

Tobacco-Related Litigation in Canada

Smoking and Health Action Foundation/
Non-Smokers' Rights Association

March 2011

Introduction

Holding the tobacco industry accountable for its illegal activities, whether through criminal charges or civil suits, serves a number of public health objectives. These objectives include acting as a deterrent to prevent industry misconduct in the future, and, affording victims, including governments, the opportunity to recover financial losses caused by misconduct.

Civil actions against the tobacco industry are relatively new in Canada, although litigation by tobacco companies to oppose tobacco control statutes dates back to 1988 (i.e. tobacco industry challenge to the *Tobacco Products Control Act*).

In addition to civil suits, the *Criminal Code* and other legislation offer options for holding the tobacco industry criminally accountable for its behaviour. However, to date, charging tobacco companies with criminal offences has not been used as a means of changing corporate behaviour and furthering public health objectives. One exception is the criminal charges laid in 2003 by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police related to the tobacco smuggling fraud of the early 1990s.¹

In Canada litigation against tobacco companies should be encouraged and monitored, as it has been proven to be effective in promoting public health objectives.

Canada Is Playing a Leadership Role

Canada is one of the riskiest countries in the world for cigarette manufacturers, in terms of their future financial viability. In September 2005, in a unanimous decision, the Supreme Court of Canada found B.C.'s *Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act* to be constitutional. All the other provinces and

Nunavut have since passed similar enabling legislation that gives them the right to sue tobacco companies to recover health care costs for treatment of tobacco-related illness. However, only B.C., New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Ontario have launched lawsuits against tobacco companies using this type of legislation.

The litigation-enabling legislation that these provinces have passed is so strong that some legal analysts suggest that it “tips the playing field steeply against the industry” in a way that greatly reduces the proof required by the provinces to win.²

It has been estimated that tens, possibly hundreds, of billions of dollars are at stake. If these lawsuits are eventually successful (it will take years before they actually get to trial or are settled), Canada will have Big Tobacco in a very financially precarious position. If the tobacco companies are found guilty and are forced by the courts to pay out significant damages, the potential exists essentially to bankrupt the companies.

The Importance of Litigation Against the Tobacco Industry

Litigation against those perceived of wrongdoing is an important element of a just society. Throughout its history, the tobacco industry has had a sordid track record. It is an industry that has lied about the risks of its products, lied about addiction, lied about its manipulation of nicotine, lied about its marketing to kids and lied about the risks of second-hand smoke.³ Furthermore, all three major tobacco companies in Canada admitted involvement in a tobacco smuggling scheme which defrauded the federal and provincial governments of billions of dollars in taxes in the 1990s.^{4,5} Critics of litigating against tobacco companies say it is too expensive and rarely achieves the desired results. However, litigation against the industry serves the public interest for a number of reasons and should be pursued, whether in civil or criminal courts, in order to achieve justice and compensation for industry wrongdoing.

The Social Benefits of Tobacco Product Liability Suits

The tobacco market is riddled with significant anomalies. One of the most obvious is that the profit margin on cigarettes is much larger than on most other consumer products. However, the use of tobacco products leads to massive third party costs. The costs are borne by taxpayers through their governments, which fund the health care system, and by society at large, due to the lost productivity of citizens who become sick or die prematurely due to tobacco-related diseases. This externalization of costs is perhaps the tobacco industry's greatest coup. Litigation provides governments and individuals with an opportunity to seek compensation for these injustices.

Tobacco product liability suits offer at least six potential social benefits:

1. Increase the cost of tobacco products.
2. Draw public attention to industry practices and the dangers of smoking.
3. Could motivate industry change.
4. Make public revealing internal industry documents through discovery.
5. Provide funding (from verdicts) that could be used to reimburse health-care costs.
6. Could bankrupt the industry, if there were a sufficient number of cases and/or awards/settlements were large enough.⁶

1. Increase the Cost of Tobacco Products

Smoking costs third parties in Canada over \$17 billion in health care costs and lost productivity each year.⁷ (This does not include the social costs, such as the impact on a family of losing a parent prematurely to a preventable tobacco-caused death.) Shifting some of those costs to manufacturers through litigation would force an

increase in prices. Higher prices have been proven to deter youth from starting to smoke and to compel current smokers to reduce their consumption or quit.

2. Draw Public Attention to Industry Practices and the Dangers of Smoking

Informing the public about the tobacco industry's unethical and illegal practices can motivate people to quit using its products. Channelling teen and young adult rebellion against the industry has also been proven to reduce youth uptake. Putting a human face to the harmful effects of smoking increases public understanding of the dangers of tobacco use and makes it harder for smokers to remain in denial about the risks to their own health.

3. Motivate Industry Change

Fear of large punitive damage awards, such as the 2002 Bullock case in California in which a jury awarded \$28 billion to the plaintiff, may motivate the industry to alter its behaviour.⁸ The industry could change in various ways, for example, by engaging in less deceptive marketing, by ending its outrageous claims that second-hand smoke isn't harmful, or by making its lobbying practices more transparent. Concern about product liability awards is frequently cited by manufacturers of other products as reasons for providing graphic package warnings, altering product designs, or even withdrawing particularly dangerous products from the market. In contrast, 'voluntary' changes by the tobacco industry to date have been modest and mostly cosmetic.

4. Make Public Tobacco Company Documents

Studies of industry misbehaviour within and outside Canada based on internal tobacco company documents have assisted tobacco control efforts around the world. Internal documents have been

instrumental in persuading juries to focus on the industry's misdeeds. The availability of documents that shed light on tobacco company practices has helped make the industry a political pariah. The end result is better public policy, including more effective legislation and regulation to control the tobacco industry and protect the public from its products.

5. Reimburse Health-Care Costs

Funds obtained through litigation, whether through a court award or settlement, can be used to reimburse individuals and health care plans for injuries and expenses caused by tobacco products. As well some states in the U.S. use some of the funds they receive from Medicaid reimbursement cases and the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement to fund tobacco control programs.

6. Force the Industry to Face the Potential of Bankruptcy

With large punitive damage verdicts on the rise, there is a possibility that a flood of such cases could bankrupt the industry. The threat of bankruptcy could force the companies to change their behaviour or make their products much less toxic and deadly.

