CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL

CLASS ACTION DIVISION
SUPERIOR COURT

NO : 500-06-001263-231

THE CLASS

and

ASSOCIATION FOR THE RIGHTS OF HOUSEHOLD AND FARM WORKERS

Representative Plaintiff

and

BYRON ALFREDO ACEVEDO TOBAR

Designated Member

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Defendant

NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT FOR THE ADJUDICATION OF OBJECTIONS
(Article 228 *C.c.p.*; *Directives de la division de Montréal* – January 1st 2026, art. 52)

TO :

Me Marieve Sirois-Vaillancourt
Me Emilie Tremblay
Me Kim Nguyen
Me Sean Doyle
Me Maria Rodriguez
Department of Justice Canada
Guy-Favreau Complex
East Tower, 9th Floor

200 René-Lévesque Boulevard West
Montréal, Quebec H2Z 1X4
Telephone : 514.629.6794 / 514.463.9332 /
438.596.6817 / 438.341.6650
Fax : 514.496.7876
Marieve.Sirois-Vaillancourt@justice.gc.ca
Emilie.Tremblay@justice.gc.ca
Kim.Nguyen@justice.gc.ca
Sean.Doyle@justice.gc.ca
Maria.Rodriguez2@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendant,
Attorney General of Canada

TAKE NOTICE that the present Notice of Case Management will be presented for adjudication before the Honourable Pierre Nollet, J.C.S., case management judge in the present matter, at the Montréal Courthouse located at 1 Notre-Dame Street East, in the city and district of Montréal, on a date to be determined.

The purpose of the case management conference is explained below:

1. On May 5, 2025, the Representative Plaintiff communicated to the Defendant an Initial Request for the Disclosure of Documents (the "**Initial Request**").

2. On July 4, 2025, the Defendant provided its position on the Initial Request, in which it stated that it did not object at this stage to requests #13 to #17 (except footnote 2), #18 to #22, #24, #25, and #39 to #56 (the "**Accepted Requests #1**"), "*subject to privilege and immunity review of the documents to be disclosed*", "*subject to obtaining the written consent of the Designated Member or an order from the Superior Court of Québec*" (for request #25), and "*without prejudice to the position of the AGC on the admissibility into evidence of these documents, including but not limited to, parliamentary privilege*" (for requests #39 to #50). Firm request-wide objections were raised with respect to footnote 2 of request #17 and requests #23, #26 to #34, and #36 to #38.

3. From September 2025 to June 2026, the Parties were engaged in several "meet-and-confer" sessions and discussed ways to limit disagreements on the disclosure requests.

4. The Representative Plaintiff and Defendant notably negotiated an agreement for the disclosure of data relevant to the determination of the size and composition of the Class, which is not yet finalized, as the Defendant needs to comment an outstanding clause.

5. Further to the meet-and-confer sessions, the Representative Plaintiff particularized the quasi-totality of the requests which were subject to firm, request-wide objections, and added certain requests. On December 4, 2025, it communicated a Particularized Initial Request for the Disclosure of Documents (the "**Particularized Request**").

6. On March 12, 2026, following the filing of Defendant's Defence, the Representative Plaintiff communicated an Additional (Post-Defence) Request for the Disclosure of Documents (the "**Additional Request**").

7. On May 29, 2026, the Defendant provided its position on the Particularized Request and Additional Request. The Defendant:

   (a) added that it did not object at this stage to requests #11, #12, #57 to #59, #60(a), and #61 to #75, nor to request #23 previously subject to a firm objection, "*subject to privilege and immunity review of the documents to be disclosed*" (the "**Accepted Requests #2**");

   (b) reiterated, and/or added to, its firm, request-wide objections regarding footnote 2 of request #17 and requests #26 to #34 and #36 to #38; and

   (c) formulated additional firm, request-wide objections regarding requests #33.1, #33.2, #60(b), #60(c), and #76.

8. On July 8, 2026, the Defendant disclosed documents in response to requests #18 and #35, and provided a partial disclosure of documents in response to request #25.

