



# Insurance Bulletin

## LITIGATION GROUP

Michael Ahmadi  
Tim Alexander  
Julia Anagnostakis  
Varoujan Arman  
Giovanna Asaro  
Erin Atkinson  
Suzanne Bailey  
Nazli Buhary  
Jess C. Bush  
Dominic T. Clarke  
Thomasina A. Dumonceau  
Thomas Durcan  
W. Colin Empke  
Ian S. Epstein  
Tim Farrell (Chair)  
Reeva M. Finkel  
Elizabeth J. Forster  
Jessica Grant  
Brenda Gross  
Russell Hatch  
Roger J. Horst  
Tobin Horton  
Sheldon Inkol  
Brendan Jones  
Visnja Jovanovic  
Brian Lau  
Kyra Leuschen  
Mark G. Lichty  
Teri D. MacDonald  
David R. Mackenzie  
Yu Mai  
Jason Mangano  
Dina Maxwell  
Eugene G. Mazzuca  
Christopher McKibbin  
Stephen R. Moore  
Lauren Morrison  
Robert D. Moss  
Kerry Nash  
Alva Orlando  
Jordan Page  
Bianca Pedro  
Robert J. Potts  
Larry P. Reimer  
Alex Reyes  
Maria Scarfo  
Eric J. Schjerning  
Marilyn R. Sharp  
Jay A. Skukowski  
Gary Srebrolow  
Jay A. Stolberg  
Rafal Szymanski  
David S. Wilson  
Roderick S.W. Winsor

*“The Court of Appeal held that a witness with special skill, knowledge, training or experience who has not been engaged by a party to the litigation may give opinion evidence at trial, without complying with Rule 53.03...”*

## WHO IS AN EXPERT FOR THE PURPOSES OF RULE 53.03: THE COURT OF APPEAL'S DECISION IN WESTERHOF V GEE ESTATE

Giovanna Asaro and Simon Reis

When can a witness who has not been retained by a party to the litigation give opinion testimony at trial? Must that witness comply with the requirements of Rule 53.03 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, which is directed at expert witnesses and requires that no opinion evidence may be tendered unless a report is prepared and signed by the expert witness, who must in turn acknowledge that he or she has a duty to the Court to be unbiased and impartial?

The confusion surrounding these critical issues was cleared this past week with the release of the Court of Appeal's decision in *Westerhof v Gee Estate* and its companion case, *McCallum v Baker*.

### The Facts of *Westerhof* and its Procedural History

The Plaintiff Mr. Westerhof was injured in a car accident. The Defendant Estate admitted liability and the trial proceeded on causation and damages alone. At trial, rulings were made on the admissibility of various medical evidence. The trial judge ruled that medical witnesses who treated or assessed Mr. Westerhof could not give opinion evidence concerning their diagnosis or prognosis as they were required to first comply with Rule 53.03 even though they were not witnesses

retained to provide expert evidence for the litigation. The medical witnesses included Mr. Westerhof's treating chiropractor and psychiatrist as well as two medical witnesses retained by Mr. Westerhof's Statutory Accident Benefits (SABS) insurer.

On appeal, the Divisional Court affirmed the trial judge's decision, concluding that all opinion evidence requires compliance with Rule 53.03, including opinion evidence from treating medical practitioners who were not retained by a party to the litigation. In so holding, the Divisional Court focused on the nature of the proffered evidence rather than the status of the witness as previous Courts had done. If the evidence is opinion evidence as it relates to such matters as causation, diagnosis, and prognosis compliance with Rule 53.03 was required. If the evidence is factual evidence alone - such as observations of the injured plaintiff and a description of the treatment provided) - compliance was not required.

### The Decision of the Court of Appeal

The Court of Appeal rejected the Divisional Court's conclusions. The Court of Appeal held that a witness with special skill, knowledge, training or experience who has not been engaged by a party to the litigation may give opinion evidence at trial, without complying with Rule 53.03 where

- the opinion to be given is based on the witness's observation of or participation in the events at issue; and

“[T]he Court of Appeal concluded that a non-party expert ... who was retained for a purpose other than the litigation, may give opinion testimony where the opinion is based on personal observations or examinations relating to the subject-matter of the litigation.”



Giovanna Asaro is a partner at Blaney McMurtry LLP. Her practice focuses on insurance litigation and insurance coverage work. Her expertise in insurance coverage matters extends to commercial general liability policies, professional liability policies, and errors and omissions policies.

Giovanna may be reached directly at 416.593.3902 or [gasaro@blaney.com](mailto:gasaro@blaney.com).

- the witness formed the opinion to be given as part of the ordinary exercise of his or her skill, knowledge, training and experience while observing or participating in such events.

The Court of Appeal termed such experts “participant experts,” which would include a treating physician.

In turn, the Court of Appeal concluded that a non-party expert - such as a physician retained by a SABS insurer - who was retained for a purpose other than the litigation, may give opinion testimony where the opinion is based on personal observations or examinations relating to the subject-matter of the litigation.