This report provides information on the different types of tobacco-related litigation in Canada, including:

- [Litigation Related to Contraband](#)
- [Tobacco Product Liability Litigation](#)
- [Individual Product Liability Litigation](#)
- [Class Action Lawsuits](#)
- [Industry Suits Against Governments](#)

Litigation Related to Contraband

Case	Background	Current Status
<p>Comprehensive agreement between Imperial Tobacco Limited of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada and the Provinces.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Comprehensive agreement between Rothmans, Benson & Hedges, Inc. and Rothmans Inc. and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada and the Provinces.</p>	<p>According to a Canada Revenue Agency press release published on July 31, 2008, “the federal and all provincial governments have entered into civil settlement agreements with Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. and Rothmans, Benson & Hedges to resolve all potential civil claims they may have in relation to the two companies’ roles in the movement of contraband tobacco in the early 1990s.</p> <p>In addition to the civil settlement, the two companies each pleaded guilty in court to a single count of “aiding persons to sell or be in possession of tobacco products manufactured in Canada that were not packaged and were not stamped in conformity with the <i>Excise Act</i> and its amendments and the ministerial regulations” between 1989 and 1994.”</p>	<p>As part of the agreement, Imperial Tobacco Limited of Canada paid a \$200 million criminal fine and will pay a further \$400 million in civil penalties over the next 15 years. The company has to comply as well with measures to prevent contraband.</p> <p>As for Rothmans, Benson & Hedges, the company paid a \$100 million criminal fine and will pay a further \$450 million in civil penalties over the next 10 years. The company has to comply as well with measures to prevent contraband.</p> <p>For more information, visit the Canada Revenue Agency's website at: http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/gncy/tbcc/menu-eng.html</p>
<p>Comprehensive agreement between JTI-MacDonald Corporation and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada and the Provinces.</p>	<p>According to a Canada Revenue Agency press release published on April 13, 2010, “the federal, provincial and territorial governments entered into civil settlement agreements with tobacco manufacturers JTI-Macdonald Corp. (JTI-MC) and R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company (RJR) to resolve potential civil claims related to the movement of contraband tobacco in the early 1990s.</p> <p>In addition to the civil settlements, JTI-MC pleaded guilty in the Ontario Court of Justice to a single count of “aiding persons to be in possession of tobacco not packaged in accordance with the <i>Excise Act</i>”, while Northern Brands International Inc., a company related to RJR, pleaded guilty to a conspiracy offence under the Criminal Code.</p>	<p>As part of the agreement, JTI-Macdonald and its affiliate Northern Brands International paid a criminal fine of \$150 million and \$75 million respectively. As for R.J. Reynolds, it was charged with \$325 million in civil penalties. JTI-Macdonald has to comply as well with measures to prevent contraband.</p> <p>The following two cases were also dropped against the manufacturers and some of its former executives:</p> <p><i>The Attorney General Of Canada v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Holdings, Inc., R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco International, Inc., JTI-Macdonald Corp., R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Northern Brands International, Inc., Japan Tobacco Inc., JT International SA, JTI-Macdonald TM Corp., et al</i></p>

		<p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>Her Majesty the Queen v. JTI-Macdonald Corp. (formerly RJR-Macdonald Inc.), Dale Sisel, Jaap Uittenbogaard, Edward Lang, Pierre Brunelle, Paul Neumann, Roland Kostantos and Peter MacGregor</i></p> <p>For more information, visit the Canada Revenue Agency's website at: http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/gncy/tbcc/menu-eng.html</p>
<p><i>The Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, et al. v. Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>The Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, et al. v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>The Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, et al. v. JTI-Macdonald Corp.</i></p>	<p>These class action lawsuits filed against Rothmans, Benson & Hedges (RBH), Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. (ITC) and JTI-Macdonald Corp. allege that the companies breached contracts with Ontario tobacco farmers related to the purchase of flue-cured tobacco from 1986 to 1996.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the contracts obligated the tobacco companies to disclose the quantity of tobacco included in cigarettes to be sold for duty-free and export purposes. This tobacco was purchased at a lower price per pound than tobacco for cigarettes to be sold in Canada. Millions of cigarettes ostensibly intended for the duty-free and export markets were then sold illegally in Canada. This cigarette smuggling was orchestrated by all three companies and was designed to force governments to lower tobacco taxes.</p> <p>In July 2008 and April 2010, the three manufacturers admitted guilt and paid criminal fines related to the 1990s smuggling crisis. The companies also entered into civil settlements with the federal and various provincial governments. Given their admission of guilt, the tobacco farmers have a good chance at success in this somewhat related action.</p>	<p>According to the law firm (Sutts, Strosberg LLP) representing the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board:</p> <p>"The class actions are in the preliminary stages. The court will eventually set a timetable for the conduct of the actions, but that has not occurred yet.</p> <p>A judge of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice will hear motions for certification of the class actions to determine whether the cases can proceed as class actions. The motion dates have not yet been set."⁹</p> <p>Because of this court action, Imperial has notified the Ontario government that it wants to or is withholding periodic payments related to the global settlement reached after Imperial admitted guilt to involvement in smuggling in the 1990s. Imperial claims that any money that might be due to the growers in their action should be taken from the payments to Ontario and put in trust. Meanwhile, the Ontario government "commenced its own action asking a court to rule on whether the claims of the growers should be settled by arbitration or by litigation."¹⁰</p>

