

CANADA

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

NC

500-06-000843-173

(Class Action)
SUPERIOR COURT

FRANK BERDAH, having his place of employment at 5457 Saint-Jacques street, Montreal, district of Montreal, Province of Quebec, H4A 2E1

-and-

9316-1305 QUÉBEC INC., legal person having its establishment at 5457 Saint-Jacques street, Montreal, district of Montreal, Province of Quebec, H4A 2E1

Applicants

-vs-

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUÉBEC, acting on behalf of the Ministère des Transports du Québec, having an establishment at 1 Notre-Dame Street East, 8th floor, Montreal, district of Montréal, province of Québec, H2Y 1B6

-and-

KPH TURCOT, UN PARTENARIAT S.E.N.C., having an establishment at 4333 boulevard de la Grande-Allée, Boisbriand, district of Terrebonne, province of Québec, J7H 1M7

-and-

CONSTRUCTION KIEWIT CIE, having an establishment at 800-1959 Upper Water Street, Halifax, province of Nova Scotia, B3J 2X2

-and-

PARSONS CANADA LTD., having an establishment at 4400-40 King Street West, Toronto, province of Ontario, M5H 3Y4

Defendants

**APPLICATION TO AUTHORIZE THE BRINGING OF A CLASS ACTION AND TO APPOINT THE STATUS OF REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF
(ARTICLES 571 AND FOLLOWING C.C.P)**

TO ONE OF THE HONOURABLE JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, SITTING IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, YOUR APPLICANT STATES AS FOLLOWS:

I. THE CLASS

1. Frank Berdah and the company he owns, 9316-1305 Québec Inc. (hereinafter the "**Applicant**"), wish to institute a class action on behalf of the following class of which he is a member, namely:

Class:

All natural and legal persons who have suffered damages from the maintenance work of the Turcot interchange (the "**Turcot Project**");

(hereinafter referred to as the "**Class**");

or any other Class to be determined by the Court;

II. INTRODUCTION

2. Defendant, the Attorney General of Québec, acts on behalf of the Ministère du Transport du Québec, a public body created by the *Act Representing the Ministère des Transports*, chapter M-28;
3. The Turcot interchange is a hub for road traffic in the Montreal area interconnecting highways 15, 20 and 720, in addition to facilitating access to the Champlain Bridge.
4. The Turcot interchange is also an essential road link between Montreal's Pierre-Elliott Trudeau International Airport and Montreal's downtown core;

5. According to information publicly available on one of Defendant's websites, the Turcot interchange is one of the most important interchanges in the province of Quebec, with a traffic volume of more than 300,000 vehicles per day, Applicant disclosing **Exhibit P-1**;
6. On its website, Exhibit P-1, Defendant declared that after 50 years of service, the Turcot interchange had to be rebuilt;
7. This rebuilding, known as the "Turcot Project", includes the reconstruction of the Angrignon, De La Vérendrye and the Montreal-West interchanges, as well as adjacent sections of highways 15, 20 and 720;
8. The Turcot Project was supposed to be carried out in 4 phases and works completed by the Fall of 2016, Applicant disclosing the document published by Defendant titled "*Projet de Reconstruction du Complexe Turcot – Phasage des travaux*" as **Exhibit P-2**;
9. A second document published by Defendant dated October 5th, 2015, confirms that the Turcot Project would now be carried out until at least 2020, Applicant disclosing the document titled "*Turcot - Conception d'ensemble*", as **Exhibit P-3**;
10. On February 27th, 2015, Defendant signed a design-build contract (contrat de conception-construction) with Defendant **KPH TURCOT**, un partenariat S.E.N.C., Applicant disclosing the multibillion-dollar contract as **Exhibit P-4**;
11. KPH TURCOT, un partenariat S.E.N.C., is a consortium with its partners being Defendants **Construction KIEWIT CIE** and **Parsons Canada Ltd.**, Applicant disclosing an extract of the enterprise's information statement from the enterprise register (CIDREQ) as **Exhibit P-5**;
12. Applicant, Frank Berdah, is natural person who has suffered quantifiable damages caused by the Turcot Project;
13. The Applicant owns the business 9316-1305 Québec Inc. ("**Galuchat**"), situated at 5457 Saint-Jacques street, Montreal, Quebec, H4A 2E1, in the heart of the Turcot Project reconstruction, Applicant disclosing an extract of the enterprise's information statement from the enterprise register (CIDREQ) as **Exhibit P-6**;

III. CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO AUTHORIZE THIS CLASS ACTION AND TO APPOINT THE STATUS OF REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF (SECTION 575 C.C.P.):

A) THE FACTS ALLEGED APPEAR TO JUSTIFY THE CONCLUSIONS SOUGHT

14. Applicant has owned Galuchat, an upholstery store, since January 15th, 2015;

15. Since February 2015, the Turcot Project has notably caused the Applicant: (i) trouble and inconvenience; (ii) moral damages; (iii) stress; (iv) loss of enjoyment of life; (v) loss of enjoyment of property; and (vi) loss of income and/or business;
16. Applicant is forced to constantly endure unbearable noise from the Defendants' Turcot Project, as it appears from a series of videos taken by Applicant in the summer of 2016, disclosed *en liasse* as **Exhibit P-7**;
17. Defendants erected a wall in front of Applicant's store, which makes access thereto a serious inconvenience, Applicant disclosing a video with helicopter footage filmed by *TVA Nouvelles* reporting on his struggles on November 7th, 2016, as **Exhibit P-8**;
18. Applicant is thus confined in his store for two years now;
19. Defendants' Turcot Project has denied Applicant of his *Charter* right to the peaceful enjoyment of his property;
20. As a result of this situation, revenues in Applicant's upholstery store have dropped significantly;
21. Applicant's business lost value as a result of Defendants' Turcot Project;
22. Applicant was forced to lay off all of his employees, save for one who works only part-time;
23. Applicant must park several blocks away from his store and walk through a virtual maze in order to get to work on a daily basis (which is stressful all year-round, but even more so in the freezing winter months);
24. As a result of the makeshift infrastructure setup by Defendants leading to and in front of Applicant's store, the city no longer cleans the garbage, debris caused by the works and dirt around the Applicant's business, nor does it remove the snow from the very long makeshift walkway leading thereto;
25. As a result of Defendants' Turcot Project, Applicant is deprived of his *Charter* right to a healthful environment;
26. The Turcot Project has caused Applicant abnormal and intolerable inconveniences;
27. Applicant has pleaded in vain with municipal and provincial levels of government, but all of his requests for assistance have either been ignored or declined;
28. Applicant's struggle has been reported by almost all the major news outlets in Montreal, Applicant disclosing *en liasse* the news articles as **Exhibit P-9**;

B) THE CLAIMS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CLASS RAISE IDENTICAL, SIMILAR OR RELATED ISSUES OF LAW OR FACT:

29. All Class members are natural or legal persons who have suffered damages as a result of the Turcot Project, which they may collectively claim against the Defendants;
30. In this case, the legal and factual backgrounds at issue are common to all the members of the Class, namely whether the Defendants must compensate Class members for the damages they suffered and whether they must reduce their noise levels at the Turcot Project;
31. The claims of every Class member are founded on very similar facts to the Applicant's claim;
32. The damages sustained by the Class members flow, in each instance, from a common nucleus of operative facts;
33. All of the damages to the Class members are a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' misconduct and willful blindness with respect to its obligations;
34. In taking the foregoing into account, all Class members are justified in claiming amounts, to be determined, as compensation for the following damages:
 - a) trouble and inconvenience;
 - b) moral damages;
 - c) stress;
 - d) loss of enjoyment of life;
 - e) loss of enjoyment of property; and
 - f) loss of income and/or business;
35. Individual questions, if any, pale by comparison to the numerous common questions that are significant to the outcome of the present Application;
36. **The questions of fact and law raised and the recourse sought by this Application are identical with respect to each Class member, namely:**
 - a) Do Defendants infringe on Class members' rights to peaceful enjoyment of their property (article 6) and their right to a healthy environment (article 46.1) as set out in Quebec's *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*?

