

**International
Comparative
Legal Guides**



Enforcement of Foreign Judgments

2024

Ninth Edition

Contributing Editor:
Louise Freeman
Covington & Burling LLP

glg Global Legal Group

Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** **State Immunity and Enforcement in England**
Louise Freeman & Tom Cusworth, Covington & Burling LLP
- 6** **International Enforcement Strategy – An Overview**
Andrew Bartlett, Osborne Clarke LLP
- 11** **EU Overview**
Sébastien Champagne & Vanessa Foncke

Q&A Chapters

- 19** **Argentina**
Marval O'Farrell Mairal: Ricardo Ostrower & Martín Vainstein
- 26** **Australia**
Corrs Chambers Westgarth: Cara North & Harrison Frith
- 33** **Canada**
Goodmans LLP: Peter Kolla, Julie Rosenthal & Sarah Stothart
- 39** **China**
SGLA Law Office: Dr. Xu Guojian
- 46** **Croatia**
Macesic and Partners LLC: Anita Krizmanic & Koraljka Devcic
- 53** **Cyprus**
Phoebus, Christos Clerides & Associates LLC: Constantinos Clerides
- 60** **England & Wales**
Covington & Burling LLP: Louise Freeman & Tom Cusworth
- 68** **France**
Archipel: Jacques-Alexandre Genet & Michaël Schlesinger
- 74** **Germany**
White & Case LLP: Markus Langen, Dr. Dominik Stier & Kristof Waldenberger
- 81** **India**
LexOrbis: Manisha Singh & Varun Sharma
- 86** **Japan**
GAIEN Partners: Yuko Kanamaru
- 91** **Jordan**
Hammouri & Partners Attorneys at-Law: Dr. Tariq Hammouri, Yotta Pantoula-Bulmer, Haitham Al-Hajaj & Rozana Al-Hroob
- 97** **Liechtenstein**
GASSER PARTNER Attorneys at Law: Thomas Nigg & Domenik Vogt
- 103** **Luxembourg**
Harvey: Ariel Devillers & Justin Colombin
- 108** **Netherlands**
OSK Advocaten: Jurjen de Korte & Geert Wilts
- 113** **Nigeria**
The Trusted Advisors: Godwin Etim, Muhiz Babatunde Adisa & Olufe Popoola
- 118** **Singapore**
WongPartnership LLP: Wendy Lin, Monica Chong Wan Yee, Jill Ann Koh & Ho Yi Jie
- 124** **Spain**
Whitewell: Pablo Martínez Llorente & Daniel Rodríguez Galve
- 140** **Sweden**
Advokatfirman Cederquist KB: Elsa Arbrandt & Ingrid Ek
- 146** **Switzerland**
BMG Avocats: Rocco Rondi, Guillaume Fatio & Mimoza Lekiqi
- 154** **Taiwan**
Formosan Brothers Attorney-at-Law: Li-Pu Lee & Szu-Shian Lu
- 160** **USA**
Steptoe LLP: Chris Paparella, Justin Ben-Asher & Niyati Ahuja

Canada



Peter Kolla



Julie Rosenthal



Sarah Stothart

Goodmans LLP

1 Country Finder

1.1 Please set out the various regimes applicable to recognising and enforcing judgments in your jurisdiction and the names of the countries to which such special regimes apply.

