



Annual Report 2024–2025



About the CCP

The Court Challenges Program (CCP) provides financial support for test cases of national importance about constitutional and quasi-constitutional official language rights and human rights. In doing so, the CCP aims to both (i) promote access to justice for those who want to ask a court to review whether government action complies with the *Charter* (and/or *Official Languages Act*) and (ii) provide the courts with an opportunity to interpret and clarify the rights those laws protect. The goal is that the decisions made by courts in CCP-funded cases will allow everyone in Canada to better understand the scope and meaning of these rights.

The CCP is administered by the University of Ottawa pursuant to a Contribution Agreement with the federal government's Department of Canadian Heritage. The CCP is administratively hosted by the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (OLBI) of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ottawa. This ensures that the CCP can make decisions and manage funding independently of the government. All decisions about who receives funding are made exclusively by the CCP's Expert Panels.

For more information about the CCP, please consult our new website: pcj-ccp.ca.

THE CCP'S PRIMARY OBJECTIVES ARE:

- To enhance access to justice for those who seek to pursue important constitutional test cases; and
- In doing so, to support the clarification and advancement of certain constitutional and quasi-constitutional official language rights and human rights in Canada for the benefit of everyone in Canada.

THE CCP'S CORE VALUES ARE:



uOttawa



Court
Challenges
Program

Canada

Director's Message

2024-2025 was, simply put, a spectacular year for the Court Challenges Program (CCP). By any metric, this past year has seen the Program achieve its full potential: a record 173 applications received and considered, with almost \$8 million granted to the 118 files selected for funding. I pause briefly here to note that this significant increase in the volume of work was absorbed by the same number of CCP staff members and the same number of Expert Panel members: everyone involved just worked that much harder to ensure that CCP funding applicants and recipients receive the thoughtful consideration and support that they need. I am deeply appreciative of their diligence and dedication.

In addition, the CCP was able to realize some longer-term projects: a comprehensive review by each Expert Panel of their Funding Guidelines in Fall 2024 sought to ensure that grants are keeping up, to the extent possible, with the real costs of cases as reported by CCP funding recipients. We also increased outreach to civil society organizations. And, after years of effort, a new website was launched in late June 2025.

Most importantly, however, was the successful negotiation and signature of the 2025-2030 Contribution Agreement. In this respect, I want to express my appreciation to the Department of Canadian Heritage for their continued support of and trust in the CCP.

I must also recognize the support and dedication of some of the Program's unsung heroes, the members of the CCP's Management Committee, with whom I worked particularly closely this last year to conclude this Agreement. And again we thank the University of Ottawa for agreeing to continue to host the CCP: the administrative infrastructure provided by the University – from IT to human resources to payroll and accounting – allows CCP staff to focus on the Program's core mission and, crucially, for the CCP to operate at arm's length from government.

But in the months since the dust settled on the 2024-2025 whirlwind, and with the Program's future now more secure, the people that I have been thinking about most of all are not the staff, or the members of our Panels and Committees, but the intrepid individuals and organizations who pursue the cases that the CCP funds. Perhaps they are top of mind because the CCP is now, with increasing frequency, seeing some of the cases that we fund come to fruition, whether with a judicial decision (often more than one, as cases make their way through appeals) or some other kind of resolution. While these decisions represent the evolution of important legal principles, each is also a story, grounded in the facts that led to the case: the encounters with government, the struggles, the frustrations, the experience of injustice. The conclusion of these cases provides us with an opportunity to celebrate, and sometimes

commiserate, with our funding recipients. It also provides us with an opportunity to recognize and thank them.

It takes exceptional courage and enormous determination to pursue constitutional litigation. It also takes endurance. Before these cases even start – indeed, long before applicants approach us for funding – prospective litigants or the communities that they represent have likely experienced hardship, often for years. Once initiated, the cases themselves can also take many years. To see these cases through to their conclusion – win, lose or settle – is nothing short of heroic.

And so when, as now, it is time to take stock of what progress the CCP has made with respect to its mission and objectives, I inescapably conclude that the results that really matter are not achieved by the people who work for or with the CCP, but by the litigants who pursue the cases that we fund. And so when, as now, I have an opportunity to thank all those who realize the CCP's mandate, I thank our litigants most of all.

– Marika Giles Samson



Message from the Chair of the Human Rights Expert Panel

This year marks the completion of our sixth full year of work following the re-launch of the Court Challenges Program (CCP). With a significantly increased budget and a renewed agreement with the Department of Canadian Heritage, it is fair to say that we feel the Program has hit full stride. Over the past year, this Expert Panel considered more applications than in any year since 2020, and we approved more files for funding than ever before. As you will see in this report, we have also reached the point where we are able to see CCP funded cases making their way through the courts, with judicial decisions in these files now coming in on a regular basis.

As members of the Human Rights Expert Panel, we have a unique vantage point into the trajectory of complex *Charter* litigation. Canada is the only government in the world that funds a program explicitly aimed at bringing constitutional rights-based challenges against its own laws, policies, and actions. That said, it is clear to us that the cost of seeing ground-breaking *Charter* litigation through to its conclusion can be astronomical. The Program is vital for this reason, although we are acutely aware that we are only able to partially cover the costs of many of the cases we select for funding and that many important matters still rely on private funds and *pro bono* contributions by lawyers. That is why,

this year, we undertook a comprehensive review of our funding envelopes at each stage of proceedings. Knowing this Program alone cannot address the significant gaps that persist in access to *Charter* justice, we must all continue to interrogate the range of factors that drive litigation costs in Canada. There are no easy answers, but with each passing year the question becomes more pressing.

