

NOVA SCOTIA COURT OF APPEAL

Citation: *Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board*,
2013 NSCA 59

Date: 20130506

Docket: CA 413884

Registry: Halifax

Between:

Ralph Ivan Doncaster

Appellant

v.

Chignecto-Central Regional School Board
And Attorney General of Nova Scotia

Respondents

Judge: The Honourable Mr. Justice Jamie W.S. Saunders

Motions Heard: May 2, 2013, 2013, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in Chambers

Held: Appellant's recusal demand denied; respondents' motion for stay granted .

Counsel: Appellant in person
Bruce T. MacIntosh, Q.C., for the respondent Chignecto-
Central Regional School Board
Edward Gores, Q.C. for the respondent Attorney General
of Nova Scotia

Decision:

[1] This case came before me in Chambers on Thursday, May 2, 2013. I first dealt with Mr. Doncaster's demand that I recuse myself from hearing the matter. On that issue, after carefully considering Mr. Doncaster's representations together with the most helpful submissions made by Mr. MacIntosh for the Chignecto-Central Regional School Board (CCRSB) and Mr. Gores on behalf of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, I advised the parties that on this record I had no need to reflect on the matter any further; that there was absolutely no merit to Mr. Doncaster's demand that I recuse myself; and that his demand was refused, with reasons to follow.

[2] I then turned to a consideration of the merits of the CCRSB's motion to stay the appeal. After hearing argument and having reviewed the comprehensive written submissions filed by counsel, I informed the parties that the CCRSB's motion for a stay was granted, with reasons to follow.

[3] These are my reasons.

Mr. Doncaster's Demand that I Recuse Myself

[4] As I said at the hearing, I used the word "demand" advisedly. Mr. Doncaster had not filed any motion as prescribed under the Rules in notifying the Court or the parties of his intentions. Rather, the first indication I had of any such demand was seeing an email Mr. Doncaster had sent to the Registrar on April 30, 2013 at 8:48 a.m. which read:

I intend to make a motion to the presiding justice (justice Saunders) to recuse himself. While my complaint to the CJC is under investigation, Justice Saunders is in a conflict of interest and a reasonable apprehension of bias exists.

- Ralph

[5] Evidently Mr. Doncaster had chosen not to copy counsel for the CCRSB or the AGNS with his email. I directed the Registrar to respond to all parties with an email sent April 30 which read:

Dear Mr. Doncaster:

Re: CA 413884 – Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board et al

...

Mr. Justice Saunders was made aware of the contents of your email sent today April 30th at 8:48 a.m. He has asked me to say that he looks forward to presiding over your motion to recuse himself from hearing your matter(s) and to considering the representations you and other counsel wish to make, in so far as the law requires.

[6] Because of Mr. Doncaster's failure to make a proper motion or file any written materials in support of his demand that I recuse myself, I inquired of counsel representing the CCRSB and the AGNS whether they were prepared to consent that I hear Mr. Doncaster's "motion" in any event. Messrs. MacIntosh and Gores both confirmed their consent that if I were prepared to proceed, they were agreeable to my doing so. I then called upon Mr. Doncaster to make whatever oral representations he thought appropriate.

[7] I reminded Mr. Doncaster that he had not favoured me with a copy of his complaint to the Canadian Judicial Council and so I had no knowledge of the nature of his complaint. In order for me to consider his demand that I recuse myself I would need to have particulars of his complaint. He attempted to find a copy on his computer notebook which he said preserved all of his correspondence and records for 30 days but after two or three minutes of searching he said he couldn't find it and would prefer to summarize the complaint. He undertook to send a copy of the complaint together with any and all attachments or other references that formed part of it, to the Registrar within the next two or three days to complete this Court's record.