<p><i>Weninger Farms Ltd., Stanley Kosciak and Linda Kosciak v. Attorney General of Canada</i></p>	<p>According to the Tobacco Justice Class Action website, “On October 2, 2009 a class action was commenced under the Class Proceedings Act, 1992, in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in London, Ontario, on behalf of tobacco producers claiming damages for malfeasance in a public office and negligence against both the federal and provincial governments for their failure to stop the sale of illegal tobacco products.</p> <p>As a result of the objection on the part of the federal government as to the jurisdiction of the Ontario courts, on October 29, 2010, a class action was commenced under the Federal Court Rules in the Federal Court of Canada in Toronto, Ontario, claiming malfeasance in a public office and negligence against the federal government for the failure of the agents of the federal government to stop the sale of illegal tobacco products.”¹¹</p>	<p>The lawsuit still awaits to be classified as a class action.¹²</p>
<p><i>The Montana First Nation and Chief Carolyn Buffalo and Rainbow Tobacco G.P. v. The Alberta Liquor and Gaming Commission</i></p>	<p>Last January, about 75,000 cartons of cigarettes were seized on the Montana Cree First Nation Territory by the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission (AGLC) and the RCMP because the cigarette packages were not marked for legal sale in the province.¹³ The cigarettes were manufactured and shipped by the Rainbow Tobacco Company located in Kahnawake, Quebec.</p> <p>The AGLC recently charged Chief Carolyn Buffalo and three other individuals under the <i>Tobacco Tax Act</i> with storing tobacco products not marked for legal sale in Alberta, for possessing more than 1,000 cigarettes and not being licensed to import tobacco into the province for resale.¹⁴</p> <p>In the meantime, Chief Carolyn Buffalo, the Montana First Nation and the Rainbow Tobacco Company are fighting back, filing on February 18, 2011 a statement of claim in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta which states that “the AGLC and the Provincial Government of Alberta lacked jurisdiction to enter onto an Indian Reserve and enforce the provincial <i>Tobacco Tax Act</i> on Full Status Indians. The AGLC did not have the right to seize the cigarettes and does not have the right to continue to detain the cigarettes”.</p>	<p>Chief Carolyn Buffalo and the three other accused are scheduled to appear in provincial court in Wetaskiwin, Alta., on June 23rd, 2011.¹⁵</p> <p>We are not aware if a trial date has been set for the First Nation lawsuit.</p>

Tobacco Product Liability Litigation

Case	Background	Current Status
<p><i>Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of British Columbia v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc., Rothmans Inc., JTI-Macdonald Corp., Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al</i></p>	<p>B.C.'s health care cost recovery lawsuit names Imperial Tobacco Canada, Rothmans, Benson & Hedges, JTI-Macdonald, the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council and several foreign companies (including British American Tobacco, Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds). It alleges that domestic tobacco manufacturers and their parent companies engaged in an elaborate conspiracy to create doubt in the public mind about the dangers of smoking; failed to warn consumers of the dangers of smoking despite their own knowledge that cigarettes were dangerous; marketed 'light' cigarettes to reassure smokers when they knew these cigarettes were just as hazardous as 'regular' ones' and targeted children in their advertising and marketing.</p> <p>The government seeks to recover \$10 billion in health care costs from these tobacco companies. The parent companies unsuccessfully argued all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada that they should not be included in the lawsuit. Citigroup, one of the world's largest banks prior to the sub-prime mortgage meltdown in 2008, said the B.C. suit, if successful, has the chance to bankrupt Imperial. B.C. is likely to achieve victory at trial because the <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i>, the legislation which enabled the lawsuit, provides "for suing in reverse onus, that is, the tobacco industry [will] have to prove that users [of its products] were not harmed. As well, it allows the use of aggregate studies showing harm in populations, without having to prove harm to specific individuals, also increasing the likelihood of success."¹⁶</p>	<p>A September 2011 target date has been set for the trial to begin.</p> <p>In the meantime, the tobacco companies have been trying to enjoin the federal government with a Third Party Notice—claiming the government should also be liable in the case. The court initially ruled against the companies.</p> <p>However, Imperial appealed this decision and that appeal was consolidated with a similar appeal in the Knight case (see page 15). In December 2009, the B.C. Court of Appeal, by a narrow 3-2 majority with a strong dissent, sided with the tobacco industry, but only in part.</p> <p>This decision was, in turn, appealed by the federal government to the Supreme Court of Canada. The case was heard February 24, 2011. The court ruling is still pending.</p>

<p><i>Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of The Province Of New Brunswick v. Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc., Philip Morris U.S.A. Inc., Philip Morris International, Inc., JTI-Macdonald Corp., R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco International, Inc., Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, British American Tobacco p.l.c., B.A.T. Industries p.l.c., British American Tobacco (Investments) Limited, Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al</i></p>	<p>Virtually identical to B.C.'s enabling legislation, New Brunswick's version of the <i>Tobacco Damages and Health-care Costs Recovery Act</i> received Royal Assent on June 22, 2006. In March 2008 New Brunswick filed its lawsuit against the tobacco companies, becoming only the second province in Canada to do so. The government has retained a consortium of Canadian and American lawyers and law firms on a contingency fee basis, meaning the province will not pay any legal fees up front. If the lawsuit is eventually successful, the consortium will cover its costs and fees by taking a percentage (12%-22%) of the amounts awarded to the province.</p>	<p>The tobacco companies named in the lawsuit have mounted various legal challenges related to the contingency fee agreement.</p> <p>However, the Supreme Court of Canada recently rejected the tobacco industry's request to appeal the New Brunswick Court of Appeal and the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench rulings which upheld the validity of the contingency-fee agreement entered into by the provincial government with outside council.¹⁷</p>
<p><i>Attorney General Of Newfoundland And Labrador v. Rothmans Inc., Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc, Carreras Rothmans Limited, Altria Group, Inc., Philip Morris U.S.A. Inc., Philip Morris International, In., JTI-Macdonald Corp., R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco International Inc., Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, British American Tobacco P.L.C., B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., British America Tobacco (Investments) Limited, and Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council.</i></p>	<p>In May 2001 the Newfoundland and Labrador government passed the <i>Tobacco Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i>, which permits the government to sue tobacco companies for the cost of treating smoking-related illnesses, estimated to be \$360 million a year.¹⁸ It was anticipated that tobacco manufacturers would challenge the legislation, as they had challenged similar legislation in B.C., and for this reason, the government referred the constitutionality of the Act to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and Labrador (Court of Appeal) in October 2002.¹⁹ British Columbia and Saskatchewan intervened in support of the Newfoundland and Labrador legislation. Imperial, Rothmans and JTI-Macdonald Corp. intervened to oppose the validity of the legislation. However, the reference case will not be heard because the issue was resolved by the Supreme Court of Canada when it ruled in favour of the B.C. legislation.</p>	<p>The government of Newfoundland and Labrador announced on February 8, 2011 the proclamation of its <i>Tobacco Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> and has also proceeded with the filing of "a statement of claim against the tobacco industry. The action is seeking the recovery of costs associated with health care services provided to individuals who have suffered with tobacco-related diseases, as well as the future health-related costs to the province. The cost of the legal proceedings to the province is also being sought in the statement of claim."²⁰</p>
<p>Nova Scotia</p>	<p>In December 2005 Nova Scotia's <i>Tobacco Damages and Health-care Costs Recovery Act</i> received Royal Assent.²¹ It is virtually identical to B.C.'s legislation.</p>	<p>Nova Scotia has not yet filed its lawsuit.</p>
<p>Manitoba</p>	<p>The <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> received Royal Assent in June 2006.²² It, too, is virtually identical to B.C.'s legislation.</p>	<p>Manitoba has not yet filed its lawsuit. However, in its November 2009 Speech from the Throne, the government said that it would proceed with the lawsuit in 2010.</p>