- b) Do Defendants contravene sections 19.1 and 20 of the *Environment Quality Act* (chapter Q-2)?
- c) Do Defendants contravene the noise standards set out in the *Environment Quality Act* (chapter Q-2), notably with respect to the *Note d'instruction 98-01* under section 94 of said Act?
- d) Do Defendants contravene the municipal noise by-laws for the cities impacted by the Turcot Project?
- e) Have Defendants caused Class members abnormal and intolerable inconveniences, thereby failing in their obligation of good neighbourly conduct?
- f) Did Defendants err in the design, construction, installation, maintenance and operation of equipment with respect to the Turcot Project?
- g) Were Defendants negligent of the well-being of the Class members, their tranquility and their right to peaceful enjoyment of their property?
- h) Are Class members entitled to moral damages?
- i) Are Class members entitled to compensatory damages for trouble and inconvenience, Defendants' violation of their rights, and/or for the loss of value of their property?
- j) Are Defendants solidarily liable for damages suffered by the Class members?
- k) Are Class members entitled to obtain orders, both under the general rules and under section 19.3 of the *Environment Quality Act*, aimed at reducing the noise emitted by the Turcot Project, so that it is reduced to acceptable levels both qualitatively and quantitatively?

C) THE COMPOSITION OF THE CLASS

- 37. The composition of the Class makes it difficult or impracticable to apply the rules for mandates to take part in judicial proceedings on behalf of others or for consolidation of proceedings;
- 38. According to Exhibit P-1, the Turcot interchange has a traffic volume of more than 300,000 vehicles per day;
- 39. By all accounts, there are likely tens of thousands of people, if not more, who are members of the Class;

40. The names and addresses of all persons included in the Class are not known to the Applicant, but may be in the possession of the provincial government;
41. Class members are very numerous and are dispersed across the province;
42. These facts demonstrate that it would be impractical, if not impossible, to contact each and every Class member to obtain mandates and to join them in one action;
43. In these circumstances, a class action is the only appropriate procedure for all of the members of the Class to effectively pursue their respective rights and have access to justice without overburdening the court system;

D) THE CLASS MEMBER REQUESTING TO BE APPOINTED AS REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF IS IN A POSITION TO PROPERLY REPRESENT THE CLASS MEMBERS

44. Applicant requests that he be appointed the status of representative plaintiff;
45. Applicant is a member of the Class;
46. Applicant has begged for help from the MTQ, city counselors, mayors, news outlets and others in order to seek some form of reparation, but all of his efforts have gone in vain;
47. On July 14th, 2016, Applicant sent the following email to the MTQ, Applicant disclosing his email and the MTQ's response *en liasse* as **Exhibit P-10**:

*« Bonjour Mr yvan Paquette ou a qui de droit.
Je vous re écris pour vous faire savoir mon desaroié et deception complete
envers la MTQ par apport a tout ce qui passe pour lechangeur turcot.*

Rien absolument rien a ete ameliorer de votre cote.

1) le bruit est infernal

2) la poussiere se repends de partout.

3) l'accés a l'immeuble par addington se fait difficilement.

4) la coupure d"eaux devient de plus en plus frequent.

5) des debris du chantier rebondis sur le trottoir en avant de limmeuble.