[8] Mr. Doncaster then described the incident, and only incident, which sparked his complaint to the Canadian Judicial Council. He said it was about my "conduct" during an earlier Chambers appearance this term when, in the process of writing down some dates he (Doncaster) had referred to his estranged wife's lawyer by "she" or "her" to which I had intervened and said something to him along the lines of "Mr. Doncaster, counsel in this Chambers has a name and so you are to refer to Ms. Stevenson by her name." Mr. Doncaster explained that my interjection came

after he had already pointed out to me that he has ADHD and Asbergers. He said that it was apparent to him that I knew nothing about Asbergers and instead of understanding his “disability” and “accommodating” it, I had “chastised” him for “not following some silly, unwritten rules of Court decorum.” He then made reference to the **Charter**, certain United Nations Conventions on Persons with Disability, cases dealing with reasonable apprehension of bias, and a “welcome message” he had printed off the Internet of remarks made on some occasion by Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin. He said that in filing his complaint with the Canadian Judicial Council he had urged the Council to require me to take “sensitivity training” to “accommodate.... someone with a mental disability, like either of the two that I have, ADHD and Asbergers ...” and until such time as I had undertaken (and I assume presumably successfully completed) such training I should be prohibited from presiding over matters which involved him.

[9] Messrs. MacIntosh and Gores made their own detailed submissions challenging both the substance of Mr. Doncaster’s remarks and the “hearsay evidence” he had proffered while seated in his chair during the hearing, having chosen not to file a proper motion under the Rules and simply raise the matter for the first time in the form of a demand sent by email to the Registrar. Mr. Doncaster signalled his intention to remain seated, early on. When Chambers began he was the only person in a packed courtroom who refused to stand. When I inquired this exchange resulted:

JUSTICE SAUNDERS: And I take it you don’t wish to stand today, Mr. Doncaster?

MR. DONCASTER: If you want to stand when you talk to me, I’ll stand when I talk to you.

[10] Mr. Doncaster made reference to other cases which I told him were, in my view, easily distinguishable and not relevant to my having to address his complaint about my conduct on that earlier Chambers appearance.

[11] For example, Mr. Doncaster referred to the case of **Wewaykum Indian Band v. Canada**, [2003] 2 S.C.R. 259. As I recall, that was a case where a party had raised the possibility of bias or apprehension of bias on the part of a sitting judge, Justice Binnie, on account of his earlier career as an Associate Deputy

Minister of Justice who, by virtue of the nature of his work, may have been exposed to some of the issues, parties, or discussions surrounding an upcoming matter before the Court. The Indian Bands had moved to set aside the Court's judgement on that basis and the Crown sought directions as to how it ought to proceed. Obviously there is no parallel between that case and this one.

[12] Mr. Doncaster also referred, by name, to certain justices on the Nova Scotia Supreme Court who had deliberately recused themselves on account of some perceived familiarity among family ties, roots or other community connections. Again, those illustrations are not helpful in my assessment of Mr. Doncaster's recusal demand in this case.

[13] The law in such matters is clear. I need not recite it in detail. Obviously the mere filing of a complaint with the Canadian Judicial Council does not pull the trigger for recusal. If that were the case, one could simply file a complaint and "pick off" a judge, one by one until the complainant either found one to his liking ("judge shopping") or there were no judges left to hear the case. Such a result is neither the law nor in the public interest.

[14] The law directs that this is an inquiry I conduct myself. The grounds put forward suggesting bias or a reasonable apprehension of bias must be serious and specific. There is a strong presumption of judicial impartiality. The law does not lightly or carelessly evoke the possibility of bias in a judge whose oath of office and authority depends upon that presumption. The test for reasonable apprehension of bias is settled law:

What would an informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically – and having thought the matter through – conclude? Would he think that it is more likely than not that [the decision-maker], whether consciously or unconsciously, would not decide fairly.

See, for example, **Wewaykum, supra; Committee for Justice and Liberty v. National Energy Board**, [1978] 1 S.C.R. 369 at 394.