Applicable Law/Statutory Regime	Relevant Jurisdiction(s)	Corresponding Section Below
<p><i>Canada-United Kingdom Civil and Commercial Judgments Convention Act</i>, RSC 1985, c C-30 (Canada).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act</i>, RSO 1990, c R.6 (Ontario).</p> <p><i>Court Order Enforcement Act</i>, RSBC 1996, c 78 (British Columbia). [Note that this statute will be superseded at an undetermined future date (currently intended to be 2025) by the <i>Money Judgement Enforcement Act</i>. This chapter continues to refer to the Court Order Enforcement Act as it remains in force for 2024.]</p> <p><i>International Conventions Implementation Act</i>, RSA 2000, C 1-6 (Alberta).</p> <p><i>The Canada-United Kingdom Judgments Enforcement Act</i>, SS 1988–89, c C-0.1 (Saskatchewan).</p> <p><i>The Canada-United Kingdom Judgments Enforcement Act</i>, CCSM, c J21 (Manitoba).</p> <p><i>Canada and the United Kingdom Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments Act</i>, RSNL 1990, c C-3 (Newfoundland and Labrador).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act</i>, RSNL 1990, c R-4 (Newfoundland and Labrador).</p> <p><i>Canada and United Kingdom Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments Act</i>, RSNS 1989, c 52 (Nova Scotia).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Canada-United Kingdom) Act</i>, RSNB 2016, c 109 (New Brunswick).</p> <p><i>Canada-United Kingdom Judgments Recognition Act</i>, RSPEI 1988, c C-1 (Prince Edward Island).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (Canada-U.K.) Act</i>, RSNWT (Nu) 1988, c R-2 (Nunavut).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (Canada-U.K.) Act</i>, RSNWT 1988, c R-2 (Northwest Territories).</p> <p><i>Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act</i>, RSY 2002, c 190 (Yukon).</p>	United Kingdom.	Section 3.

2 General Regime

2.1 Absent any applicable special regime, what is the legal framework under which a foreign judgment would be recognised and enforced in your jurisdiction?

In nine Canadian provinces (i.e., all provinces except for Quebec) and in all three Canadian territories, absent an applicable statutory regime (as listed above in section 1), the enforceability of a foreign judgment is determined by the common law rules governing recognition and enforcement, which are discussed below.

In Quebec, the enforceability of a foreign judgment is governed by the *Civil Code of Quebec*.

2.2 What constitutes a 'judgment' capable of recognition and enforcement in your jurisdiction?

At common law, a foreign judgment may be recognised if:

- it is a final judgment (although this requirement has been waived in certain limited circumstances);
- it was granted by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

- it is of a nature that the principle of comity requires the Canadian court to enforce. (*Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at para. 31.)

If it is a judgment for the payment of money, it must be for a definite sum. (*Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at para. 10.)

If it is a non-monetary judgment:

- the order must be clear (i.e., someone unfamiliar with the case must be able to ascertain what is required to comply with the terms of the judgment);
- the obligation imposed by the order must be “complete and defined”; and
- the order must not be penal. (*Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at paras 91, 95 and 100.)

2.3 What requirements (in form and substance) must a foreign judgment satisfy in order to be recognised and enforceable in your jurisdiction?

First, the judgment creditor must prove that the foreign court had jurisdiction to issue the judgment in question. The judgment creditor can prove this either by showing that the foreign court had a real and substantial connection with the litigants or with the subject matter of the dispute, or that one of the traditional bases of jurisdiction (e.g., presence in the jurisdiction or attornment) was satisfied. (*Chevron Corp. v. Yaiguaje*, 2015 SCC 42 at paras 27 and 54.)

Second, the general rule is that the foreign judgment must be final – i.e., the court that made the order must not have the power to rescind or vary it. (*Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at para. 31; and *Re Cavell Insurance Co.* (2006) 80 OR (3d) 500 at para. 42 (C.A.)) It should be noted that one very limited exception to the finality rule exists in a case where the order in question related to the procedures to be followed at a meeting of creditors entitled to vote on a proposed arrangement. (*Re Cavell Insurance Co.* (2006) 80 OR (3d) 500 at para. 54 (C.A.))

2.4 What (if any) connection to the jurisdiction is required for your courts to accept jurisdiction for recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment?

No additional requirements apply in order for a Canadian court to determine whether a foreign judgment should be recognised and enforced. Thus, there is no need for the judgment creditor to prove, for example, that the judgment creditor is present or that it has assets in the enforcing jurisdiction. (*Chevron Corp. v. Yaiguaje*, 2015 SCC 42 at para. 3.)

2.5 Is there a difference between recognition and enforcement of judgments? If so, what are the legal effects of recognition and enforcement respectively?