9. On July 13, 2026, as a result of further meet-and-confer exchanges between the parties, the Defendant reformulated its position on requests #26 to #31 (the "**Accepted Requests #3**" and, together with the Accepted Requests #1 and Accepted Requests #2, the "**Accepted Requests**") as follows:

   > *The parties are engaged in discussions regarding Section IV - The Historical Development of the Programs of the Representative Plaintiff's Particularized Initial Request for Documents.*
   >
   > *At this time, the AGC does not object to provide historical documents about the development of the programs at issue, but rather to the qualification and subjective nature of the requests 26 to 31. The AGC's consent to provide documents responsive to the historical development of the programs is subject to privileges and immunity review of the documents to be disclosed, including solicitor-client privilege and privileges under s. 37 and 38 of the Canada Evidence Act (R.S.C., 1985, c-5).*

At this time, the AGC estimates that documents could be disclosed on a rolling basis, within the next 3 months.

10. As a result of the above, despite the meet-and-confer exchanges between the parties and the particularization efforts made by the Representative Plaintiff, more than 1 year and 7 months after the filing of the Originating Application, and more than 1 year after the Defendant announced not objecting at this stage to the majority of the Accepted Requests, the Representative Plaintiff has only obtained responses to requests #18 and #35 and a partial response to request #25.

11. As a result of the above, despite the meet-and-confer exchanges between the parties and the particularization efforts made by the Representative Plaintiff, more than 1 year and 7 months after the filing of the Originating Application, and more than 1 year after the Defendant announced not objecting at this stage to the majority of the Accepted Requests, the Representative Plaintiff has only obtained – and only on July 8, 2026 – responses to requests #18 and #35 and a partial response to request #25.

12. Though the Defendant has agreed to communicating documents on a rolling basis and to advising the Representative Plaintiff once it considers that a particular request has been fully answered, the Defendant has announced that it will require several months to begin disclosing responses to the rest of the Accepted Requests and has provided no indication of the total time or number of iterative disclosures required to fully answer the Accepted Requests (except for requests #26 to #31, for which it announced a delay of 3 months).

13. Such delays in the disclosure of documents are not conducive to the efficient progress of this class action, and the Court's involvement is necessary.

14. The Representative Plaintiff asks the Court to:

    (a) adjudicate the firm, request-wide objections to requests #26 to #34, #36 to #38, #60(b), #60(c) and #76, as it appears from the joint document on objections[1]; and

    (b) order the Defendant to provide the documents which respond to the Accepted Requests (subject to the privileges and immunities that may be claimed on a particularized basis) within 90 days; and

---

[1] The Representative Plaintiff does not ask for the adjudication of the remaining objections at this stage, but reserves its right to ask for the adjudication of the objections to be raised in respect of particular documents (privileges and immunities claimed by the Defendant) or of the other remaining objections, if the documents willingly provided by the Defendant are deemed unsatisfactory.

(c) order the Defendant to provide a log of the privileges and immunities claimed in respect of particular documents within the same deadline, for further adjudication by the Court, if necessary.

15. In accordance with Article 52 of the *Directives de la division de Montréal – 1er janvier 2026*, a joint document is attached to this Notice for Case Management indicating the objections concerned, the grounds for objection, and the time required to address them (the "**Joint Table of Objections**").

The relief sought is as follows:

DISMISS the request-wide objections raised by the Attorney General of Canada as set out in the Joint Table of Objections, subject to the privileges and immunities to be claimed on a particularized basis;

ORDER the Attorney General of Canada to provide to the Representative Plaintiff the documents which respond to the Accepted Requests and the documents which respond to the requests for which objections were dismissed (subject in both cases to the privileges and immunities that may be claimed on a particularized basis), within 90 days of judgment;

ORDER the Attorney General of Canada to provide to the Representative Plaintiff and to the Court a log of the privileges and immunities claimed on a particularized basis within 90 days of judgment, for further adjudication by the Court, if necessary;

ISSUE any further order(s) that this Court deems necessary in the circumstances;

THE WHOLE with costs.

