



In this issue:

1. [New Youth Drug Stabilization Legislation](#)
2. [S.C.C. Justices at 2006 Pitblado Lectures](#)
3. [Costs to Innocent Bystander: ON. C.A.](#)
4. [Investigative Detentions: Q.B.](#)
5. [Accused Exempt from SOIRA Registration: P.C.](#)

1. New Youth Drug Stabilization Legislation

[The Youth Drug Stabilization \(Support for Parents\) Act](#) will come into force on November 1, 2006. The Act permits parents and guardians to seek apprehension orders for children who they believe have a serious addiction problem. The legislation provides the right to counsel for the youth and criminal defence lawyers should therefore become familiar with the provisions of the Act.

2. S.C.C. Justices at 2006 Pitblado Lecture

Appellate Courts: Policy, Law and Practice are the focus of the 2006 Isaac Pitblado Lectures. The Lectures will be held on November 3 and 4 at The Fort Garry hotel in Winnipeg. The program features keynote speakers The Honourable Madam Justice [Rosalie S. Abella](#) and The Honourable Mr. Justice [Marshall E. Rothstein](#), both of the Supreme Court of Canada as well as The Honourable Mr. Justice Thomas A. Cromwell of the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal and Professor [Daniel Jutras](#) of the Faculty of Law, McGill University. Co-chairs are The Honourable Chief Justice Richard J. Scott and G. Patrick S. Riley. Visit our [website](#) for more information and to download the [registration form](#).

3. Costs to Innocent Bystander: ON. C.A.

In [R. v. Ciarniello](#), 2006 CanLII 29633, the Ontario Court of Appeal awards costs to a 3rd party bystander to a criminal investigation on application under [s. 24\(1\) of the Charter](#). In doing so, the court creates a new exception to the rule that "...costs against the Crown as a s. 24(1) remedy for a *Charter* breach in cases not involving Crown misconduct requires something that is "rare" or "unique" that "must at least result in something akin to an extreme hardship on the defendant.""

4. Investigative Detentions: Q.B.

The decision in *R. v. Lindo and Horn*, 2006 MBQB 101 contains a useful summary of the law of investigative detentions since the decision of the Supreme Court in [R. v. Mann](#) [2004] 3 S.C.R. 59, 2004 SCC 52 (CanLII). The case is also interesting in that the accused would not have succeeded in arguing that he had an expectation of privacy in the vehicle of another, but did succeed in arguing that his own rights in being free from an arbitrary detention were breached and that the discovery of the drugs was both causally and temporally connected to that breach so that the evidence was excluded against him as well as the driver.

5. Accused Exempt from SOIRA Registration: P.C.

In *R. v. L.T.*, an August 28, 2006 decision of the Provincial Court, Brandon Centre, the court considers an application to exempt an accused from registration under the [Sex Offender Information Registration Act](#) pursuant to [s. 490.023\(2\)](#) of the [Criminal Code](#). The court considers the decisions in [R. v. Redhead-McIntyre](#), 2006 ABCA 84 and in *R. v. Putrus* [2006] A.J. 492, 2006 ABQB 313 and finds that "...while the hardship aspect of the analysis should be emphasized in keeping in mind that registration is inherently in the public interest, the circumstances of the offender and the offence may be considered. It would seem that in balancing the public interests versus the hardship on the accused, it would be very difficult to ignore the nature of the offence or the circumstances of the offender."

[Go to the eLaw Archive](#)

The Law Society of Manitoba provides this service solely for the benefit of and to support the competence of its members. Members should exercise their professional judgment in using or adapting any content.