As a practical matter, courts are generally asked to both recognise and enforce a foreign judgment, as the judgment creditor usually has been unable to have the judgment fully satisfied. However, there is a difference between the two concepts. “Enforcement” refers to the process of compelling the judgment debtor to honour its obligations imposed by the judgment. In order to have a judgment enforced, it must first be recognised. “Recognition” refers to the process of having the local court treat the judgment as a final pronouncement as to the rights of the parties. For example, a party may seek to have a foreign judgment recognised (but not enforced) in order to establish a plea of *res judicata*.

2.6 Briefly explain the procedure for recognising and enforcing a foreign judgment in your jurisdiction.

If the judgment creditor is proceeding pursuant to common law, the judgment creditor is required to commence a proceeding (either an action or an application, depending on the jurisdiction) in the local superior court seeking recognition and enforcement of the foreign judgment. Where the foreign judgment is for the payment of money, the claim for relief should seek an order that the judgment debtor pay the requisite sum to the judgment creditor. The judgment creditor in such cases typically seeks summary judgment on the claim.

If, however, the judgment creditor is proceeding pursuant to one of the statutory regimes listed in section 1 above, then the specific procedure set out in the applicable statute should be followed.

2.7 On what grounds can recognition/enforcement of a judgment be challenged? When can such a challenge be made?

Assuming that the preconditions to enforcement of a foreign judgment (set out in question 2.3 above) have been met, there are three main defences to an action to enforce a foreign judgment: fraud (i.e., if the foreign judgment was obtained by fraud); lack of natural justice (i.e., if the foreign proceeding did not conform to the principles of natural justice – including notice and the right to be heard); and public policy (i.e., it would be contrary to Canadian public policy to enforce the foreign judgment). (*Beals v. Saldanha*, 2003 SCC 72 at para. 35; *Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at para. 12.) Canadian courts have traditionally been reluctant to apply the public policy defence. (Castel & Walker, *Canadian Conflict of Laws*, looseleaf, 6th ed. (Toronto: LexisNexis, 2005) §14.1, p. 14–6; *Beals v. Saldanha*, 2003 SCC 72 at para. 75.) For recent examples of this reluctance, see *Costco Wholesale Corporation v. TicketOps Corporation*, 2023 ONSC 573 at paras 53 and 92 and see *Roger Vanden Berghe NV v. Merinos Carpet Inc.*, 2023 ONSC 6728 at paras 55 and 74.

In addition, Canadian courts will generally not enforce judgments that are obtained under foreign taxing statutes or penal statutes.

In the case of a non-monetary judgment, additional defences may be raised, as the court will consider factors including:

- whether the terms of the order are clear and specific enough to ensure that the defendant will know what is expected of the defendant;
- whether the order is limited in scope;
- whether the originating court has retained the power to issue further orders;
- whether enforcement is the least burdensome remedy for the Canadian justice system;
- whether the Canadian litigant is exposed to unforeseen obligations;
- whether third parties are affected by the order; and
- whether the use of judicial resources is consistent with what would be permitted for domestic litigants. (*Pro Swing Inc. v. Elta Golf Inc.*, 2006 SCC 52 at para. 30.)

2.8 What, if any, is the relevant legal framework applicable to recognising and enforcing foreign judgments relating to specific subject matters?

As noted above, the traditional rule is that Canadian courts will not enforce foreign judgments obtained under tax statutes,

criminal or quasi-criminal statutes. (Dicey and Morris, *The Conflict of Laws*, 12th ed. (London: Stevens & Sons, 1993) at p. 103.) However, there are exceptions. For example, Quebec will recognise tax judgments from jurisdictions that will similarly recognise and enforce obligations resulting from the taxation laws of Quebec. (*Civil Code of Quebec*, art. 3162.)

There are also statutes providing for the reciprocal enforcement of family law support orders in most provinces.

2.9 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment when there is: (a) a conflicting local judgment between the parties relating to the same issue; or (b) local proceedings pending between the parties?