Montréal, July 15, 2026

Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP

DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP
Counsel for the Representative Plaintiff **Association for the Rights of Household and Farm Workers**
Me Jean-Philippe Groleau
Me Guillaume Charlebois
Me Alexandra Belley-McKinnon
Me Aliosha Hurry
1501 McGill College Avenue, 27th floor
Montréal (Québec) H3A 3N9

Email: jpgroleau@dwpv.com /
gcharlebois@dwpv.com /
abelleymckinnon@dwpv.com /
ahurry@dwpv.com

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL

CLASS ACTION DIVISION
SUPERIOR COURT

NO : 500-06-001263-231

THE CLASS

and

ASSOCIATION FOR THE RIGHTS OF HOUSEHOLD AND FARM WORKERS

Representative Plaintiff

and

BYRON ALFREDO ACEVEDO TOBAR

Designated Member

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Defendant

OATH OF ALIOSHA HURRY

I, the undersigned, **Aliosha Hurry**, attorney, practicing my profession at the law firm of Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP, having its principal place of business in Quebec at 1501 McGill College Avenue, 27th floor, Montreal (Quebec) H3A 3N9, solemnly declare:

1. I am one of the attorneys for the Representative Plaintiff herein;

2. I have read the attached *Notice of Case Management Conference for the Adjudication of Objections*, and all of the facts alleged therein, which do not otherwise appear from the Court record, if any, are true to the best of my knowledge.

AND I HAVE SIGNED

ALIOSHA HURRY

SOLEMNLY AFFIRMED before me this 15th day of July 2026 by Aliosha Hurry whose oath was taken in Montréal and was received in Montréal.

Claude Lalancette

Commissioner for Oaths for Québec and for outside of Québec

COMMISSAIRE À L'ASSERMENTATION
COMMISSIONER FOR OATHS
CLAUDE LALANCETTE
172 856
FOR QUÉBEC AND FOR OUTSIDE QUÉBEC
POUR LE QUÉBEC ET POUR L'EXTÉRIEUR DU QUÉBEC

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL

CLASS ACTIONS DIVISION
SUPERIOR COURT

NO : 500-06-001263-231

THE CLASS

and

ASSOCIATION FOR THE RIGHTS OF HOUSEHOLD AND FARM WORKERS

Representative Plaintiff

and

BYRON ALFREDO ACEVEDO TOBAR

Designated Member

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Defendant

JOINT DOCUMENT ON OBJECTIONS
(*Directives de la division de Montréal* – January 1, 2026, s. 52)

TO:

M^e^ Marième Sirois-Vaillancourt
M^e^ Emilie Tremblay
M^e^ Kim Nguyen
M^e^ Sean Doyle
M^e^ Maria Rodriguez
Department of Justice Canada
Quebec Regional Office
Marieve.Sirois-Vaillancourt@justice.gc.ca
Emilie.Tremblay@justice.gc.ca
Kim.Nguyen@justice.gc.ca
Sean.Doyle@justice.gc.ca
Maria.Rodriguez2@justice.gc.ca
NotificationPGC-AGC.Civil@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for the Defendant, Attorney General of Canada

Request No.	Description of documents requested	Grounds for objection	Time needed for adjudication of the objection
	Section *V – Awareness of the Harmful Impacts of Employer-Tying Measures by the Defendant* of Representative Plaintiff's Particularized Initial Request for the Disclosure of Documents		
32	All complaints, denunciations or submissions received by the Government of Canada since 1966 regarding: (a) the restricted capacity of current or former holders of Closed Work Permits[1], Business Visitors or Domestic Workers of Foreign Representatives to resign or change employers in Canada; (b) the power imbalance between such migrant workers and their employers in Canada; (c) the vulnerability of such migrant workers to exploitation, abuse or human and labour rights violations, or exploitation, abuse or human and labour rights violations suffered by such migrant workers, including but not limited to: i) financial abuses (predatory loans, wage theft, non-payment of wages, late payment of wages, underpayment of wages, illegal deductions or fees);	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […][2]	**Representative Plaintiff**: 30 minutes **Defendant**: 45 minutes

1 In this joint document, the capitalized terms have the meanings given to them in Representative Plaintiff's Particularized Initial Request for the Disclosure of Documents and Representative Plaintiff's Additional (Post-Defence) Request for the Disclosure of Documents.