*6) nous ne savons pas encore si des dommages au batiment ou aux
fondation on ete constater. Nous nous appretens a nettoyer tout lavant
de limmeuble interieurement pour verifier cela du au bombardement du*

ciment ainsi que les pillones qui vous creusee dans le sol. Veuillez noter que email s"ajoute a tout mes emails et appels presedent qui ont ete en fait et envoyer, sans aucune reponse concrete a l'amelioration du chantier mais surtout pour moi en tant que commercant qui est malheureusement couper de toute realite avec ce projet. Malheureusement la ville de montreal fait de meme que vous il lance la balle dans votre cour et comme il dise le silence et d'or!!!! Ceci est une autre plainte formelle que je fais en vous disant que vous tuer mon travaille plus rapidement que vous avez planifier. »

48. When it became apparent to Applicant that Defendants would never compensate him willingly, he contacted his attorney who practices mostly in class actions;
49. Applicant was referred to his attorney by his friend;
50. As for identifying other Class members, Applicant draws certain inferences based on the magnitude of the Turcot Project, and realizes that there is a very important number of citizens that find themselves in an identical situation, and that it would not be useful for him to attempt to identify them given their sheer number;
51. Applicant has given the mandate to his attorneys to obtain all relevant information with respect to the present action and intends to keep informed of all developments;
52. Applicant, with the assistance of his attorneys, is ready and available to manage and direct the present action in the interest of the members of the Class that he wishes to represent and is determined to lead the present dossier until a final resolution of the matter, the whole for the benefit of the Class, as well as to dedicate the time necessary for the present action and to collaborate with his attorneys;
53. Applicant has the capacity and interest to fairly and adequately protect and represent the interest of the Class members;
54. Applicant is prepared to dedicate the time necessary for this action and to collaborate with other Class members and to keep them informed, notably via his Facebook social media account, where he is very active concerning the present action;
55. Applicant is in good faith and has instituted this action for the sole purpose of having his rights, as well as the rights of other Class members, recognized and protected so that they may be compensated for the damages that they have suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' misconduct;
56. Applicant understands the nature of the action;

57. Applicant's interests are not antagonistic to those of other Class members;
58. Applicant's interest and competence are such that the present class action could proceed fairly;

IV. NATURE OF THE ACTION AND CONCLUSIONS SOUGHT

59. The action that the Applicant wishes to institute on behalf of the Class members is an action in damages, with injunctive relief and declaratory judgment;
60. The conclusions that the Applicant wishes to introduce by way of an Originating Application are:

GRANT Plaintiff's action against Defendants on behalf of all the Class members;

DECLARE the Defendant liable for the damages suffered by the Applicant and each of the Class members;

ORDER the Defendants to take the necessary measures to reduce the noise generated by the Turcot Project, to acceptable levels, both qualitatively and quantitatively, based on the evidence that will be submitted to the Court;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to pay the designated Plaintiff and each of the Class members an annual amount, to be determined, as of February 1st, 2015 and until such time that sufficient noise mitigation measures have been implemented;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to compensate the designated Plaintiff and the Class members for the diminution in value to their property;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to each Class member a sum to be determined in compensation for any other damages which the Court may determine;

CONDEMN the Defendant to pay interest and the additional indemnity on the above sums according to law from the date of service of the *Application to Authorize the Bringing of a Class Action and to Appoint the Status of Representative Plaintiff*;

ORDER that the claims of individual Class members be the object of collective recovery if the proof permits and alternately, by individual recovery;

ORDER the Defendant to deposit in the office of this Court the totality of the sums which forms part of the collective recovery, with interest and costs;

CONDEMN the Defendant to bear the costs of the present action, including class

counsel's professional fees and disbursements, the cost of notices, the cost of management of claims and the costs of experts, if any, including the costs of experts required to establish the amount of the collective recovery orders;

RENDER any other order that this Honourable Court shall determine;

61. The interests of justice favour that this Application be granted in accordance with its conclusions;

V. JURISDICTION

62. The Applicant suggests that this class action be exercised before the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, in the district of Montreal, for the following reasons:

- a) A great number of the Class members, including the Applicant, reside in the district of Montreal;
- b) The Applicant's cause of action took place in the district of Montreal;
- c) The Applicant's attorneys practice their profession in the district of Montreal;

FOR THESE REASONS, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

GRANT the present application;