If the foreign judgment conflicts with an existing Canadian judgment, the foreign judgment will not be enforced. (*South Pacific Import Inc. v. Ho*, 2009 BCCA 163 at paras 55–56.)

In Quebec, a foreign judgment will not be recognised if there is a proceeding pending before the Quebec courts between the same parties and dealing with the same subject matter. (*Civil Code of Quebec*, art. 3155(4).)

2.10 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment when there is a conflicting local law or prior judgment on the same or a similar issue, but between different parties?

Canadian courts may enforce foreign judgments even in circumstances where the judgment was based on commercial activity that would not be lawful in Canada. Canadian courts have enforced foreign judgments for gambling debts, even though the contracts giving rise to the debts would have been illegal if made in Canada. See, e.g., *Boardwalk Regency Corp. v. Maalouf* (1992), 6 O.R. (3d) 737 (C.A.). They have also enforced judgments that bear an interest rate higher than what would be permitted under the analogous Canadian laws. See, e.g., *Lion Creek Properties, Ltd, LLP v. Sorobey*, 2015 ABQB 223.

A prior domestic judgment on a “similar issue”, but between different parties, should not pose any impediment to the enforcement of the foreign judgment.

2.11 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment that purports to apply the law of your country?

The fact that the foreign judgment was based upon an application of Canadian law should not pose any impediment to recognition and enforcement.

2.12 Are there any differences in the rules and procedure of recognition and enforcement between the various states/regions/provinces in your country? Please explain.

Each province and territory has its own procedural rules, which will govern the specific process to be followed for obtaining an order recognising and enforcing a foreign judgment.

From a substantive point of view, the common law rules governing recognition and enforcement are the same across all of the Canadian common law jurisdictions. Quebec, however, employs a civil law substantive legal regime, embodied in the *Civil Code of Quebec*.

2.13 What is the relevant limitation period to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment?

Assuming that the judgment creditor is seeking to enforce a foreign judgment at common law, the general limitation period applies to such an action. The general limitation periods vary from province to province. In most (but not all) instances, the general limitation period is two years. However, if the judgment creditor is proceeding under one of the statutory reciprocal enforcement regimes listed in Part 1 above, then the applicable statute should be consulted to see if a different limitation period applies. For specific details on limitation periods, a judgment creditor should consult the specific text of the limitations statute in the jurisdiction in which they are seeking to enforce the judgment.

3 Special Enforcement Regimes Applicable to Judgments from Certain Countries

3.1 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, what requirements (in form and substance) must the judgment satisfy in order to be recognised and enforceable under the respective regime?

For specific requirements, a judgment creditor should consult the specific text of the statute in the jurisdiction(s) in which it is seeking to enforce the judgment. Generally, however, the specific regimes have the following requirements (in form and substance) that the foreign judgment must satisfy in order to be recognised and enforced.

From a reciprocal jurisdiction:

In order to be recognised and enforceable under any of the statutory regimes applicable to specific locations rather than all foreign jurisdictions, the judgment must have been given by a reciprocating jurisdiction.

Meet the definition of “judgment”:

The Convention between Canada and the United Kingdom, providing for reciprocal enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, adopted federally in Canada and by the individual provinces and territories in the specific regimes listed in question 1.1, defines a judgment as “any decision, however described (judgment, order and the like), given by a court in a civil or commercial matter, and includes an award in proceedings on an arbitration if the award has become enforceable in the territory of origin in the same manner as a judgment given by a court in that territory”. The Convention focuses on monetary judgments, and specifically excludes and does not apply to certain other types of orders or judgments (such as orders for the periodic payment of maintenance, orders for recovery of taxes, judgments on appeal from non-court bodies, and matrimonial or custody or status orders). In some other specific regimes, “judgment” is also limited to judgments whereby “money is payable” (e.g. *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSO 1990, c R.5 (Ontario), *Court Order Enforcement Act*, RSBC 1996, c 78 (British Columbia), and *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSA 2000, c R-6 (Alberta)). In others still, a judgment is not definitionally limited to only monetary awards, and there are provisions addressing the mechanisms by which an enforcing court, on application of a party, may make an order enabling them to enforce a non-monetary judgment (e.g. *Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act*, SS 2005, c E-9.121 (Saskatchewan)).

