



MILLER THOMSON LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
Patent & Trade-Mark Agents



CRIMINAL LAW, REGULATION & ENFORCEMENT NEWSLETTER

March 2010

This Newsletter is published by Miller Thomson's Criminal Law, Regulation & Enforcement Group as a service to our clients. We encourage you to forward the e-mail delivering this newsletter to anyone (internal or external to your organization) who might be interested. Complimentary e-mail subscriptions are available by contacting newsletters@millerthomson.com.

Inside

Workplace Safety: Another Criminal Code Prosecution

WORKPLACE SAFETY: ANOTHER CRIMINAL CODE PROSECUTION

J. Bruce McMeekin
Markham
905.415.6791
bmcmeekin@millerthomson.com



For the third time, police have laid Bill C-45 *Criminal Code* charges arising from a workplace fatality. Millennium Crane Rentals of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, along with two individuals, have been charged with criminal negligence causing death.

In April, 2009, a City of Sault Ste. Marie employee, James Vecchio, was crushed when a crane collapsed into the excavated hole in which he was working. The City was undertaking sewer work at the city landfill when the accident occurred.

The *Criminal Code* workplace duty of care was enacted in 2004 by Bill C-45. It requires every employer who undertakes or directs work to take reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm to any employee or any other person arising from that work. The criminally negligent breach of the duty of care causing death is an indictable offence punishable by a maximum sentence of life imprisonment and/or unlimited fines. When a criminally negligent breach causes bodily harm, the maximum penalty is 10 years imprisonment and/or unlimited fines.

Thus far, the C-45 provision has been used on only two occasions. In 2004, a supervisor with a small Newmarket, Ontario, construction company was charged when a trench collapsed causing fatal injuries to a worker. However, the C-45 charge was withdrawn when the supervisor pleaded guilty to parallel provincial *Occupational Health and Safety Act* ("OHSA") charges. In 2008, a Transpavé, a Quebec paving stone manufacturer, pleaded guilty to criminal negligence causing the death of one of its employees and was fined \$100,000.

Millennium Crane is also charged with five offences contrary to the OHSA. The crane operator is charged with one OHSA count. Each charge laid under the OHSA against the company is subject to a \$500,000 fine, in addition to an automatic 25 per cent victim impact surcharge. The maximum fine for the individual is \$25,000 per charge, plus the surcharge.

In comparison to the OHSA and other provincial workplace safety statutes, C-45 criminal prosecutions require the Crown to prove fault on behalf of each accused. For criminal negligence, the fault requirement is a *marked and substantial departure from the standard of care which, in the circumstances, could reasonably be expected to prevent the commission of the offence*. In law, this is a more serious fault requirement than that for OHSA offences, wherein the fault level is negligence – a *mere departure* from the standard of care reasonably expected in the circumstances. Moreover, in OHSA prosecutions fault is a presumed element of the offence, but a presumed element rebuttable by the defendant if it can establish that it met the standard of care by taking all reasonable care to prevent the commission of the offence (the so-called reverse onus inherent in strict liability offences).

In the case of organizations or corporate defendants charged with a C-45 offence, the fault must be that of the senior officer or officers responsible for the part of the organization's activities relevant to the offence. This is also true of OHSА prosecutions, the two primary differences between them again being the more serious level of fault required for C-45 offences and the rebuttable presumption of fault for OHSА offences

What is often forgotten about the C-45 duty of care is that it applies to protect *any* person from death or bodily harm originating from a workplace mishap. In this case the fatality was a City, and not a Millennium employee. Non-workers are also protected. If a company's criminal negligence causes the spill of a dangerous chemical into the natural environment, it is still exposed to a prosecution under the C-45 provision if the spill seriously harms or causes the death of civilians or non-workers, but not employees.

This new prosecution drives home yet again the importance of corporate leaders embracing and fostering a culture of regulatory compliance within their organizations.

The Millennium charges are returnable in the Sault Ste. Marie courts shortly. We will keep you updated as the matter progresses.

Bruce McMeekin is a partner in the Markham office and represents corporations and individuals subject to investigation or prosecution for regulatory and white-collar criminal offences. If you have questions about the Criminal Code workplace duty of care please contact Bruce or any other member of the Criminal Law, Regulation and Enforcement Group.

MILLER THOMSON LLP CRIMINAL LAW, REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT GROUP

Toronto/Markham

Douglas Best 416.595.8588
dbest@millerthomson.com

Bryan J. Buttigieg 416.595.8172
bbuttigieg@millerthomson.com

Adrienne Campbell 416.595.2661
acampbell@millerthomson.com

David W. Chodikoff 416.595.8626
dchodikoff@millerthomson.com

Emily Cole 416.595.8640
ecole@millerthomson.com

Robert England 416.595.8566
rengland@millerthomson.com

Jacqueline L. King 416.595.2966
jking@millerthomson.com

Roderick M. McLeod, Q.C. 905.415.6707
rmcleod@millerthomson.com

J. Bruce McMeekin 905.415.6791
bmcmeekin@millerthomson.com

Andrew Roman 416.595.8604
aroman@millerthomson.com

Stuart Rudner 905.415.6767
srudner@millerthomson.com

Adam Stephens 416.595.8572
astephens@millerthomson.com

Katherine Xilinas 416.595.8165
kxilinas@millerthomson.com

Vancouver

Daniel L. Kiselbach 604.643.1263
dkiselbach@millerthomson.com

Donald J. Sorochan, Q.C. 604.643.1214
dsorochan@millerthomson.com

Calgary

Fred R. Fenwick, Q.C. 403.298.2421
ffrenwick@millerthomson.com

Edmonton

Daniel C.P. Stachnik, Q.C. 780.429.9761
dstachnik@millerthomson.com

Note:

This newsletter is provided as an information service to our clients and is a summary of current legal issues. These articles are not meant as legal opinions and readers are cautioned not to act on information provided in this newsletter without seeking specific legal advice with respect to their unique circumstances. Miller Thomson LLP uses your contact information to send you information on legal topics that may be of interest to you. It does not share your personal information outside the firm, except with subcontractors who have agreed to abide by its privacy policy and other rules.

© Miller Thomson LLP, 2010 All Rights Reserved. All Intellectual Property Rights including copyright in this publication are owned by Miller Thomson LLP. This publication may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety provided no alterations are made to the form or content. Any other form of reproduction or distribution requires the prior written consent of Miller Thomson LLP which may be requested from the editor at newsletters@millerthomson.com

www.millerthomson.com