Saskatchewan	Tobacco-related health care costs are estimated at \$145 million annually in Saskatchewan. The province's <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> received Royal Assent in April 2007. ²³	Saskatchewan has not yet filed its lawsuit.
<i>Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of Ontario v. Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc., JTI-Macdonald Corp., Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al</i>	Ontario passed the <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> in May 2009. ²⁴ In September 2009 Ontario filed its lawsuit against the tobacco companies, becoming the third province in Canada to do so. ²⁵ Ontario is seeking \$50 billion in damages for past and ongoing health care costs linked to treating tobacco-related illness.	On January 29, 2010, the United Kingdom-based defendants (parents of the Canadian tobacco companies) served notices of motion and supporting evidence challenging jurisdiction. ²⁶ BAT reports that the first hearing is scheduled for April 2011. ²⁷
Quebec	Quebec passed its <i>Tobacco-related Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> in June 2009.	The tobacco industry filed a constitutional challenge of the <i>Act</i> in August 2009. ²⁸ Unfortunately, the Quebec Attorney General failed in 2010 to block the industry's challenge and the issue is headed to the courts. ²⁹
Alberta	The <i>Crown's Right of Recovery Act</i> received Royal Assent in Alberta in November 2009. The legislation is similar to B.C.'s <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> .	In October 2010, the Alberta Justice Minister said "Alberta will file a statement of claim within a year likely against several of the country's largest tobacco companies." ³⁰
PEI	Royal Assent was given to PEI's <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act</i> in December 2009. PEI became the tenth province in the country to adopt enabling legislation allowing them to sue tobacco companies to recover health care costs.	PEI has not yet filed its lawsuit.
Nunavut	On Nov. 1, 2010 in Nunavut, assent was given to Bill 37, the <i>Tobacco Damages and Health Care Cost Recovery Act</i> . The bill had received first reading on June 9, 2010.	The Nunavut government has not yet filed its lawsuit.

Individual Product Liability Litigation

Case	Background	Current Status
<p><i>Spasic v. Imperial Tobacco, et al</i></p>	<p>On May 1, 1997, <i>Spasic v. Imperial Tobacco et al</i> was filed against Imperial Tobacco and Rothmans, Benson & Hedges for millions of dollar in damages.³¹ A second suit, <i>Spasic Estate v. B.A.T. Industries p.l.c.</i>, was brought against British American Tobacco and its Montreal subsidiary, Imperial Tobacco Canada, in September 1997 after new evidence was revealed about the relationship between the companies.³² Mirjana Spasic died of smoking-related lung cancer in February 1998, but her estate continues to pursue both lawsuits.³³ The suits claim the defendant tobacco companies were negligent and deceitful in their manufacture and distribution of cigarettes and conspired together to deceive the public about the dangers of cigarettes. In addition to these arguments that are traditionally used against tobacco companies, the suits also claim intentional spoliation of evidence—a claim that the tobacco companies destroyed evidence of their tortuous actions.³⁴</p> <p>The defendants have managed to drag out the proceedings for more than a decade, but a trial date is finally in sight. The <i>Spasic v. Imperial</i> case has been transferred to Toronto from the small community of Milton, Ontario. The case continues to inch closer to trial at the Superior Court of Justice in Toronto. The plaintiff brought a motion which was heard October 25, 2006 to compel the defendants to serve sworn affidavits of documents and to approve a confidentiality order. The Court granted the order sought by the plaintiff, leading the defendants to provide lists of documents disclosing relevant evidence.</p>	<p>The case is currently at the discovery stage.</p>

<p><i>Peter Stright v. Imperial Tobacco Company Limited</i></p>	<p>Lower Sackville, Nova Scotia resident Peter Stright started smoking cigarettes in 1975, when he was 11 years old. He became addicted to nicotine and later in life developed Buerger’s Disease. Stright’s September 2002 Statement of Claim alleges that his nicotine addiction and Buerger’s Disease were caused by the negligent and/or intentional acts of Imperial Tobacco Limited:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The Defendant designed, manufactured and distributed tobacco products that are inherently defective and dangerous when used as intended, that is ignited and inhaled into the body.”</p> <p>It is further claimed that Imperial Tobacco knew or ought to have known that their products were dangerous and that the company should have warned its customers “of the dangerous and defective nature of its tobacco products.”³⁵</p> <p>The case had previously been in abeyance since 2005.</p>	<p>In March 2010, British American Tobacco told its shareholders that “The parties have been summoned to appear before the court where it is anticipated that the plaintiff will advance its case to avoid the claim being quashed.”³⁶</p>
---	---	---

