

Environmental Prosecutions – Defence Strategies & Latest Cases

Jacquelyn Stevens

Partner, Certified Specialist in Environmental Law by the Law Society of Ontario

John Georgakopoulos

Partner, Certified Specialist in Environmental Law by the Law Society of Ontario

EnviroTech 2019
Calgary, Alberta
April 24, 2019

Overview

- **Environmental Liabilities**
- **Inspections vs Investigations**
- **Potential Legal Defences**
- **Sentencing & Implications of Conviction**
- **Environmental Prosecutions – Case Law Updates**

ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITIES

Environmental Liabilities

- **Regulatory Liability**

- regulator can issue orders
- regulator can prosecute under environmental statutes
- “person responsible”, “contaminant”, “adverse effect”

- **Civil Liability**

- contamination on-site (soil, groundwater, indoor air)
- contaminant migration and impact off-site (groundwater, air emissions)
- concept of “flow through” property
- causes of action and damages

Personal Environmental Liabilities

- **Personal Environmental Regulatory Liability**
 - individuals may be ordered and/or prosecuted
 - statutory liability for Directors, Officers and agents
- **Personal Environmental Civil Liability**
 - individuals may be sued
 - precedent from the Ontario Court of Appeal (*Midwest*) for piercing corporate veil in an environmental lawsuit

INSPECTIONS VS INVESTIGATIONS

Inspections

- **Inspections occur**
 - to verify compliance with the Act
 - where inspector has “reasonable grounds to believe” or “reasonably believes” that substance or documents related to Act can be found in the place.
- **Inspectors can require persons on site to**
 - give “all reasonable assistance”
 - furnish all information that the inspector may reasonably require to carry out his/her duties

Inspections – Obstruction

- **It is an offence to**
 - knowingly make false or misleading statements
 - obstruct or hinder the Inspector (such as physically preventing the inspection)
 - provide false or misleading samples, results, or documents

Investigations

- **Investigations occur**
 - when reasonable and probable grounds formed of contravention that constitutes an offence
 - for the purpose of seeking evidence for prosecution of an offence
 - to seek evidence of due diligence

Investigations – With Consent

- **Voluntary investigation can take place where**
 - agree to interviews
 - agree to disclose documents
 - allow investigator on premises

Investigations – Without Consent

- **Exigent circumstances**
 - impractical to obtain a search warrant
 - reasonable grounds to believe entry necessary to prevent imminent loss or destruction of evidence
 - a pollution offence has been committed
 - place to be searched likely has evidence of offence
 - can involve police assistance

Investigations – Without Consent

- **Judicial Authorization**
 - search warrant (becoming more frequent)
 - judicial order
 - can involve police assistance

Search Warrants & Orders – What to do?

- **Investigator should provide a copy when executing**
 - immediately review with lawyer to
 - determine scope of authorization
 - consider challenge of basis for authorization
- **Cooperate, with caution – non-compliance is contempt of court (criminal consequences)**
- **Ask for a list of items seized**
- **Segregate documents and assert claim of legal privilege (where appropriate)**
- **Conduct training, organize files in advance!**

Investigations – Obstruction

- **It is an offence to**
 - hinder an investigator carrying out legitimate purposes of legislation (i.e., execution of search warrant)
 - refuse to furnish information required to be maintained
 - provide false/misleading information
- **It is not an offence to**
 - exercise personal *Charter* rights
 - assert claim of legal privilege over documents
 - refuse to consent to the investigation (including voluntary interviews)

POTENTIAL LEGAL DEFENCES

Potential Legal Defences

Charter Applications: R v Jarvis and R v Ling **(SCC) considerations**

- Timing of formation of reasonable and probable grounds of offence(s) by inspectors
- Timing and context of inspector's collection and sharing of information with investigators
- If successful in *Charter* application, two possible remedies
 - exclusion of evidence
 - stay of proceedings

Potential Legal Defences

De Minimus Principle (R v Beets)

- **Law does not attach penal consequences for trivial or minimal impairments to the natural environment (*R v CP*)**
- **Two Uses :**
 - to attack Crown's case (i.e. "adverse effect" in Ontario's *EPA*, s. 14(1))
 - as a defence
- **Is offence at issue minimal or trivial ("mere trifle")?**

Potential Legal Defences

Defence of Officially Induced Error (*Lévis (Ville) v Tétreault*)