AUTHORIZE the bringing of a class action in the form of an Originating Application in declaratory judgment, injunctive relief and damages;

APPOINT the Applicant the status of representative plaintiff of the persons included in the Class herein described as:

Class:

All natural and legal persons who have suffered damages from the maintenance work of the Turcot interchange (the "**Turcot Project**");

(hereinafter referred to as the "**Class**")

or any other Class to be determined by the Court;

IDENTIFY the principle questions of fact and law to be treated collectively as the following:

- a) Do Defendants infringe on Class members' rights to peaceful

enjoyment of their property (article 6) and their right to a healthy environment (article 46.1) as set out in Quebec's *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*?

- b) Do Defendants contravene sections 19.1 and 20 of the *Environment Quality Act* (chapter Q-2)?
- c) Do Defendants contravene the noise standards set out in the *Environment Quality Act* (chapter Q-2), notably with respect to the *Note d'instruction 98-01* under section 94 of said Act?
- d) Do Defendants contravene the municipal noise by-laws for the cities impacted by the Turcot Project?
- e) Have Defendants caused Class members abnormal and intolerable inconveniences, thereby failing in their obligation of good neighbourly conduct?
- f) Did Defendants err in the design, construction, installation, maintenance and operation of equipment with respect to the Turcot Project?
- g) Were Defendants negligent of the well-being of the Class members, their tranquility and their right to peaceful enjoyment of their property?
- h) Are Class members entitled to moral damages?
- i) Are Class members entitled to compensatory damages for trouble and inconvenience, Defendants' violation of their rights, and/or for the loss of value of their property?
- j) Are Defendants solidarily liable for damages suffered by the Class members?
- k) Are Class members entitled to obtain orders, both under the general rules and under section 19.3 of the *Environment Quality Act*, aimed at reducing the noise emitted by the Turcot Project, so that it is reduced to acceptable levels both qualitatively and quantitatively?

IDENTIFY the conclusions sought by the class action to be instituted as being the following:

GRANT Plaintiff's action against Defendants on behalf of all the Class members;

DECLARE the Defendant liable for the damages suffered by the Applicant and each of the Class members;

ORDER the Defendants to take the necessary measures to reduce the noise generated by the Turcot Project, to acceptable levels, both qualitatively and quantitatively, based on the evidence that will be submitted to the Court;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to pay the designated Plaintiff and each of the Class members an annual amount, to be determined, as of February 1st, 2015 and until such time that sufficient noise mitigation measures have been implemented;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to compensate the designated Plaintiff and the Class members for the diminution in value to their property;

CONDEMN the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to each Class member a sum to be determined in compensation for any other damages which the Court may determine;

CONDEMN the Defendant to pay interest and the additional indemnity on the above sums according to law from the date of service of the *Application to Authorize the Bringing of a Class Action and to Appoint the Status of Representative Plaintiff*;

ORDER that the claims of individual Class members be the object of collective recovery if the proof permits and alternately, by individual recovery;

ORDER the Defendant to deposit in the office of this Court the totality of the sums which forms part of the collective recovery, with interest and costs;

CONDEMN the Defendant to bear the costs of the present action, including class counsel's professional fees and disbursements, the cost of notices, the cost of management of claims and the costs of experts, if any, including the costs of experts required to establish the amount of the collective recovery orders;

RENDER any other order that this Honourable Court shall determine;

DECLARE that all members of the Class that have not requested their exclusion, be bound by any judgement to be rendered on the class action to be instituted in the manner provided for by the law;

FIX the delay of exclusion at thirty (30) days from the date of the publication of the notice to the members, date upon which the members of the Class that have not

exercised their means of exclusion will be bound by any judgement to be rendered herein;

ORDER the publication of a notice to the members of the Class in accordance with article 579 C.C.P. within sixty (60) days from the judgement to be rendered herein in the "News" sections of the Saturday editions of LA PRESSE, LE JOURNAL DE MONTRÉAL, and the MONTREAL GAZETTE;

ORDER that said notice be published on the Defendants' various websites, Facebook pages and Twitter accounts, in a conspicuous place, with a link stating "Notice of a Class Action Concerning the Turcot Project – Avis d'une action collective concernant le projet échangeur Turcot";

ORDER the Defendants to send an Abbreviated Notice regular mail and by e-mail to each Class member, to their last known physical and e-mail addresses, with the subject line "Notice of a Class Action – Avis d'une action collective";

RENDER any other order that this Honourable Court shall determine;

The whole with costs including publications fees.

