Court Martial Appeal Court of Canada



Cour d'appel de la cour martiale du Canada

Date: 20211117

Docket: CMAC-618

Citation: 2021 CMAC 9

Present: BELL C.J.

**BETWEEN:** 

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

**Appellant/Responding Party** 

and

# **CORPORAL EULER**

**Respondent/Moving Party** 

Motion determined on the basis of written submissions filed by the Moving Party on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021 and by the Responding Party on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021.

Order delivered at Ottawa, Ontario, on November 17, 2021.

REASONS FOR ORDER BY:

CHIEF JUSTICE BELL

Court Martial Appeal Court of Canada



Cour d'appel de la cour martiale du Canada

Date: 20211117

**Docket: CMAC-618** 

Citation: 2021 CMAC 9

Present: BELL C.J.

**BETWEEN:** 

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

**Appellant/Responding Party** 

and

**CORPORAL EULER** 

**Respondent/Moving Party** 

## **REASONS FOR ORDER**

## **CHIEF JUSTICE BELL**

[1] By way of Notice of Motion brought pursuant to Rule 8(1) of the *Court Martial Appeal Court Rules*, SOR86/-959 (Rules), filed on October 20, 2021, Corporal P.J.M. Euler, the Moving Party, requests this Court quash the appeal on the basis that the Appellant has not shown a substantial ground of appeal in its Memorandum of Fact and Law. For the following reasons I dismiss the motion. [2] The power to quash an appeal should be exercised sparingly: *Schmidt v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, (1995) 24 O.R. (3d) 1 (ONCA) at para. 6, 82 OAC 233; *Christo v. Woon*, 2017
ONSC 5127 at para. 22, 282 A.C.W.S. (3d) 617.

[3] In their submissions, the parties present differing interpretations of the Military Judge's reasons. The Appellant contends that the Military Judge required corroboration of the complainant's testimony. The Moving Party, Corporal P.J.M. Euler contends that the Military Judge did not require corroboration. Such differing interpretations are more appropriately dealt with by way of a hearing on the merits, rather than by way of a motion to quash.

[4] For the above reasons :

IT IS ORDERED THAT the motion to quash the appeal is dismissed.

"B. Richard Bell" Chief Justice

### COURT MARTIAL APPEAL COURT OF CANADA

### NAMES OF COUNSEL AND SOLICITORS OF RECORD

#### **DOCKET:**

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** 

CMAC-618

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN v. CORPORAL EULER

MOTION DETERMINED ON THE BASIS OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS, WITHOUT APPEARANCE OF THE PARTIES.

**REASONS FOR ORDER BY:** 

CHIEF JUSTICE BELL

**DATED:** 

NOVEMBER 17, 2021

#### **IN WRITING:**

Maj Patrice Germain

LCol D. Bernsten

APPELLANT/RESPONDING PARTY RESPONDENT/MOVING PARTY

#### **SOLICITORS OF RECORD**:

Canadian Military Prosecution Services Ottawa, Ontario

Defence Counsel Services Gatineau, Quebec APPELLANT/RESPONDING PARTY

RESPONDENT/MOVING PARTY