Eyolfson v. Buzzi, 2012 NWTSC 79 S-1-FM-2011-000123

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF THE INTERJURISDICTIONAL SUPPORT ORDERS ACT, S.N.W.T. 2002, c.19

BETWEEN:

SHELLEY LYNN EYOLFSON

Applicant

- and -

DEREK PAUL BUZZI

Respondent

Transcript of the Ruling delivered by The Honourable

Justice L. Charbonneau, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest

Territories, on the 18th day of October, 2012.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. A. Vogt: Counsel on behalf of the Designated

Authority

Ms. M. Nightingale: Counsel on behalf of the Respondent

1	THE	COURT:	This matter sta	arted off as an
2		application by the	applicant under	the
3		Interjurisdictional	l Support Orders	s Act, but the
4		respondent has resp	ponded, has prov	vided evidence,
5		which is on the cou	art file, which	raises matters
6		that are relevant t	to the issue of	child support.
7		The court, as a res	sult of reviewin	ng that
8		information, direct	ed that further	r information be
9		obtained from the a	applicant.	
10		There is evide	ence now on the	court file tha

There is evidence now on the court file that the applicant was made aware of the information that was required. I am referring here to the information that was required in the order made by this court on the 26th of April, 2012. In that order, the court directed the designated authority provide the applicant with the documents that were filed by the respondent, which include information suggesting that the child in question is no longer a child of the marriage.

The designated authority was also directed to contact the applicant and to request her to provide updated financial information, including household financial information, as well as various other things that are listed at paragraph 2 of the order.

At that time, the matter was adjourned to

July 26th. According to the information attached to the affidavit, the designated authority has complied with its obligations under the order, but the applicant has not provided any information as a result. Part of the documents include an e-mail confirming that the applicant was informed of what information she had to provide on June 26th, and there is a further e-mail from early September, September 7, where the person responsible for these matters in the other jurisdiction confirms that she has again spoken to the applicant and the applicant says she has not submitted the information yet.

If this was a matter of the applicant asking for more time to submit the information or expressing some difficulties in obtaining some of the information that she is being asked to provide or if she had filed other information rebutting what the respondent has adduced, I would be less inclined to make an order today. In the face of this complete lack of response and no request for additional time and because this matter has already been put over a number of times, I am going to dismiss the applicant's application.

I am also going to grant the other relief sought by the respondent, which is to declare

1		that child support i	s no longer payable for N.B.
2		The draft order	that was presented by Ms.
3		Nightingale will iss	sue as presented.
4		I direct that t	the designated authority take
5		the necessary steps	to ensure that that order is
6		forwarded on to the	applicant.
7		Is there anythi	ng further that is required
8		on this?	
9	MS.	NIGHTINGALE: T	hank you, Your Honour.
10	MS.	VOGT:	hose are all my matters, Your
11		Honour.	
12	THE	COURT: T	hank you, counsel.
13			
14			
15			Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
16		t	to Rule 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules of Court.
17		~	apreme court Nates of court.
18			
19			Innette Wright, RPR, CSR(A) Court Reporter
20			Notice Reporter
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			