Comply with time limitations:

The various statutes also have time limitations. Under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act*, RSO 1990, c R.6 (Ontario), for example, the judgment creditor must apply to a court in Ontario for registration of the judgment within six years after the date of the last judgment given. The time frame is also six years under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, CCSM, c J20 (Manitoba) and *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSA 2000, c R-6 (Alberta). By contrast, under the *Court Order Enforcement Act*, RSBC 1996, c 78 (British Columbia) and *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSPEI 1988, c R-6 (Prince Edward Island), the time frame is 10 years after the judgment became enforceable.

3.2 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, does the regime specify a difference between recognition and enforcement? If so, what is the difference between the legal effect of recognition and enforcement?

While recognition and enforcement are different concepts (recognition of a foreign judgment allows a creditor to assert it as rendering the subject of such judgment *res judicata*, while enforcement allows a creditor to obtain money payable), these differences do not affect the registration rules to which the judgment will be subject under the statutory regimes.

Most of the specific regimes do not specify any difference between recognition and enforcement (for example, there are not distinct sections addressing the two concepts in the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, CCSM, c J20 (Manitoba), *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSA 2000, c R-6 (Alberta), the *Court Order Enforcement Act*, RSBC 1996, c 78 (British Columbia), and the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act*, RSO 1990, c R.6 (Ontario)). The *Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act*, SS 2005, c E-9.121 (Saskatchewan) does specify rules for a judgment creditor seeking to enforce a judgment in a different section from those seeking to recognise a judgment, but there are no substantive distinctions between the analyses. The Saskatchewan regime specifically notes in a section titled “Recognition of foreign judgments” that “the rules in this Part that determine whether a foreign judgment is unenforceable for lack of jurisdiction in the court of the state of origin over a party or subject-matter, or on account of fraud, public policy or a violation of the principles of procedural fairness and natural justice, also apply, with any necessary modification, in determining whether a foreign judgment is binding on the parties so as to be a defence to a claim, or conclusive of an issue, in an action in Saskatchewan”.

3.3 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, briefly explain the procedure for recognising and enforcing a foreign judgment.

In order to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment under one of the specific regimes, a judgment creditor must apply to register the judgment. For specific details on registration procedures, a judgment creditor should consult the specific text of the statute in the jurisdiction in which they are seeking to enforce the judgment.

Under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act*, RSO 1990, c R.6 (Ontario), the practice and procedure for registration is governed by the law of the registering (Ontario) court. A judgment creditor may apply for registration within six years from the date of judgment or final appeal. They should include in their application (1) the original court judgment sought to be

enforced or a certified copy thereof, (2) a certified translation of the judgment, if other than English, (3) proof of the notice given to the judgment debtor in the original court, and (4) particulars of other matters required by the Ontario court.

Under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSA 2000, c R-6 (Alberta), a judgment creditor may apply to the Court of King’s Bench within six years after the date of the judgment to have the judgment registered. The application can be made *ex parte* if the judgment debtor was either personally served in the original action or appeared or otherwise submitted to the jurisdiction of the original court, and the time period for appeal has expired or been dismissed. The judgment creditor must include in their *ex parte* application a certificate issued from the original court (signed by a judge or the clerk of that court) setting out the particulars of the judgment, in the form prescribed by Regulation 487/1981.

3.4 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, on what grounds can recognition/enforcement of a judgment be challenged under the special regime? When can such a challenge be made?

For specific details on challenges to recognition and enforcement, a judgment creditor should consult the specific text of the statute in the jurisdiction in which they are seeking to enforce the judgment.

Under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments (U.K.) Act*, RSO 1990, c R.6 (Ontario), registration of a judgment can be challenged, and the court will not register it, in circumstances including where the judgment is already satisfied, where it was obtained by fraud, where its enforcement would be “contrary to public policy”, or where, in the view of the registering (Ontario) court, the judgment debtor either is entitled to immunity from the jurisdiction of that court or was entitled to immunity in the original court and did not submit to its jurisdiction.