Class Action Lawsuits

Case	Background	Current Status
<p><i>Victor Todd Sparkes v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited and Imperial Tobacco Company Limited</i></p>	<p>On July 20, 2004, a Newfoundland law firm filed a class action lawsuit against tobacco giant Imperial Tobacco, claiming the Montreal-based company deceived its customers in its marketing of ‘light’ and ‘mild’ cigarettes.³⁷ “It’s on behalf of all those people who, in the belief that light cigarettes were a more healthful alternative, smoked light cigarettes anywhere in the last 30 years or so,” said Ches Crosbie, the plaintiff’s lawyer.³⁸</p> <p>Crosbie filed the lawsuit in Newfoundland Supreme Court on behalf of Victor Sparkes and others. Sparkes, a former smoker, said he hasn’t developed any obvious illnesses as a result of smoking for 15 years. He said he smoked light cigarettes because he believed they could delay the onset of smoking-related illnesses.</p> <p>The lawsuit, which is similar to one filed in 2003 in British Columbia, isn’t seeking compensation for people who suffered health problems due to smoking. Instead, the suit is based on Newfoundland’s <i>Trade Practices Act</i>, a statute enacted in the 1970s as part of pro-consumer reforms.</p> <p>“We’re saying it was a deceptive trade practice and forbidden by the act,” said Crosbie. The suit will seek the refund of money made from the sales of ‘light’ and ‘mild’ cigarettes since their introduction in the 1970s. Crosbie said hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake.³⁹</p> <p>In December 2008, in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and Labrador, Justice James P. Adams dismissed the class action lawsuit, on the grounds that the plaintiff had not established cause. In February 2009, the plaintiff’s lawyers sought leave to appeal the decision to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal.</p>	<p>In a decision handed down by the Newfoundland Court of Appeal on March 22, 2009, the bid to certify the class action was rejected. The appeal court ruled that in order for Newfoundland consumers to seek protection under the <i>Trade Practices Act</i>, the consumers must have a direct relationship, what lawyers call privity, with the manufacturers. This privity requirement does not exist in other provinces.</p> <p>A few months later, the <i>Trade Practices Act</i> was replaced by the <i>Consumer Protection and Business Practices Act</i>. The government of Newfoundland and Labrador Government stated that it took such action “to strengthen and streamline legislation that prohibits unfair and unconscionable business transactions and provide remedies for wronged consumers”.⁴⁰</p>

<p><i>Cécilia Létourneau v. Imperial Tobacco Ltd., Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. and JTI-Macdonald Corp.</i></p>	<p>Christine Fortin and Joseph Mandelan, both of Montreal, along with Cécilia Létourneau of Rimouski, say cigarette manufacturers knew for decades that their products were harmful and addictive. In 1998 lawyers from the law firm Trudel & Johnson representing the three smokers asked the Quebec Superior Court to hear the suit against Imperial Tobacco Ltd., Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. and RJR Macdonald Inc. (now JTI-Macdonald). The claim was filed on behalf of all Quebecers who at the time of service of the motion (September 10, 1999) were addicted to the nicotine in cigarettes manufactured by the respondents and who remain addicted and on behalf of the legal heirs of persons included in the group at the time of service of the motion but who later died without first quitting smoking.⁴¹ The claim seeks \$5,000 for each person included in the group plus compensation for specific damages, for a total of \$17.8 billion.^{42, 43}</p>	<p>Both the Cécilia Létourneau and the Quebec Council on Tobacco and Health class action lawsuits were certified in 2005. Both class action lawsuits will be heard together in Quebec Superior court before judge Brian Riordan in October 2011.</p>
<p><i>Conseil québécois sur le tabac et la santé and Jean-Yves Blais v. Imperial Tobacco Ltd., Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. and JTI-Macdonald Corp.</i></p>	<p>The class action suit launched by the Quebec Council on Tobacco and Health is seeking compensation for victims of cancers of the lung, larynx and throat and for emphysema sufferers, as well as for the legal heirs of deceased persons in the group. The class action suit is seeking \$5 billion in damages.</p>	<p>Both the Cécilia Létourneau and the Quebec Council on Tobacco and Health class action lawsuits were certified in 2005. Both class action lawsuits will be heard together in Quebec Superior court before judge Brian Riordan in October 2011.</p>
<p><i>Jasmine Ragoonanan and Phillip Ragoonanan, by their estate representative, Davina Ragoonanan, and Ranuka Baboolal, by her estate representative, Vashti Baboolal v. Imperial Tobacco Limited, Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc., and JTI-Macdonald Inc.</i></p>	<p>This class action dealt specifically with fire-safe cigarettes. After a house fire caused by a smouldering cigarette killed three children in January 1998, relatives of the victims brought an action against Imperial Tobacco Canada.⁴⁴ The claim alleged that the injuries, death and property loss suffered in the fire could have been avoided or reduced if the defendants' cigarettes had been fire-safe. The plaintiffs attempted to have the suit certified as a class action, which would have included relatives of victims of other cigarette-caused fires. The claims in the case included a breach of the company's duty to produce a safe product and of their duty to warn of hazards of their products.⁴⁵ The class was denied certification in October 2005 by Ontario Superior Court Judge Maurice Cullity.⁴⁶ The decision denying certification was appealed by the plaintiffs to the Divisional Court, and was heard in January 2008.⁴⁷ On April 30, 2008 the Divisional Court released its Reasons for Judgment dismissing the plaintiffs' appeal. The plaintiffs then launched an additional appeal.</p>	<p>On August 26, 2009 a further appeal was dismissed, "thus ending the litigation."⁴⁸</p>