2 For several requests included in this joint document, the Defendant adds in its grounds for objection that the documents requested may also be subject to certain privileges and immunities. The Representative Plaintiff does not require the adjudication of these grounds at this time, as these objections can be debated at a later time, once the particular documents in respect of which the privileges and immunities are asserted are known. Accordingly, this part of the grounds for objection is not reproduced, and is replaced by "[…]" in this joint document.

	ii) employer control over movements or over social interactions; iii) unsafe working conditions, such as hazardous tasks, exposure to physical or chemical hazards, exposure to extreme weather, lack of personal protective equipment, exposure to faulty or broken equipment or machinery, inadequate training, unsafe transportation methods, unsustainable productivity targets, excessive working hours, and insufficient breaks and periods of rest; iv) work-related accidents, injuries, illnesses or death; v) experiencing poor living conditions, including inadequate, unsanitary, overcrowded or poorly maintained accommodation, inadequate nutrition, lack of access to clean drinking water, lack of access to sanitation facilities, sleep deprivation, and lack of privacy; vi) experiencing discrimination, intimidation or psychological harassment; vii) physical violence or assault; viii) sexual harassment, sexual assault or rape; ix) chronic fatigue, stress and mental health issues, including depression and anxiety disorders; x) substance use disorders; xi) experiencing situations of illegal or undocumented work or of irregular status; and xii) becoming a victim of human trafficking, debt bondage, or other forms of modern slavery; or		

	(d) other negative consequences for such migrant workers of their restricted capacity to resign or change employers in Canada, including but not limited to: i) a loss of access (or delay in access) to health coverage; ii) a loss of access (or delay in access) to permanent legal status; iii) a loss of access (or delay in access) to legal status for family members; iv) deportation risks upon termination of their employment; v) a restricted freedom of movement; vi) a restricted access to social interactions or social isolation; vii) a restricted access to potential assistance, including community networks and support networks such as legal clinics or unions; viii) a restricted access to health and social services; ix) a restricted access to health and social benefit programs or deprivation of the benefits of these programs; x) a restricted capacity to assert their legal rights and to seek redress for the violation of such rights through administrative or judicial processes.		
33	All Documents generated, issued or received by or exchanged within the Government of Canada since 1966 discussing the exposure of current or former holders of	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would	

	Closed Work Permits, Business Visitors or Domestic Workers of Foreign Representatives to any of the consequences described above in paragraphs 32(a), 32(b), 32(c) or 32(d) hereof or the fact that such migrant workers suffer(ed) any of such consequences.	in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
33.1	Incident reports, investigation reports, inspection reports, evaluation reports, or inspection services evaluation reports generated, issued or received by or exchanged within the Government of Canada since 1966 in respect of instances of exploitation, abuse, human or labour rights violations (including those listed in paragraph 32(c) above) or other negative consequences (including those listed in paragraph 32(d) above) suffered by current or former holders of Closed Work Permits, Business Visitors or Domestic Workers of Foreign Representatives.	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
33.2	Incident reports, investigation reports, inspection reports, evaluation reports, or inspection services evaluation reports generated, issued or received by or exchanged within the Government of Canada since 1982 in respect of	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. […]	

	failures by employers of holders of Closed Work Permits to comply with LMIA conditions.		
34	All (a) Policies & Guidelines; (b) memoranda, instructions, discussion papers, briefing, research or policy papers, reports, analyses, or written correspondence sent or received by an Executive Official or Employee; or (c) minutes or notes of meetings or verbal exchanges involving an Executive Official or Employee, in all cases since 1966 and in all cases discussing proposed changes to the Act, to the Regulations, to Policies & Guidelines or to immigration programs or streams as a result of the exposure of current or former holders of Closed Work Permits, Business Visitors or Domestic Workers of Foreign Representatives to any of the consequences described above in paragraphs 32(a), 32(b), 32(c) or 32(d) hereof, whether or not such proposed changes were implemented.	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
36	All complaints, denunciations or submissions received by the Government of Canada regarding (a) the downward pressure on working conditions in Canada arising from Canadian employers' reliance on Closed Work Permits; (b) the existence of an incentive for Canadian employers to replace Canadian citizen or permanent resident workers by holders of Closed Work Permits; or (c) obstacles created by Closed Work Permits to holding abusive employers accountable.	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	