Under the *Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act*, RSNL 1990, c R-4 (Newfoundland and Labrador), registration will not be ordered where a judgment debtor shows, among other things, that the original court acted without jurisdiction or without authority, that the judgment debtor was not properly served or did not submit to the court’s jurisdiction, that the judgment was obtained by fraud, that “for reasons of public policy or for some similar reason” would not have been entertained by the registering (Newfoundland and Labrador) court, or that the judgment debtor would have a “good defence” if an action were brought on the judgment.

4 Enforcement

4.1 Once a foreign judgment is recognised and enforced, what are the general methods of enforcement available to a judgment creditor?

The specific methods of enforcement available to a judgment creditor depend on the province or territory that recognised it. A foreign judgment that has been recognised in one province or territory cannot be automatically enforced outside of its borders. If enforcement in multiple Canadian provinces and territories is required to satisfy the foreign judgment, then recognition proceedings in each would be required.

Generally, there are many enforcement tools available to judgment creditors, including various writs (including a writ of seizure and sale), garnishment and the appointment of a receiver. See, e.g., Ontario’s *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194 and *Execution Act*, RSO 1990, c. E.24. Garnishment is an equitable remedy compelling payment by a third party to the creditor

for debts owing from the third party to the judgment debtor. A sheriff can also be employed to assist in execution. A judgment debtor (or others) may be examined under oath in relation to matters pertinent to enforcement once the foreign judgment has been recognised, such as the location of cash and property. Certain assets may be exempt from seizure.

5 Other Matters

5.1 Have there been any noteworthy recent (in the last 12 months) legal developments in your jurisdiction relevant to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments? Please provide a brief description.

In 2023, the Court of Appeal for Ontario delivered its decision in *Benzacar v. Terk*, 2023 ONCA 773, which concerned a garnishment remedy that sought payment upon a foreign judgment. Garnishment is a statutory and equitable remedy. Under rule 60.08 of Ontario's *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, a judgment creditor may enforce an order for the payment of money by the garnishment of debts payable to the judgment debtor by a third party (the "garnishee"). The garnishee can dispute the garnishment by filing a "garnishee's statement" advising of any debts owing to the judgment debtor. The Court of Appeal held that where a garnishee files a materially false garnishee statement without reasonable justification, the garnishee can be held liable for the full amount of the debt owing by the judgment debtor that the judgment creditor seeks to garnish.

The facts of the *Benzacar v. Terk* case involved two former spouses, one of whom (Mr. Terk) owed the other (Ms. Benzacar) amounts under various domestic and foreign court orders that Mr. Terk failed to pay. Ms. Benzacar enforced a foreign judgment against Mr. Terk in Ontario, and then sought to garnish in Ontario debts owing to Mr. Terk by a corporation controlled by Mr. Terk. The garnishee (here the corporation) delivered

the garnishee statement to dispute the garnishment, but falsely did not disclose debts owing by the corporation to Mr. Terk and that would become owing to Mr. Terk. The Court of Appeal held that where (1) a garnishee statement contains a materially false statement, and (2) there is no reasonable justification for the statement's incorrect content, then the court can treat the garnishee as if it had not filed the required garnishee's statement at all. In those circumstances, a court can, pursuant to rule 60.08(17), make an order against the garnishee to pay the full amount sought to be garnished, or the amount of the debt owing by the garnishee to the debtor, whichever is less. In the result, the corporation was ordered to pay to Ms. Benzacar the full amount of the judgment debt sought against Mr. Terk.

This case demonstrates that if third parties are faced with garnishment proceedings that they seek to contest, they need to take seriously the obligations to file an accurate garnishee's statement.

5.2 Are there any particular tips you would give, or critical issues that you would flag, to clients seeking to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment in your jurisdiction?