Applying these principles, the Court considered each impugned evidentiary ruling made by the trial judge. The Court concluded that some of the treating physicians and non-party experts should not have been excluded from giving expert opinion testimony for failure to comply with Rule 53.03, while others were properly excluded. Notably, the Court held that the trial judge erred in excluding the opinion testimony of a treating psychiatrist and pain specialist, as well as two non-party experts who conducted a functional abilities assessment of Mr. Westerhof in August 2005 and prepared a report for Mr. Westerhof’s SABS insurer. Despite their non-compliance with Rule 53.03, these witnesses were entitled to testify concerning the medical history they took from the plaintiff, the tests they performed, and the treatment results they observed, including their observations about whether Mr. Westerhof was experiencing pain.

The Court held that the trial judge’s erroneous evidentiary rulings prevented Mr. Westerhof from placing important evidence before the judge

and jury that could reasonably have affected the outcome of the trial. These errors warranted the granting of a new trial.

#### The Implications of *Westerhof*

The decision in *Westerhof* and its companion case, *McCallum v Baker*, brings much needed clarity to the scope of Rule 53.03 and will have significant practical consequences for litigants heading to trial.

Although *Westerhof* arose in a personal injury context, the decision applies equally across other areas of civil and commercial litigation where “participant” or third party expert witnesses not retained by one of the parties to the litigation may be involved, such as engineers, financial advisors, accountants, and environmental consultants.

*Westerhof* ultimately provides greater certainty to litigants that they will be able to introduce the necessary evidence to prove their case. Previously, where an expert witness did not comply with Rule 53.03, litigants were forced to either abandon the expert’s evidence or seek leave from the Court before trial to excuse non-compliance. Now, where the requirements stated in *Westerhof* are met, litigants will have greater certainty whether their treating physicians or other opinion witnesses not retained for the purpose of trial can testify and the scope of their testimony. ■

#### BLANEYS PODCAST

##### Blaney McMurtry LLP

Blaney Podcasts are available for download at <http://www.blaney.com/podcast>. Topics to date include Powers of Attorney, Canada’s Anti-Spam Legislation, Termination of Employment, Workplace Harassment, Family Law and



Simon Reis is currently articling with Blaney McMurtry LLP. He received his J.D. from Western University and holds a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Studies and History from Queen's University.

Succession Planning. In the newest podcast, Lou Brzezinski answers questions about the firm's involvement in the Target insolvency proceeding on behalf of unsecured creditors.

New podcasts continue to be posted so check back regularly for the latest topic. Podcasts are also available for download on [iTunes](#). ■

## BLANEYS BLOGS

### Blaney McMurtry LLP

Be sure to follow our regularly updated blogs, published by the Firm and individual lawyers, covering a variety of topics:

**Blaneys@Work** examines recent events and decisions in the world of labour and employment law. [[blaneysatwork.com](#)]

**Blaneys Ontario Court of Appeal Summaries** (Blaneys OCA Blog) offers weekly summaries of all decisions released by the Court of Appeal for Ontario (other than criminal law decisions). [[blaneyscourtsummaries.com](#)]

**Henry J. Chang's Canada-US Immigration Blog** covers recent decisions, legislative changes and news related to Canada and US immigration. [[www.americanlaw.com/immigrationblog/](#)]

**Blaneys Fidelity Blog** provides updates on recent developments in fidelity insurance in Canada and the United States, and covers other topics of interest to fidelity insurers. [[blaneysfidelityblog.com](#)] ■

EXPECT THE BEST

**Blaney  
McMurtry**  
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS LLP

2 Queen St. East, Suite 1500  
Toronto, Canada M5C 3G5  
416.593.1221 TEL  
416.593.5437 FAX  
[www.blaney.com](#)

canada's insurance  
defence network



vos avocats en assurance  
partout au canada

Blaney McMurtry is a member of the *Risk Management Counsel of Canada*, a Canada-wide association of independent law firms with expertise in meeting the needs of the risk management industry by providing a range of services for the insurance industry, risk retention groups and self-insureds.

To learn more about *Risk Management Counsel of Canada* and how its members can assist you, contact Tim Alexander (416.593.3900) or Larry Reimer (416.593.3997).

*Insurance Bulletin* is a publication of the Insurance Law Group of Blaney McMurtry LLP. The information contained in this newsletter is intended to provide information and comment, in a general fashion, about recent cases and related practice points of interest. The views and comments contained in this newsletter are those of the author alone, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Blaney McMurtry LLP or other members of the firm. The information and views expressed are not intended to provide legal advice. For specific advice, please contact us. *Editors:* Giovanna Asaro (416.593.3902) and Visnja Jovanovic (416.593.3942).

We welcome your comments. Address changes, mailing instructions or requests for additional copies should be directed to Kelly MacNeil at 416.593.7221 ext. 3600 or by email to [kmacneil@blaney.com](#). Legal questions should be addressed to the specified author.