Montreal, February 1st, 2017

Ticket Legal Inc

TICKET LÉGAL INC.

Attorneys for Applicant

True copie

Ticket Legal Inc

SUMMONS
(ARTICLES 145 AND FOLLOWING C.C.P)

Filing of a judicial application

Take notice that the Applicant has filed this Application for Authorization to Institute a Class Action and to Appoint the Status of Representative Plaintiff in the office of the Superior Court in the judicial district of Montreal.

Defendant's answer

You must answer the application in writing, personally or through a lawyer, at the courthouse of Montreal situated at 1 Rue Notre-Dame E, Montréal, Quebec, H2Y 1B6, within 15 days of service of the Application or, if you have no domicile, residence or establishment in Québec, within 30 days. The answer must be notified to the Applicant's lawyer or, if the Applicant is not represented, to the Applicant.

Failure to answer

If you fail to answer within the time limit of 15 or 30 days, as applicable, a default judgement may be rendered against you without further notice and you may, according to the circumstances, be required to pay the legal costs.

Content of answer

In your answer, you must state your intention to:

- negotiate a settlement;
- propose mediation to resolve the dispute;
- defend the application and, in the cases required by the Code, cooperate with the Applicant in preparing the case protocol that is to govern the conduct of the proceeding. The protocol must be filed with the court office in the district specified above within 45 days after service of the summons or, in family matters or if you have no domicile, residence or establishment in Québec, within 3 months after service;
- propose a settlement conference.

The answer to the summons must include your contact information and, if you are represented by a lawyer, the lawyer's name and contact information.

Change of judicial district

You may ask the court to refer the originating Application to the district of your domicile or residence, or of your elected domicile or the district designated by an agreement with the plaintiff.

If the application pertains to an employment contract, consumer contract or insurance contract, or to the exercise of a hypothecary right on an immovable serving as your main residence, and if you are the employee, consumer, insured person, beneficiary of the insurance contract or hypothecary debtor, you may ask for a referral to the district of your domicile or residence or the district where the immovable is situated or the loss occurred. The request must be filed with the special clerk of the district of territorial jurisdiction after it has been notified to the other parties and to the office of the court already seized of the originating application.

Transfer of application to Small Claims Division

If you qualify to act as a plaintiff under the rules governing the recovery of small claims, you may also contact the clerk of the court to request that the application be processed according to those rules. If you make this request, the plaintiff's legal costs will not exceed those prescribed for the recovery of small claims.

Calling to a case management conference

Within 20 days after the case protocol mentioned above is filed, the court may call you to a case management conference to ensure the orderly progress of the proceeding. Failing this, the protocol is presumed to be accepted.

Exhibits supporting the application

In support of the Application for Authorization to Institute a Class Action and to Appoint the Status of Representative Plaintiff, the Applicant intends to use the following exhibits:

- Exhibit P-1:** Screen capture of Defendant's website confirming that the Turcot interchange is one of the most important interchanges in the province of Quebec, with a traffic volume of more than 300,000 vehicles per day, (<https://www.turcot.transports.gouv.qc.ca/en/Pages/default.aspx>);
- Exhibit P-2:** Copy of document published by Defendant titled "*Projet de Reconstruction du Complexe Turcot – Phasage des travaux*";
- Exhibit P-3:** Copy of document dated October 5th, 2015, titled "*Turcot - Conception d'ensemble*";
- Exhibit P-4:** Copy of design-build contract (contrat de conception-construction) with KPH TURCOT, dated February 27th, 2015;
- Exhibit P-5:** Extract of the enterprise's information statement from the enterprise register (CIDREQ) for KPH TURCOT;