<p><i>John Smith v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. (aka Kenneth Knight v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd.)</i></p>	<p>On May 8, 2003, law firm Klein Lyons filed a class action suit in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on behalf of smokers of 'light' and 'mild' cigarettes in B.C. The Statement of Claim alleges that Imperial Tobacco Canada knowingly deceived smokers into believing 'light' and 'mild' cigarettes were less harmful than regular cigarettes.⁴⁹ B.C. resident Kenneth Knight, who smoked a pack and a half of cigarettes for 17 years, is not seeking compensation for personal injuries. Rather, he is asking the court for a permanent injunction to stop Imperial from marketing or selling 'light' or 'mild' cigarettes. Knight is also seeking a refund for all the money he and any other members of the class paid to purchase the allegedly misrepresented cigarettes. The law firm estimates that compensation and damages could run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. In 2004 Imperial filed its Statement of Defence and also filed a Third Party Notice against the Attorney General of Canada. The notice seeks to force the federal government to participate in the case and to reimburse Imperial any amount that the defendant is ordered to pay.⁵⁰</p>	<p>The federal government was initially successful to strike out the Third Party Notice.</p> <p>However, Imperial appealed this decision and that appeal was consolidated with a similar appeal in the British Columbia case (see page 8). In December 2009, the B.C. Court of Appeal, by a narrow 3-2 majority with a strong dissent, sided with the tobacco industry, but only in part.</p> <p>This decision was, in turn, appealed by the federal government to the Supreme Court of Canada. The case was heard last February 24, 2011. The court ruling is still pending.⁵¹</p>
<p><i>Kunta v. Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al.</i></p>	<p>Deborah Kunta alleges that her chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), severe asthma and lung disease were caused by smoking cigarettes. She has named 15 Canadian and international tobacco manufacturers in her lawsuit, as well as the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council. Philip Morris International reported that: "She is seeking compensatory and unspecified punitive damages on behalf of a proposed class comprised of smokers, their estates, dependents and family members, as well as restitution of profits, and reimbursement of government health care costs allegedly caused by tobacco products."⁵² The class action was filed on June 12, 2009.</p>	<p>According to Philip Morris International, "in September 2009, plaintiff's counsel informed defendants that he did not anticipate taking any action in this case while he pursues a multi-jurisdictional class action filed in Saskatchewan".⁵³ (See Adams)</p>
<p><i>Dorion v. Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al.</i></p>	<p>This class action is similar to the previous one and was filed on June 15, 2009.</p>	<p>Philip Morris International noted that "no activity in this case is anticipated while plaintiff's counsel pursues a multi-jurisdictional class action filed in Saskatchewan."⁵⁴ (See Adams)</p>
<p><i>Semple v. Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al.</i></p>	<p>This class action is similar to the previous two and was filed on June 18, 2009.</p>	<p>Philip Morris International noted that "no activity in this case is anticipated while plaintiff's counsel pursues a multi-jurisdictional class action filed in Saskatchewan."⁵⁵ (See Adams)</p>

<p><i>McDermid v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, et al.</i></p>	<p>This class action was filed on June 25, 2010 in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, against Imperial Tobacco Canada, Philip Morris International (PMI) and other tobacco industry manufacturers. PMI reported that: “The plaintiff, an individual smoker, alleges his own addiction to tobacco products and heart disease resulting from the use of tobacco products. He is seeking compensatory and unspecified punitive damages on behalf of a proposed class comprised of all smokers who were alive on June 12, 2007, and who suffered from heart disease caused by smoking, their estates, dependents and family members, plus disgorgement of revenues earned by the defendants from January 1, 1954 to the date the claim was filed.”⁵⁶</p>	<p>In its 2010 Annual Report, Philip Morris International stated that “defendants have filed jurisdictional challenges on the grounds that this action should not proceed during the pendency of the Saskatchewan class action”. (See Adams)⁵⁷</p>
<p><i>Bourassa v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited, et al.</i></p>	<p>This class action was also filed on June 25, 2010 in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, against Imperial Tobacco Canada, Philip Morris International (PMI), and other tobacco industry manufacturers. PMI reported that: “The plaintiff, the heir to a deceased smoker, alleges that the decedent was addicted to tobacco products and suffered from emphysema resulting from the use of tobacco products. She is seeking compensatory and unspecified punitive damages on behalf of a proposed class comprised of all smokers who were alive on June 12, 2007, and who suffered from chronic respiratory diseases caused by smoking, their estates, dependents and family members, plus disgorgement of revenues earned by the defendants from January 1, 1954 to the date the claim was filed.”⁵⁸</p>	<p>In its 2010 Annual Report, Philip Morris International stated that “defendants have filed jurisdictional challenges on the grounds that this action should not proceed during the pendency of the Saskatchewan class action”. (See Adams)⁵⁹</p>
<p><i>Adams v. Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council, et al.</i></p>	<p>Thelma Adams suffers from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) caused by her smoking. The Regina, Saskatchewan resident “is seeking compensatory and unspecified punitive damages on behalf of a proposed class of all smokers who have smoked a minimum of 25,000 cigarettes and have suffered, or suffer, from COPD, emphysema, heart disease, or cancer as well as restitution of profits.”⁶⁰ The action has been brought against the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers’ Council, Imperial Tobacco Canada, RBH and affiliated companies. The class action was filed on July 10, 2009.</p>	<p>The court case is in the preliminary stages.⁶¹ After serving motions challenging jurisdiction, some UK-based companies (parents of the Canadian tobacco companies) were released from the action.⁶²</p>

Industry Suits Against Governments

Case	Background	Current Status
<p><i>Grand River Enterprises v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada</i></p>	<p>On July 14, 2008, Grand River Enterprises (GRE), the largest First Nations-owned and -operated cigarette manufacturer in Canada, and four of its shareholders, filed a lawsuit in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice against the Government of Canada. The statement of claim alleges that the government has failed to enforce laws and prevent contraband tobacco on First Nations reserves. GRE is seeking \$1.5 billion in damages, an amount equal to all federal tobacco taxes paid by the company since 1997. GRE also seeks damages for the loss of market share and sales it has suffered as a result of the growth in the contraband market.</p> <p>Ironically the contraband market has at times included counterfeit versions of two of GRE’s most popular brands, which are even available for sale on the Six Nations reserve where the company is located.</p> <p>The federal government is essentially being sued for failing to enforce federal tobacco tax laws on reserves. The statement of claim against the federal government notes that GRE has filed a separate case in the Tax Court of Canada, which challenges the ability of the federal government to apply tobacco taxes to GRE. By law, federal tobacco taxes apply under all circumstances, including to on-reserve manufacturers, but GRE is contesting this law. Essentially, it is arguing that the Excise Tax should apply to everyone, or it should apply to no one.</p>	<p>The Attorney General of Canada has filed a Notice of Intent to defend itself against the lawsuit being heard in Ontario Superior Court.</p> <p>According to a case law update released on May 18, 2010 by the law firm WeirFoulds LLP, “the Attorney General moved for a temporary stay of the plaintiffs’ proceeding pending determination of the plaintiff GRE’s appeals at the Tax Court of Canada.... The motions judge agreed with the Attorney General that the action should be temporarily stayed until final determination of the tax appeals...”⁶³</p>
<p>Mader's Tobacco Store Limited and Robert George N. Gee</p>	<p>Robert Gee, the owner of Mader's Tobacco retail store in Kentville, Nova Scotia was charged in July 2009 for violating the provincial <i>Tobacco Access Act</i> by refusing to remove tobacco products from a wall display behind his store counter.⁶⁴</p> <p>In response, Robert Gee launched a Charter of Rights and Freedom challenge of the provincial legislation. The first phase of the case was heard before the Provincial Court of Nova Scotia on January 21 and July 6, 2010. Not surprisingly, the judge ruled on August 18, 2010 that the tobacco display ban did infringe section 2 (b) of the Charter.⁶⁵</p>	<p>The trial will go into a second phase to determine if the infringement is justifiable under section 1 of the Charter. The court will set the date for the hearing on October 6, 2011.</p>