[15] Mr. Doncaster does not assert that I ought to recuse myself because he lost a case at a previous trial or Chambers appearance over which I presided. It is obvious but perhaps bears repeating that such an assertion would hardly be a basis

for recusal in any event. That isn't how things work. Otherwise disgruntled litigants would invariably demand the recusal of any judge who had found against them, eventually whittling the juridical pool down to zero.

The mere fact that a party has lost some motion or suit before a judge (without a jury) does not entitle that litigant to be thereafter free of that judge. That is so both in later suits of a broadly similar nature, and in later motions in the same suit.

Broda v. Broda, 2001 ABCA 151 at 16.

[16] Rather, Mr. Doncaster says that my having “chastised” (his word) him for “not following some silly, unwritten rules of Court decorum” suggests to him that I:

... may draw some conclusions based upon my behaviour. So, for instance, perhaps where I don't have any deference to authority you may draw some conclusions that because I don't respect authority therefore I may not, you know, respect the law. And, therefore, my case may be – you may deem it frivolous when, in fact, it's not.

This he says:

... may bring into question again your partiality where it is apparent, I think that you do expect people in the court with mental disability or not, you like them to follow the court decorum and I would say even archaic rituals of this Court and that my failure to show you the respect you think that may be acclaimed by judges where, in my personal opinion, a judge is no more – and I said this in another Provincial Court case before Judge Jamie Campbell to kind of explain Asbergers. To me, a judge is no more deserving of respect than a janitor. I judge people – I behave – I interact with people based on how they interact with me. Another way I put it before is respect is not acclaimed; it's earned. And so given the fact that I don't show you the respect that I think it seems you were use to getting from people in this court, I would say even having watched court processes a lot it seems like not just respect but deference in submission that it seems to be, I guess to go back to Medieval times, it seems like it's still where you, people coming to the court are considered to be coming before the King's representative and you know the King gets to sit upon his bench and people kind of see to him. So because of that lack of respect and deference I think again that brings in to question whether or not you will be deciding things on the basis of the actual evidence and facts before you rather than on the basis of your personal opinion and

perhaps even emotional response to me not showing the respect and having the gall to go and complain to the Judicial Council, things like that. ...

[17] That then is the basis for Mr. Doncaster's demand that I recuse myself from hearing the CCRSB's motion for a stay (which the AGNS supports fully and joins in). Based on this record I have no hesitation in concluding that an informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically, and having thought the matter through, would not think it more likely that I consciously or unconsciously, would not decide the matter fairly.

[18] Mr. Doncaster's demand that I recuse myself is rejected.

CCRSB's Motion for Stay

[19] I accept the facts, submissions and authorities set forth in Mr. MacIntosh's comprehensive and most helpful brief. The motion he brings on behalf of the CCRSB (fully supported and joined in by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia) seeks to stay Mr. Doncaster's appeal from the trial decision of Nova Scotia Supreme Court Justice Kevin Coady (now reported at 2012 NSSC 383). The background to that case can be briefly summarized.

[20] CCRSB had a Protection of Property Notice served upon Mr. Doncaster on February 5, 2012, following a schoolyard confrontation involving the appellant at Enfield District Elementary School. CCRSB took this step to ensure the safety of students and staff and to maintain stability in the school environment. Mr. Doncaster then commenced an application in the Nova Scotia Supreme Court seeking a judicial determination that the Nova Scotia **Protection of Property Act**, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 363 did not apply to public schools and that the Notice issued against him by CCRSB breached his **Charter** rights. He sought to have the notice quashed. Due to the **Charter** issues raised the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was given notice and fully participated.

[21] Mr. Doncaster's application was heard in Special Chambers on October 9, 2012. In support of his application Mr. Doncaster filed a single 3-paragraph affidavit. He did not submit any evidence supporting his **Charter** breach allegations.