Clients should pay critical attention to limitation period issues when seeking recognition and enforcement in Canada. Recognition and enforcement actions may be needed in multiple Canadian jurisdictions, and the applicable limitation periods vary between the provinces and territories. Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland and Labrador have limitations legislation based on a basic litigation period triggered when the claim is or ought to have been discovered. Manitoba has a different discoverability regime, and the limitations statutes of Prince Edward Island and the territories are different still and do not address discoverability.



Peter Kolla is a partner in the Dispute Resolution Group at Goodmans. His practice focuses on assisting clients with a wide variety of litigation and arbitration proceedings involving complex commercial and financial transactions, mergers and acquisitions disputes, and securities matters. An experienced trial and appellate litigator, he has successfully tried a 10-figure award for his client, and has successfully defended cases in which his client was facing 10-figure damage exposure. Peter is recognised by *The Legal 500 Canada*, *Benchmark Litigation Canada* as a "Future Star", and the *Lexpert Special Edition: Canada's Leading Litigation Lawyers*.

Goodmans LLP

Bay Adelaide Centre – West Tower
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7
Canada

Tel: +1 416 597 6279
Email: pkolla@goodmans.ca
URL: www.goodmans.ca/people/bio/Peter_Kolla



Julie Rosenthal is a partner in the Dispute Resolution, Class Actions and Competition and Foreign Investment Law Groups at Goodmans. Julie has extensive experience in complex commercial disputes, competition law, regulatory/administrative law proceedings, procurement law, white collar crime, internal investigations, as well as domestic and international arbitrations. She has appeared before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Federal Court of Appeal, the Federal Court and all levels of court in Ontario. Julie is recognised by *Benchmark Litigation Canada*, *The Canadian Legal Lexpert Directory*, *The Legal 500 Canada*, *The Best Lawyers in Canada*, and is named among Canada's best litigators in the *Lexpert Special Edition: Canada's Leading Litigation Lawyers*.

Goodmans LLP

Bay Adelaide Centre – West Tower
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7
Canada

Tel: +1 416 597 4259
Email: jrosenthal@goodmans.ca
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/julie-rosenthal



Sarah Stothart is a partner in the Dispute Resolution Group at Goodmans. Her practice is divided between corporate commercial and intellectual property litigation, with a focus on securities and technology issues. She acts for and advises clients on a variety of litigation matters, including complex contractual disputes, patent disputes, shareholder disputes including oppression claims, and issues relating to fiduciary, statutory and regulatory obligations. Sarah is licensed in Ontario and California and has appeared before all levels of Ontario and Canadian federal courts, the Competition Tribunal, and the Supreme Court of Canada, as well as in the US before the Delaware Court of Chancery.

Goodmans LLP

Bay Adelaide Centre – West Tower
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7
Canada

Tel: +1 416 597 4200
Email: sstothart@goodmans.ca
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/sarahstothart

Goodmans is internationally recognised as one of Canada's leading business law firms. Based in Toronto, the firm has market-leading expertise in M&A, capital markets, private equity, real estate, tax, restructuring, dispute resolution and other business-related specialties.

Our clients are business leaders, innovators, entrepreneurs and investors who need counsel from a law firm that is as enterprising, forward-thinking and direct as they are. We work hard to develop the most appropriate solution for any situation, including problems that are international in scope, and provide clear, concise and straightforward advice to solve some of our clients' most complex and demanding legal issues.

At Goodmans, our lawyers excel in their fields to help our clients excel in theirs – ensuring exceptional levels of service and business success. We deliver intelligent results, responsiveness, energy, talent and determination to get the deal done.

www.goodmans.ca

Goodmans^{LLP}

International Comparative Legal Guides

The **International Comparative Legal Guide (ICLG)** series brings key cross-border insights to legal practitioners worldwide, covering 58 practice areas.

Enforcement of Foreign Judgments 2024 features three expert analysis chapters and 22 Q&A jurisdiction chapters covering key issues, including:

- General Regimes
- Special Enforcement Regimes Applicable to Judgments from Certain Countries
- Enforcement
- Grounds for Challenging Recognition/Enforcement of a Foreign Judgment
- Recent Developments