization calculations based on the evidence before him.
- [7] Nor was there any error in the trial judge's decision to impute an income of \$200,000 to the appellant for the purposes of the spousal support calculation. This outcome was the result of the appellant's failure to make financial disclosure of his income. The amount the trial judge arrived at was appropriately based on the financial evidence provided by the respondent – the only evidence before the trial judge.
- [8] The trial judge's decisions regarding the quantum and duration of spousal support are entitled to considerable deference on appeal. Absent an error in principle, a significant misapprehension of the evidence, or an award that is clearly wrong, this court cannot intervene: *Hickey v. Hickey*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 518, at para. 11. We see no such error here.
- [9] Finally, the appellant argues that the trial judge failed to provide sufficient reasons for his decision. We do not agree. On this uncontested trial determining issues of equalization and spousal support, there was no competing evidence for the trial judge to contend with. The trial judge's decision was made entirely on the respondent's evidence, and in this context, the basis for his calculations is readily understood. C. Disposition [10] The appeal is dismissed. Costs in the amount of \$25,000, inclusive of the costs of the related motions before this court, are to be paid by the appellant to the respondent forthwith. "Grant Huscroft J.A." "J. Copeland J.A." "D.A. Wilson 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/24107/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/singh-v-seth-2026>

Prepared on 24 October 2026 · Esheria