[22] Justice Coady characterized the situation in ¶17 of his decision stating:

[3] Early in Mr. Doncaster's separation from Jennifer Field there was an incident at the children's school. School staff understood that Ms. Field was the parent authorized to pick up the children after school. Mr. Doncaster arrived at the school requesting that the children be released to him. A confrontation ensued between school staff, Mr. Doncaster and Ms. Field. Police were called and he was directed to leave the school premises. Staff instructed the parents to resolve the issue of after school pick up and to advise the school accordingly. Due to this confrontation, as well as other circumstances, the school board served Mr. Doncaster with a notice pursuant to the *Protection of Property Act*. The notice prohibited him from being on the school property.

[23] Following protracted oral and written arguments Coady, J. dismissed the claims of Mr. Doncaster in their entirety and ordered him to pay costs to CCRSB and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia saying:

[20] I award \$2500.00 in costs to both respondents for a total costs award against Mr. Doncaster in the amount of \$5000.00.

[24] Evidently Mr. Doncaster filed two separate appeals from that decision, the first CA 410231 filed on December 11, 2012; the second, CA 413884 filed March 25, 2013. Each appeal arises from the same trial decision and alleges the identical grounds of appeal.

[25] As indicated in Mr. MacIntosh's brief CCRSB filed a motion to stay in the first appeal which sought the same remedies as requested here. As soon as that first motion was brought, Mr. Doncaster discontinued that appeal but without giving any notice to the CCRSB.

[26] Mr. Doncaster has not made any meaningful attempt to satisfy his \$5,000 costs debt. On April 24, 2013, the School Board received one \$5.00 bill from Mr. Doncaster. He made a similar payment of a \$5.00 bill to the Attorney. These are the only payments Mr. Doncaster has made to fulfil the costs order issued by Justice Coady.

[27] The Board then brought the present motion seeking a stay of these proceedings pending Mr. Doncaster's paying the costs order in the court below and

posting security for costs in this appeal, whether the appellant be impecunious or not.

[28] I will now address Mr. Doncaster's principal arguments as I recall them. He did not file any written submissions or an affidavit to respond to CCRSB's motion.

[29] He sought an adjournment implying that he was ill prepared. I denied that motion. Mr. MacIntosh reminded Mr. Doncaster that he had received a copy of the CCRSB's brief in the first appeal (which Mr. Doncaster had chosen to discontinue without notice to the other parties) about 3 weeks earlier and the contents of that brief were identical to the contents of their brief here. In addition, it was clear to me both from the nature and substance of Mr. Doncaster's representations that he was prepared to respond to the applicant's arguments.

[30] He asked to give *viva voce* evidence. I denied his request. Such a request, even if it were justified (and I decided it was not) would only have delayed the proceedings when Mr. Doncaster himself had urged that the matter proceed quickly so that he could attend a relative's wake in Antigonish later in the day.

[31] He complained that I had prevented him from cross-examining Ms. Angie Scanlan, a paralegal with Mr. MacIntosh's firm who had sworn a lengthy affidavit with exhibits attached in support of CCRSB's motion. I reminded Mr. Doncaster that he had sent an email to the Registrar on Sunday, April 28 at 11:34 a.m. reading:

I wish to give notice that I require an opportunity cross-examine Ms. Scanlan on her affidavit.

- Ralph

When the Registrar told me that she had received such a letter from Mr. Doncaster I instructed her to reply which she did by a letter sent to Mr. Doncaster dated April 29, 2013 (copied to counsel for the CCRSB and the AGNS) as follows:

Dear Mr. Doncaster:

RE: CA 413884 – Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board et al.

As you are aware, Justice Saunders is presiding in Chambers. I have drawn his attention to your email dated Sunday April 28th @ 11:34 am. Stating you “require an opportunity to cross-examine Ms Scanlan on her affidavit.

Justice Saunders has instructed me to inform you that his leave is required to cross-examine any affiant. You have not given any reasons for your request. It seems to him that Ms. Scanlan’s affidavit is simply presented to establish a factual chronology of events. Unless you can explain the basis for your request, and offer reasons that persuade him to grant leave, your request will be declined, and Ms Scanlan need not appear.