- Exhibit P-6:** Extract of the enterprise's information statement from the enterprise register (CIDREQ) for 9316-1305 Québec Inc. ("Galuchat");
- Exhibit P-7:** *En liasse*, copies of videos taken by Applicant in the summer of 2016 showing the noise caused by Turcot Project construction;
- Exhibit P-8:** Copy of TVA Nouvelles helicopter video footage published on November 7th, 2016, showing the wall erected in front of Applicant's store;
- Exhibit P-9:** *En liasse*, copies of Montreal news articles reporting on Applicant's situation;
- Exhibit P-10:** *En liasse*, copies of the July 14th, 2016, email Applicant sent to the MTQ and the MTQ's response;

These exhibits are available on request.

Notice of presentation of an application

If the application is an application in the course of a proceeding or an application under Book III, V, excepting an application in family matters mentioned in article 409, or VI of the Code, the establishment of a case protocol is not required; however, the application must be accompanied by a notice stating the date and time it is to be presented.

Montreal, February 1st, 2017

Ticket Legal Inc

TICKET LÉGAL INC.

Attorneys for Applicant

True copie

Ticket Legal Inc

NOTICE OF PRESENTATION
(articles 146 and 574 al. 2 C.P.C.)

TO: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC
1 Notre-Dame Street East, 8th floor,
Montréal, Québec, H2Y 1B6

KPH TURCOT, UN PARTENARIAT S.E.N.C
4333 boulevard de la Grande-Allée
Boisbriand, Québec, J7H 1M7

CONSTRUCTION KIEWIT CIE
800-1959 Upper Water Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3J 2X2

PARSONS CANADA LTD.
4400-40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario, M5H 3Y4

Defendants

TAKE NOTICE that Applicant's *Application to Authorize the Bringing of a Class Action and to Appoint the Status of Representative Plaintiff* will be presented before the Superior Court at **1 Rue Notre-Dame E, Montréal, Quebec, H2Y 1B6**, on the date set by the coordinator of the Class Action chamber.

GOVERN YOURSELVES ACCORDINGLY.

Montreal, February 1st, 2017

Ticket Legal Inc
TICKET LÉGAL INC.

Attorneys for Applicant

True Copie

Ticket Legal Inc

N°:

(Class Action)
SUPERIOR COURT
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

500-06-000843-173

FRANK BERDAH, having his place of employment at 5457 Saint-Jacques street, Montreal, district of Montreal, Province of Québec, H4A 2E1
-and-

93161305 QUÉBEC INC., legal person having its establishment at 5457 Saint-Jacques street, Montreal, district of Montreal, Province of Québec, H4A 2E1

-vs-

Applicants

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC, acting on behalf of the Ministère des Transports du Québec, having an establishment at 1 Notre-Dame Street East, 8th floor, Montreal, district of Montréal, province of Québec, H2Y 1B6

-and-

KPH TURCOT, UN PARTENARIAT S.E.N.C., having an establishment at 4333 boulevard de la Grande-Allée, Boisbriand, district of Terrebonne, province of Québec, J7H 1M7
ET ALS.

Defendants

**APPLICATION TO AUTHORIZE THE
BRINGING OF A CLASS ACTION AND TO
APPOINT THE STATUS OF
REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF
(ARTICLES 571 AND FOLLOWING C.C.P.)**

COURT COPY

TICKET LÉGAL INC.

5800, boulevard Cavendish, Suite 411
Montréal (Québec) H4W 2T5
T: (514) 929-0542 • F: (514) 221-4123
E: izukran@lpclex.com

ME JOEY ZUKRAN
CODE: AZ 00X4

N/D : 555-45

15243

99
action collective

Abdo
col

details:
On Joe Joey Zukran

01 FEV. 2007