Defendant must establish that:

- defendant made an error of law/mixed law and fact
- defendant considered the legal consequences of its actions
- an appropriate official gave the advice
- the advice was reasonable
- the advice was erroneous, and
- the defendant relied on the official's advice in committing the offence

Potential Legal Defences

Defence of Necessity (*R v Perka*, *R v Latimer*)

Defendant must establish that:

- defendant faced imminent danger or peril
- defendant had no reasonable legal alternative to its chosen outcome, and
- defendant only inflicted harm proportionate to the harm the defendant sought to avoid

Potential Legal Defences

Defence of Due Diligence (*R v Sault Ste Marie (City)*)

- **Took all reasonable care to avoid the offence**
 - “reasonable care and due diligence do not mean superhuman efforts. They mean a high standard of awareness and decisive, prompt and continuing action” – *R v Courtaulds Fibres*
- **Reasonable belief in a mistaken set of facts**
 - “the defence will be available if the accused reasonably believed in a mistaken set of facts which, if true, would render the act or omission innocent” – *R v Sault Ste Marie (City)*

Potential Legal Defences

Defence of Due Diligence

- **Environmental Management Systems (EMS)**
 - develop and implement EMS
 - reasonable and realistic corporate policy
 - identify environmental impacts and legal requirements
 - implement SOPs and training
 - adequate commitment of resources
 - continuous improvement (management review, audits)

Case Law – Due Diligence Defence

R v Zellstoff Celgar Limited Partnership (BCPC 2012)

- Defendant found guilty of discharging effluent into the Columbia River
- Defendant had ISO procedures to prevent the discharge
 - “...had the defendant followed the ISO procedures, it should have prevented the spill...”
- Defence of due diligence rejected

Case Law – Due Diligence Defence

***R v ControlChem* (OCJ 2016)**

- Employee deliberately discharged liquids from four large totes into a storm drain which turned the creek white
- 5 *EPA* and *OWRA* charges were brought against both the company and employee
- Employee pled guilty and convicted on 1 *OWRA* charge
- Due diligence (took all reasonable care) was made out during the company's trial in Fall 2015
- Company mantra – “nothing leaves the building”
- ControlChem acquitted of all charges

Case Law – Due Diligence Defence

***R v MV Marathassa* (BCPC 2019)**

- Ship leaked fuel oil into English Bay in Vancouver
- Charged under *Canada Shipping Act* for discharging pollutant, failing to implement pollution emergency plan
- Due diligence defence made out at trial
 - defendant reasonably believed ship was designed, built, and certified to internationally recognized environmental and safety standards (ECO standard) (belief in mistaken set of facts)
 - pollution prevention systems included comprehensive crew selection and training program aimed at pollution prevention
 - met and exceeded regulatory requirements and industry standards
- MV Marathassa acquitted of all charges

SENTENCING & IMPLICATIONS OF CONVICTION

Sentencing & Implications of Conviction

- **Court weighs several sentencing factors when assessing a fine amount**
 - **statutory sentencing factors**
 - adverse effect, intentional or reckless. prior warning, prior convictions, actions after offence
 - **common law sentencing factors – *R v Bata Industries Ltd***
 - nature of environment affected, extent of damage, deliberateness, attitude, size, wealth and power of corporation, duration of non-compliance, profits, prior offences, evidence of character

Sentencing & Implications of Conviction

- **Defendant may have more of a “target on its back”**
 - more day-to-day scrutiny of operations
 - higher frequency of inspections by environmental officers
- **Increased fines if subsequent conviction under same/similar environmental statute(s)**

Sentencing & Implications of Conviction

- **Defendant's conviction(s) will be publicly accessible and published**
 - “Court Bulletins” published – defendant names, offence(s), and penalty
 - Prosecution Disposition Reports published and available in government and legal databases
 - Local news reporting, social media
- **Defendant's business, contracts and customer relations may be at risk or negatively affected**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROSECUTIONS – CASE LAW UPDATE

Case Law Update – Tailings Waste

Syncrude Canada Ltd (ABPC 2019)

- Syncrude abandoned tailings pond containing bitumen without completing remediation
- Contractor for Syncrude found 30 decomposing Great Blue Herons in pond and one live heron covered in oil
- Syncrude convicted under Alberta's *EPEA* and federal *Migratory Birds Act*
- Syncrude fined \$2.75 million
 - \$25,000 fine plus VFS to court for *EPEA* charges
 - \$950,000 held in trust by AER to fund wildlife, biodiversity projects (RFP process)
 - \$1.8 million directed to EDF