37	All Documents generated, issued or received by or exchanged within the Government of Canada discussing any of the subjects described above in paragraphs 36(a), 36(b) or 36(c) hereof.	The request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
38	All (a) Policies & Guidelines; (b) memoranda, instructions, discussion papers, briefing, research or policy papers, reports, analyses, or written correspondence sent or received by an Executive Official or Employee; or (c) minutes or notes of meetings or verbal exchanges involving an Executive Official or Employee, in all cases discussing proposed changes to the Act, to the Regulations, to Policies & Guidelines or to immigration programs or streams as a result of Canadian employers' reliance on Closed Work Permits or the impact of their reliance on Canadian workers, permanent residents and/or the Canadian labour market, or as a result of any of the subjects described above in paragraphs 36(a), 36(b) or 36(c) hereof, whether or not such proposed changes were implemented.	The request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
	IV – Additional (Post-Defence) Request for the Disclosure of Documents		
60	All […] (b) memoranda, instructions, discussion papers, briefing, research or policy papers, reports, analyses, or written correspondence sent or received by an Executive Official or Employee; or (c) minutes or notes of meetings or verbal exchanges involving an Executive Official or	The requests are abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry.	**Representative Plaintiff**: 15 minutes

	Employee, in all cases pertaining to the opportunity or inopportunity or to the risks or benefits of the DWAP, of the obligation for Domestic Workers of Foreign Representatives to live in the foreign representative's household, of the prohibition from working for more than one employer at a time, or of the requirement of the express consent of the Office of Protocol to employer transfers, including proposals to ministers or to Cabinet in respect of the modification of the DWAP or such obligation, prohibition or requirement.	Furthermore, the requests are not framed in objective terms and invite a subjective interpretation of documents. They are therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by this Court. […]	**Defendant:** 15 minutes
76	All Documents generated, issued or received by or exchanged within the Government of Canada containing an assessment of or otherwise pertaining to the feasibility or effects of alternatives to the admission of migrant workers under Closed Work Permits other than the issuance of open work permits, including but not limited to immigration selection and permanent status recognition programs, and reliance on government or non-profit organizations as official sponsors.	The request is abusive, overly broad, disproportionate, and would in effect transform this class action into a commission of inquiry. Furthermore, the request is not framed in objective terms and invites a subjective interpretation of documents. It is therefore susceptible to varying interpretations and would be unenforceable if ordered by the Court. […]	
	Total amount of time required		1h 45 mins

Montréal, July 15, 2026

Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP

Montréal, July 15, 2026

Attorney General of Canada

Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP
Counsel for the Representative Plaintiff
M[e] Jean-Philippe Groleau
M[e] Guillaume Charlebois
M[e] Alexandra Belley-McKinnon
M[e] Aliosha Hurry

Attorney General of Canada
Counsel for the Defendant
M[e] Mariève Sirois-Vaillancourt
M[e] Émilie Tremblay
M[e] Kim Nguyen
M[e] Sean Doyle
M[e] Maria Rodriguez

No. 500-06-001263-231

S U P E R I O R C O U R T

(Class Actions Division)

District of Montréal

THE CLASS

and

ASSOCIATION FOR THE RIGHTS OF HOUSEHOLD AND FARM WORKERS

Representative Plaintiff

and

BYRON ALFREDO ACEVEDO TOBAR

Designated Member

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Defendant

NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT FOR THE ADJUDICATION OF OBJECTIONS AND JOINT DOCUMENT ON OBJECTIONS

ORIGINAL

DAVIES

Counsel for the Representative Plaintiff
M^tre^ Jean-Philippe Groleau
M^tre^ Guillaume Charlebois
M^tre^ Alexandra Belley-McKinnon
M^tre^ Aliosha Hurry
T 514.841.6583 / 6404 / 6456 / 514.807.1373
jpgroleau@dwpv.com
gcharlebois@dwpv.com
abelleymckinnon@dwpv.com
ahurry@dwpv.com
File 287026

1501 McGill College Avenue, 27th floor
Montréal, QC H3A 3N9
Canada

T 514.841.6400
F 514.841.6499