If you intend to reply you must do so in writing to me and all other parties by 12 noon tomorrow.

[32] This prompted a lengthy response from Mr. Doncaster. On account of its length I will not reproduce it verbatim, but simply record its first sentence:

Caroline,

I am not requesting leave to cross-examine an affiant. I am giving notice that cross-examination is required.

following which Mr. Doncaster then proceeded to cite and offer his own interpretation of certain CPRs. To all of that I directed the Registrar to send the following email to Mr. Doncaster dated April 30, 2013, which read:

Dear Mr. Doncaster:

RE: CA 413884 – Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board et al

I have referred your email of today’s date sent at 11:35 am to Justice Saunders who has asked me to inform you that:

- he declines to grant you leave to cross-examine the affiant as no reasons were offered to support your request and it appears to him that the affidavit is simply filed to establish a factual chronology of events;

- the affiant need not attend the hearing;
- he intends to hear the CCRSB's motion for a stay and costs and security for costs on Thursday if, after considering your motion to have him recuse himself, he decides to proceed;
- he does not wish to enter into any further exchanges with you by correspondence and expects to hear your submissions at Thursday's hearing, should you choose to appear.

[33] Any member of this Court has the power to effectively superintend and manage the Court's own process. Such a statement hardly requires affirmation, but if any were needed one could start with 90.37:

Motion to a judge of the Court of Appeal

90.37 (2) A judge of the Court of Appeal has and may exercise any power necessary to deal with a motion made to the judge under this Rule 90.37 or any other Rule, or other legislation.

[34] Mr. Doncaster complained that I did not have jurisdiction to consider CCRSB's motion because it had not been filed in accordance with the Rules. I rejected that submission as being entirely without merit. He cited CPR 23 complaining that the applicants' motion was late. I will assume Mr. Doncaster is confused. CPR 23 is not this Court's motions Rule. Our Rule is CPR 90.37(5) which says that only four clear days are required. Mr. Doncaster also argued that CCRSB had to make a motion for directions before it was allowed to make a motion for a stay, this time quoting CPR 90.36(3). Again, I will assume Mr. Doncaster is confused. He is referring to the wrong rule. Evidently he does not understand the difference between making a motion to the Court of Appeal under CPR 90.36, and making a motion to a judge of the Court of Appeal under CPR 90.37.

[35] Mr. Doncaster said that the CCRSB and the Crown should not be allowed to bring a motion for a stay because such relief is only available for "exceptional circumstances". That is wrong. Such is not the law in every case. While this Court's power to stay is used sparingly, it will always be a useful tool, whenever circumstances warrant, to effect or restore justice between the parties.

Alternatively, I think any reasonable observer would conclude that Mr. Doncaster has, by his actions, made himself an exceptional case.

[36] Mr. Doncaster said the CCRSB and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia are not entitled to request a stay because this case is “quasi-criminal in nature”. Wrong again. This is a civil matter in which Mr. Doncaster chose to challenge the constitutional validity and scope of provincial legislation. There is nothing criminal or quasi-criminal or regulatory about it.

[37] He then suggested this was a case that ought to be set down for “judicial mediation”. I rejected that submission saying that the Court’s leave would first have to be obtained and in any event would require all-party consent across the board.

[38] Mr. Doncaster next pleaded impecuniosity saying that he had a negative net worth. In this I told him it seemed to me that he was then attempting to *rely upon* the contents of the CCRSB’s supporting affidavit which made some reference to Mr. Doncaster’s financial situation – the very same document he had *opposed* just a few minutes earlier. In any event, as this Court has ruled previously, impecuniosity does not offer immunity from security for costs in every case. See for example, **Turner-Lienaux v. Campbell**, 2001 CarswellNS 291; and **Lienaux v. Campbell**, 2011 NSCA 94.