Case Law Update – Effluent

Irving Pulp and Paper Limited (NBPC 2018)

- Defendant company discharged improperly treated effluent into St. John River between June 2014 and August 2016
- In 2018, defendant convicted under *Fisheries Act*
- Defendant fined \$3,500,000, of which \$2,340,000 was directed to EDF and \$1,160,000 directed towards UNB Canadian Rivers Institute
- Company also directed to commission new effluent treatment system

Case Law Update – PCBs

Collingwood Prime (OCJ 2018)

- Electrical equipment exceeded regulated PCB levels and was not sent for destruction to authorized facility
- Company and its director charged with
 - 10 counts of contravening *PCB Regulations* under *CEPA*
 - 1 count of failing to comply with an EPCO
- Defendants pleaded guilty
 - company and director fined \$420,000, and
 - 45-day jail term for director (to be served on weekends)

Case Law Update – Crude Oil

Montreal, Maine and Atlantic Canada Co. (QCCP 2018)

- Train carrying 7.7 million litres of crude oil derailed in Lac-Mégantic in July 2013
- Resulting fire destroyed town's downtown, 47 people died, 2,000 people forced out of homes
- 6 million litres of crude oil spilled, including into Lac-Mégantic and the Chaudière River
- Defendant company fined \$1,000,000 under *Fisheries Act*, of which \$400,000 is to be directed to EDF

Case Law Update – Wastewater

Obed Mountain Mine (ABPC 2017)

- Defendant company operated a dike that held back wastewater at Obed Mountain Mine in Alberta
- When dike failed, contaminated water and sediment spilled into creeks and impacted Athabasca River
- Defendant convicted under the *Fisheries Act* and Alberta's *EPEA*
- Defendant fined \$3,500,000, of which \$1,150,000 was directed to be held in trust by the University of Alberta and \$2,150,000 directed towards the EDF

Case Law Update – Fuel Oil

Canadian National Railway Corporation (ABPC 2017)

- Defendant railway company operated fueling station
- ECCC officers traced oil sheen from North SK River >8km through Edmonton's storm drain system to fueling station
- Joint federal-provincial investigation - oil and water separator did not comply with *Storage Tank Systems for Petroleum and Allied Petroleum Products Regulations*
- Defendant convicted under *CEPA*, *Fisheries Act* and Alberta's *EPEA*
- Defendant fined \$2,500,000

Case Law Update – Logging

Gwaii Wood Products Ltd. (BCPC 2017)

- Defendants' logging and road construction caused extensive damage to over 2.5 km of streams, stream banks, riparian vegetation, and wetlands
- Defendants convicted under *Fisheries Act*
- Defendants ordered to collectively pay \$2,200,000, of which \$400,000 was directed to Fisheries and Oceans Canada to promote fisheries management activities
- 2 defendants also prohibited from conducting logging operations

Case Law Update – PCBs

***Tidan Inc.* (QCCP 2016)**

- Defendant company and seven associated companies did not follow Environmental Protection Compliance Orders (EPCOs) relating to the use, storage, and disposal of electrical equipment containing PCBs
- In 2016, defendants convicted under *CEPA* and *PCB Regulations* (52 charges)
- Defendants fined \$975,000 directed towards the EDF
- Defendants also required to publish an article and develop procedures to manage electrical equipment and provide training to management

Case Law Update – Chlorinated Water

Clark Builders (ABPC 2012)

- Defendant was construction manager for the project
- Subcontractor hit a water main when excavating for foundation pilings
- Defendant failed to obtain locates for water main prior to construction
- Approx. 12 million litres of chlorinated water entered the North Saskatchewan River
- Defendant pleaded guilty to offence under the *Fisheries Act* and fined \$285,000

Willms & Shier Environmental Lawyers

- **Established over 40 years ago**
- **18 lawyers**
 - seven are certified by the Law Society of Ontario as Environmental Law Specialists
 - lawyers called to the Bars of Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut

Contact Information



Jacquelyn Stevens

jstevens@willmsshier.com



John Georgakopoulos

jgeorgakopoulos@willmsshier.com

T: (403) 444-6887

Willms & Shier Environmental Lawyers LLP

www.willmsshier.com