References

- ¹ Royal Canadian Mounted Police. “RCMP Lays Criminal Charges Against Canadian Tobacco Company.” Press Release. 28 February 2003.
- ² Spielman A. “Canadian Litigation Against Tobacco: More Risky Than US Litigation, But We Won’t Hear for Years.” Citi Investment Research. E-mail Alert. 6 October 2009. www.citigroupgeo.com/pdf/SEU40833.pdf. Accessed January 2011.
- ³ United States District Court For the District of Columbia. United States of America et al, v. Philip Morris USA Inc., et al. Final Opinion: August 17, 2006. Civil Action No. 99-2496 (GK). www.usdoj.gov/civil/cases/tobacco2/amended%20opinion.pdf. Accessed March 2009.
- ⁴ Canada Revenue Agency. “Federal and provincial governments enter into civil settlement agreements with two tobacco companies.” Press Release. 31 July 2008. www.cra-arc.gc.ca/nwsrm/rlss/2008/m07/nr080731b-eng.html. Accessed February 2009.
- ⁵ Canada Revenue Agency. “Federal, provincial, and territorial governments conclude landmark settlements with tobacco companies.” Press Release. 13 April 2010. <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/nwsrm/rlss/2010/m04/nr100413-eng.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ⁶ Tobacco Control Resource Centre, Inc. “Types and Uses of Tobacco Litigation.” PowerPoint Presentation. Slides 27-33. <http://tc.bmjournals.com/content/vol11/issue3/images/data/DC1/TCRC.zip>. Accessed March 2008.
- ⁷ Rehm et al. “The Costs of Substance Abuse in Canada 2002.” Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse. March 2006. www.ccsa.ca/NR/rdonlyres/18F3415E-2CAC-4D21-86E2-CEE549EC47A9/0/ccsa0113322006.pdf. Accessed March 2008.
- ⁸ *Note: A judge later reduced the award to \$28 million. “Tobacco Lawsuit Award Slashed.” CBSNEWS.com. 19 December 2002. www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/10/04/national/main524400.shtml. Accessed March 2008.
- ⁹ <http://www.tobaccogrowersclassaction.com/home>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹⁰ Marion, Michael-Allan. “Tobacco growers steer clear of dispute”. Brantford Expositor. 16 November 2010. <http://www.brantfordexpositor.ca/ArticleDisplay.aspx?e=2846859>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹¹ <http://www.tobaccojusticeclassaction.com/index.htm>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹² Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. “Federal government sued over illegal smokes”. The Canadian Press. 1 November 2010. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/story/2010/11/01/ontario-smoke-shacks-suit792.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹³ Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. “Alberta seizes millions of illegal cigarettes”. 6 January, 2011. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/story/2011/01/06/edmonton-cigarettes-seized.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹⁴ Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. “Alberta charges chief in cigarette seizure”. 15 April 2011. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/story/2011/04/15/edmonton-chief-buffalo-cigarettes-charges.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹⁵ Goruk, Kirsten. “Chief fights Alberta over seizures of 16M cigarettes”. Edmonton Journal. 16 April 2011. <http://www.edmontonjournal.com/news/Chief+fighters+Alberta+over+seizure+cigarettes/4628385/story.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹⁶ Ashley MJ, Boadway T, et al. “Actions will speak louder than words: Getting serious about tobacco control in Ontario. A Report to the Minister of Health from her Expert Panel on the Renewal of the Ontario Tobacco Strategy.” February 1999. p. 30. www.otru.org/pdf/special/special_actions_eng.pdf. Accessed March 2010.
- ¹⁷ Office of the Attorney General. “Supreme Court of Canada upholds New Brunswick court rulings in tobacco lawsuit.” Press release. 25 October 2010.

-
- http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/news/news_release.2010.10.1675.html. Accessed April 2011.
- ¹⁸ Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. *Tobacco Health Care Costs Recovery Act*. Received Royal Assent on May 24, 2001. <http://assembly.nl.ca/Legislation/sr/statutes/t04-2.htm>. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ¹⁹ Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. "Government announces next steps with tobacco litigation." Department of Justice. Press Release. 18 October 2002. www.gov.nl.ca/releases/2002/just/1018n01.htm. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ²⁰ Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. "Tobacco Health Care Costs Recovery Act Proclaimed." Press release. 8 February, 2011. <http://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2011/just/0208n03.htm>. Accessed April 2011.
- ²¹ Nova Scotia. *Tobacco Damages and Health-care Costs Recovery Act*. www.gov.ns.ca/legislature/legc/bills/59th_1st/3rd_read/b222.htm. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ²² Government of Manitoba. *Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act* <http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/2006/c01806e.php>. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ²³ Government of Saskatchewan. *The Tobacco Damages and Health Care Cost Recovery Act*. <http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/details.cfm?p=23236>. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ²⁴ Government of Ontario. *Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act, 2009*. www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_09t13_e.htm. Accessed March 2010.
- ²⁵ *Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario v. Rothmans Inc., et al.* Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Court File No. CV-09-38798. 29 September 2009. <http://smoke-free.ca/litigation/US-CDA-Litigation/Canada%20Litigation/Ontario/DOC002-statementofclaim.pdf>. Accessed March 2010.
- ²⁶ British American Tobacco. Annual Report 2009. March 2010. p. 184. [www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/\\$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement](http://www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement). Accessed March 2010.
- ²⁷ British American Tobacco. Annual Report 2010. p. 183. <http://www.bat.com/ar/2010/downloads/index.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ²⁸ Corbeil, Michel. "Poursuites contre les cigarettiers: une longue bataille juridique en vue." *Le Soleil*. 14 Octobre 2010. <http://www.cyberpresse.ca/le-soleil/actualites/justice-et-faits-divers/201010/13/01-4332220-poursuites-contre-les-cigarettiers-une-longue-bataille-juridique-en-vue.php>. Accessed April 2011.
- ²⁹ Lavoie, Jean Pascal. "Soins de santé : l'industrie du tabac contre-attaque." *Le Soleil*. 8 Novembre 2010. <http://www.cyberpresse.ca/le-soleil/actualites/sante/201011/07/01-4340312-soins-de-sante-lindustrie-du-tabac-contre-attaque.php>. Accessed April 2011.
- ³⁰ Edmonton CTV. "Province to join other provinces in tobacco lawsuit." 25 October 2010. http://edmonton.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20101025/edm_lawsuit_101025/20101025/?hub=EdmontonHome. Accessed April 2011.
- ³¹ *Spasic v. Imperial Tobacco et al.* Amended Statement of Claim. Ontario Court (General Division), Court File No: C17773/97. 1 May 1997. www.sommersandroth.com/cases-spasic-soc-amend.htm. Accessed 10 March 2008.
- ³² *Spasic Estate v. B.A.T. Industries p.l.c.* Statement of Claim. www.sommersandroth.com/cases-spasic-bat-soc.htm. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ³³ Sibbald B. "Will litigation become part of public health arsenal in Canada's war on smoking?" *Canadian Medical Association Journal*. 30 May 2000; 162 (11). www.cmaj.ca/cgi/content/full/162/11/1608. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ³⁴ Meldrum H. "Big Tobacco Big Responsibilities: The Basic Principles of Civil and Criminal Liability for Canadian Corporations." Prepared for Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada. 2002. p. 44.