[39] Mr. Doncaster said that to allow the stay would be “putting a price on my attempt to enforce my **Charter** rights”. I rejected that submission by reminding Mr. Doncaster that it was he who had drawn in the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in the first place and that by posting security and honouring the costs order from the court below he would then have every opportunity to carry on whatever challenge he thinks he has relating to this particular statute.

[40] In his written and oral submissions Mr. MacIntosh on behalf of the CCRSB made reference to Justice Coady’s strong and clear findings against Mr. Doncaster, quoting these portions of Justice Coady’s decision:

[1] Ralph Ivan Doncaster has become one of the most active self-represented litigants in this and other Courts of Nova Scotia. It is fair comment that all of these proceedings are rooted in his acrimonious separation from his spouse and children.

Mr. Doncaster has decided that these family based issues are best dealt with by confrontation rather than conciliation. It appears as if he has recently discovered that the Courts of Nova Scotia provide the best weapons to pursue his objectives.

...

[18] Mr. Doncaster has not satisfied me that he is poor. Further, I am satisfied that he is the exact kind of litigant who will exploit the Court's services unless he is tempered by cost concerns.

[41] Mr. Doncaster took umbrage with these findings suggesting that they were irrelevant to matters in the court below and to my consideration of the motion for a stay. I reject his submission. In my opinion they are absolutely relevant to a consideration of the issues that arise here. This is especially the case where, as here counsel allege that Mr. Doncaster has shown a pattern of exploiting court resources to suit his own ends. That puts the issue squarely before the Court. I asked Mr. Doncaster if he had kept a record of the number of proceedings in which he was named as a participating party in the courts of Nova Scotia. He said he had not. As a matter of interest, and to provide substance to Justice Coady's unambiguous findings, which are obviously well-founded, I include as an appendix and to form part of my decision a chart which lists the total number of proceedings in Nova Scotia where Mr. Doncaster is named as a party, current to April 29, 2013.

[42] From this it is clear that there are currently a total of 103 cases of ongoing litigation involving Mr. Doncaster.

[43] This number, on its face, strikes me as astounding. I have not had the time to inquire as to how many outstanding judgments, or costs orders there are against Mr. Doncaster. At some point that may be an inquiry worth pursuing.

[44] In light of Justice Coady's findings in the court below and from what I have seen on this and other matters on our Court's docket, it seems to me that litigants such as Mr. Doncaster appear to fall into a camp of persons who claim an unconditional, and unassailable "right to appeal" every step, in every case. Persons who hold such a view are seriously misguided or ill-informed. No right is absolute. In our free and democratic society every right, privilege or interest is balanced and held in check by other rights, privileges and interests. The

opportunity to appeal is regulated by long held practices and rules, by which deadlines, substance, style and content are strictly enforced. Those unwilling or unprepared to follow those strictures do so at their peril.

[45] Litigants, self-represented or not, with legitimate interests at stake will be treated with respect and will quickly come to realize that judges, lawyers and court staff are prepared to bend over backwards to accommodate their needs, to explain procedures that may seem foreign, and to ensure that the merits of their disputes will be heard. They and their cases will be seen as the *raison d'être* for access to justice.

[46] Litigants, self-represented or not, with a different agenda designed to wreak havoc on the system by a succession of endless, mindless or mind-numbing paper or electronic filings, or meant to drive a spouse or opposite party to distraction or despair or financial ruin will quickly come to realize that the Court's patience, tolerance and largesse have worn thin. They and their cases will be seen as an affront to justice and summarily shown the door.

[47] More often than not, the individuals in this latter group whom I would dub "self-serving litigants" leave a trail of unpaid judgments and costs orders in their wake. Judges will not sit idly by as the finite resources of their courts are hijacked by people with computer skills or unlimited time on their hands; at the expense of worthy matters, waiting patiently in the queue for a hearing. Faux litigants will be exposed, soon earning the tag "vexatious litigant" or "paper terrorist" whose offerings deserve a sharp rebuff and rebuke.

[48] Over the past two months I have encountered several such cases. Their number is mounting. I find that troubling. The Bench, the practicing Bar and the public should be concerned. This trespass upon legitimate advocacy is not in the public interest. In the short term it frustrates the efficient passage and completion of litigation. In the long term it erodes and denigrates confidence in and respect for the administration of justice. It defeats a system of dispute resolution managed and overseen by people who are doing the best they can to serve the public in a way that respects and follows the law, and produces a result that satisfies the primary object of the Rules which is to provide "for the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every proceeding".

[49] For all of these reasons I find that this is a proper case for me to exercise my discretion under CPR 90.42 and order a stay of this proceeding CA 413884 until such time as Mr. Doncaster has fully satisfied the costs order imposed against him by Justice Coady in Halifax No. 398426, and in addition, has posted security for costs in the amount of \$3,500 in the present appeal.

Saunders, J.A.

Appendix "A"

List of Proceedings with Ralph Ivan Doncaster a.k.a. Ralph Doncaster a.k. Ralph I. Doncaster, named as a party, current to April 29, 2013.

Nova Scotia Court of Appeal:

	Court Case No.	Court	Party Title	Year Started	Name of Proceeding
1.	CA No 388212	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field
2.	CA No 393423	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field
3.	CA No 413884	NSCA	Appellant	2013	Ralph Evan Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia
4.	CAC No 413496	NSCA	Appellant	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Field and the Attorney General of Canada
5.	CA No 400779	NSCA	Respondent	2012	Andrea Marie Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field and Ralph Ivan Doncaster
6.	CA No 404979	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field
7.	CA No 404981	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field
8.	CA No 406486	NSCA	Respondent	2012	Andrea Marie Doncaster, Viola Marie Doncaster, and Ivan Ralph Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field and Ralph Ivan Doncaster
9.	CAC No. 408973	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen

10.	CA No. 410231	NSCA	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board and The Attorney General of Nova Scotia
11.	CAC No. 410878	NSCA	Appellant	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
12.	CAC No. 410901	NSCA	Appellant	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
13.	CA No. 413485	NSCA	Appellant	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field

Nova Scotia Supreme Court (General Division):

	Court Case No.	Court	Party Title	Year Started	Name of Proceeding
14.	ST No. 406972	NSSC	Defendant	2012	HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN v. RALPH DONCASTER
15.	ST No. 388641	NSSC	Defendant	2012	THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NOVA SCOTIA v. RALPH DONCASTER
16.	ST No. 372044	NSSC	Defendant	2012	JENNIFER LYNN FIELD v. RALPH IVAN DONCASTER
17.	Hfx No. 398426	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board
18.	Hfx No 391759	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
19.	ST No 388609	NSSC	Defendant	2012	Her Majesty the Queen Vs. Ralph Doncaster
20.	ST No 274911	NSSC	Defendant	2006	In the matter of an assessment or assessments by the Minister of National Revenue under the Excise Tax Act,

					against: Ralph Doncaster
21.	CRT No. 401579	NSSC	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Doncaster
22.	ST No. 408132	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
23.	CRT No. 410837	NSSC	Accused	2013	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Doncaster
24.	CRT No. 408987	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
25.	ST No. 406080	NSSC	Defendant	2012	The Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. Ralph I. Doncaster
26.	Hfx No. 391466	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Patricia Thomson
27.	Hfx No. 391030	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Holly Thompson and Joyce Custance
28.	Hfx No 391028	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Girl Guides of Canada
29.	Hfx No 391027	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Janet M. Stevenson
30.	Hfx No 391026	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. William Harvey
31.	Hfx No 390758	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Janet M. Stevenson
32.	Hfx No 390641	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. RCMP Enfield Detachment
33.	Hfx No 390505	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Craig Burnett
34.	Hfx No 390503	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Cheryl Ponee, RCMP Enfield Detachment