-
- ³⁵ *Stright v. Imperial Tobacco Company Ltd.* Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Court File No. 177663. 5 September 2002
- ³⁶ British American Tobacco. Annual Report 2009. March 2010. p. 188.
[www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/\\$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement](http://www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement). Accessed March 2010.
- ³⁷ *Victor Todd Sparkes v. Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited.* Amended Statement of Claim. 29 November 2004.
http://www.cba.org/ClassActions/class_2004/newfoundland/main/06-29-2004_Sparkes.aspx. Accessed April 13, 2010.
- ³⁸ Canadian Press. “Class-action lawsuit filed against Imperial Tobacco.” 20 July 2004. www.tobacco.org/articles/lawsuit/sparkes/. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ³⁹ Canadian Press. “Lawsuit filed in Nfld. against tobacco company.” 20 July 2004. www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/1090359397268_11. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ⁴⁰ Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. “New Act for Consumer Protection and Business Practices”. Press release. 22 May 2009.
<http://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2009/gs/0522n04.htm>. Accessed 14 April 2011.
- ⁴¹ Quebec Superior Court. Notice to Members. *Cécilia Létourneau v. JTI-Macdonald Corp., Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltée and Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc.*, Court File No. 500-06-000076-983. 21 February 2004. www.trudeljohnston.com/en/tabac/notice_to_members.pdf. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ⁴² Canadian Press. “Three plan \$11.5-billion lawsuit against tobacco firms.” 11 September 1998. <http://lists.essential.org/1998/intl-tobacco/msg00145.html>. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ⁴³ Rothmans Inc. “Renewal Annual Information Form: For the period ended March 31, 2006.” p. 20.
- ⁴⁴ *Ragoonanan v. Imperial Tobacco et al.*, (2000) Superior Court of Justice, Ontario. No. 4597.
www.canlii.org/en/on/onsc/doc/2005/2005canlii5861/2005canlii5861.pdf. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ⁴⁵ Meldrum H. “Big Tobacco Big Responsibilities: The Basic Principles of Civil and Criminal Liability for Canadian Corporations.” Prepared for Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada. 2002. p. 43.
- ⁴⁶ Imperial Tobacco Canada. “Another Tobacco Class Action Denied Certification.” Press Release. 31 October 2005.
- ⁴⁷ British American Tobacco. “Preliminary Announcement – Year Ended 31 December 2007.” 28 February 2008. p. 35.
[www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO7C8SXJ/\\$FILE/medMD7C8UNP.pdf?openelement](http://www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO7C8SXJ/$FILE/medMD7C8UNP.pdf?openelement). Accessed 10 March 2008.
- ⁴⁸ British American Tobacco. Annual Report 2009. March 2010. p. 187.
[www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/\\$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement](http://www.bat.com/group/sites/uk_3mnfen.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO52AK34/$FILE/medMD83VF6K.pdf?openelement). Accessed March 2010.
- ⁴⁹ *Knight v. Imperial Tobacco.* Class Action Statement of Claim. 8 May 2003. www.kleinlyons.com/class/light_cigs/sofc.pdf. Accessed 28 March 2008.
- ⁵⁰ Imperial Tobacco Canada. “Interim Financial Statements, Second Quarter Report.” 30 June 2004.
- ⁵¹ Stone, L. “Top court set to eigh in on smoking's cost.” *The Ottawa Citizen*, 11 January, 2011.
<http://www.ottawacitizen.com/news/court+weigh+smoking+cost/4089168/story.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- ⁵² Philip Morris International. Annual Report 2010. p. 78. http://media.corporate-ir.net/media_files/irol/14/146476/ar10.pdf. Accessed April 2011.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*

-
- 54 Ibid
- 55 Ibid
- 56 Ibid
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 British American Tobacco. Annual Report 2010. p. 185. <http://www.bat.com/ar/2010/downloads/index.html>. Accessed April 2011.
- 63 <http://www.weirfoulds.com/showpublication.aspx?Show=1643>. Accessed April 2011
- 64 McPhee, John. "Judge: Tobacco-display ban violates store owner's rights". The Chronicle Herald. 19 August 2010. http://www.jeansergebrisson.net/Judge_%20Tobacco-display%20ban%20...pdf. Accessed April 2010.
- 65 R. v. Mader's Tobacco Store Ltd., 2010 NSPC 52. <http://decisions.courts.ns.ca/nspc/2010/2010nspc52.html>. Accessed April 2011.