35.	CRH No 390099	NSSC	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster
36.	Hfx No 389866	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. RCMP Enfield Detachment
37.	Hfx No 375132	NSSC	Defendant	2012	Jennifer Lynn Field v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster, DVIA
38.	CRT No 413736	NSSC	Accused	2013	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster
39.	Hfx No 393762	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Susan Ward
40.	ST No 393916	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field and The Attorney General of Canada
41.	CRT No 398333	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Lynn Field
42.	Hfx No 398420	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Cheryl Ponee
43.	CRH No 399419	NSSC	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster
44.	CRH No 402619	NSSC	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster
45.	Hfx No 404956	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Chignecto-Central Regional School Board
46.	Hfx No 405655	NSSC	Plaintiff	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Deanna Koch
47.	CRT No 405763	NSSC	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v. Ralph Ivan Doncaster
48.	Hfx No 409789	NSSC	Appellant	2012	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. HMTQ
49.	Hfx No 411357	NSSC	Plaintiff	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. RCMP Enfield Detachment and Attorney General for

					Nova Scotia
50.	Hfx No 412325	NSSC	Plaintiff	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Royal Bank of Canada
51.	CRT No 413057	NSSC	Apellant	2013	Ralph Ivan Doncaster v. Her Majesty the Queen
52.	SFSNMCA-080378	Supreme Court - Truro	Respondent	2012	Viola Doncaster, Ivan Doncaster v. Jennifer Field, Ralph Doncaster
53.	STCIV-081213	Supreme Court - Truro	Respondent	2012	Andrea Doncaster v. Ralph Doncaster, Jennifer Field
54.	STD-079303	Supreme Court – Truro	Petitioner	2012	Ralph Doncaster v. Jennifer Field

Nova Scotia Supreme Court (Family Division):

	Court Case No.	Court	Party Title	Name of Proceeding
	none			

Nova Scotia Family Court:

	Court Case No.	Court	Party Title	Year Started	Name of Proceeding
55.	FSNMCA-078805	Family Court, Shubenacadie	Respondent	2012	Jennifer Field v. Ralph Doncaster

Small Claims Courts:

	Court Case No.	Court	Party Title	Year Started	Name of Proceeding
56.	SCT No. 370341	Sm Cl - Truro	Claimant	2011	Ralph Doncaster v. Home Trust
57.	SCT No. 370340	Sm Cl – Truro	Claimant	2011	Ralph Doncaster v. Nitcom IT Solutions Inc.
58.	SCT No. 370338	Sm Cl – Truro	Claimaint	2011	Ralph Doncaster v. Beacon Insurance , MJR Collection Services Ltd.

Nova Scotia Provincial Court:

	Court Case No.	Court			Name of Proceeding
59.	1710694	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2006	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
60.	170699	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2006	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
61.	1710702	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2006	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
62.	1893432	Sydney Provincial Court	Accused	2008	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
63.	2403585	Antigonish Provincial Court	Accused	2011	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
64.	2404694	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
65.	2414376	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster

66.	2418002	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
67.	2423583	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
68.	2423949	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
69.	2426091	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
70.	2426092	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
71.	2426093	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
72.	2426095	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
73.	2433853	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
74.	2433854	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
75.	2433855	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
76.	2434422	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
77.	2434423	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
78.	2435234	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
79.	2435235	Dartmouth	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph

		Provincial Court			Ivan Doncaster
80.	2435236	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
81.	2435237	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
82.	2436205	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
83.	2436212	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
84.	2441120	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
85.	2441123	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
86.	2444669	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
87.	2444670	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
88.	2444671	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
89.	2444690	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
90.	2447160	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
91.	2447161	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
92.	2447162	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster

93.	2447163	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
94.	2447164	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
95.	2449641	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
96.	2449647	Dartmouth Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
97.	2449896	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
98.	2449897	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
99.	2449898	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
100.	2455899	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
101.	2480117	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
102.	2509914	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster
103.	2509915	Truro Provincial Court	Accused	2012	Her Majesty the Queen v Ralph Ivan Doncaster