Moreover, despite the CCP staff's efforts to publicize and explain the CCP's eligibility criteria, we continue to receive applications that fall outside of our mandate in every funding round, in part because the CCP's reach is not as broad as the *Charter* itself. The Human Rights Branch of the CCP cannot fund matters that do not address *federal* laws, policies, or actions. Nor does the CCP's mandate include all sections of the *Charter*. We understand very well why this is frustrating to applicants, who cannot always be expected to understand the constitutional boundaries between areas of federal and provincial jurisdiction. This confusion is further evidence of the value of professional legal advice and of the many areas where access to justice challenges arise: we are well aware that people in Canada face many more barriers in vindicating their rights than just financial ones. Nonetheless, we aim to support cases where Program funding can make a meaningful difference.

Finally, I want to devote a few words of appreciation to my Panel colleagues. Working with this Panel is one of the great pleasures and privileges of my career. I deeply appreciate how rigorously my colleagues engage in their pre-meeting reading and preparatory work, as well as the careful, reflective engagement of our conversations. The capacity to disagree, but to seek consensus, is one we all value, and we believe that it makes our decisions stronger. This year our Panel said a bittersweet farewell to Yvonne Peters, who truly served as a model for all of us in this work. I think of her often as we make our way through a diverse and ever-increasing workload. But while 2024-2025 saw the departure of one colleague, we have also been very lucky to be able to welcome Patricia Paradis to the Panel, and we are already benefitting enormously from both her deep subject-matter expertise and her collegiality. We are truly lucky to get to do such fascinating work with such excellent colleagues.

– Catherine Dauvergne



Message from the Chair of the Official Language Rights Expert Panel

It is with pride and a deep sense of responsibility that I share my first message as Chair of the Official Language Rights Expert Panel of the Court Challenges Program (CCP). I am honoured to follow in the footsteps of my predecessor, Professor Emmanuelle Richez, whose leadership and unwavering commitment to advancing minority language rights have been an inspiration to everyone at the Program. I also take this opportunity to thank Johane Tremblay for her many years of service on the Expert Panel including, most recently, as Vice-Chair. But as the service of these two exceptional colleagues comes to an end, we have been delighted to welcome many new colleagues this year, bringing fresh new perspectives and experiences.

Our Panel's work is rooted in powerful ideas that underpin who we are as a nation.

The first is that language rights in Canada are not only constitutional guarantees and essential to our Canadian form of democracy, but also deeply personal expressions of our identity. Every Canadian should be able to live, learn, and thrive in the official language of their choice.

The CCP is also rooted in another powerful idea: that a broader access to justice can be achieved by supporting cases that have the potential to clarify and strengthen the legal framework protecting official language

minorities across Canada. This Program is one of the few tools available to ensure that these rights are respected, protected and fulfilled. This work is especially important today as our country evolves and new challenges emerge.

It has been so exciting to work with this Panel at an exceptional point in its history. As an independent body dedicated to the legal rights of official language communities in Canada, in 2024-2025 the Panel received a record number of funding applications. These figures reflect both the growing awareness of the Program and the pressing need for the funding that it offers. Thanks to the dedication and hard work of our staff and Panel members, last year we managed to allocate over \$3 million to eligible cases, nearly the entire funding envelope budgeted for official language rights cases. This is a testament to the Program's relevance and the trust placed in it by linguistic minority communities across the country.

The signing of a new five-year contribution agreement also marks a significant milestone. It brings renewed stability and sustainability, ensuring that the CCP can continue to support meaningful legal action from coast to coast to coast. We are especially encouraged by the opportunity this agreement provides to expand outreach and ensure that the Program is known by and readily available to those who need it most.

This branch of the Court Challenges Program exists to ensure that individuals and communities can access justice when their language rights are at risk. Whether it involves education rights, reinforcing the institutional governance for minority language institutions, or access to public services, these rights shape our families, our communities, and our collective future.

We invite educators, legal professionals, community organizations, and individuals to learn more about how the Program works and how it can support efforts to uphold constitutional rights. As Chair, I see the courage of those who come forward to challenge injustice. Their determination reminds us that the strength of our democracy lies not only in our institutions, but in the voices of individuals, civil society organizations and institutions who demand justice.

The Court Challenges Program is a vital part of that vision. I am honoured to contribute to its stewardship and to support the communities it serves.

- Pearl Eliadis



CCP Staff

CCP staff, working closely with the Director, are on the front lines of the Program. Tasked with the day-to-day administration of the CCP, the staff ensure the Program's efficient operation and the independence of its decision-making process. Every day, staff field questions from potential funding applicants about the application process, coordinate the intake of these applications, support the Expert Panels in their selection process and communicate the Panels' decisions, and ensure the disbursement and proper management of CCP funds. Our staff are the primary point of contact for those seeking to understand and access the Program at all stages of the funding process.



Catherine Thibault
Legal Counsel



Maggie Bellerose
Legal Counsel



Jessica Yassine
Legal Counsel



Pascale Castonguay
Communication Advisor



Aminata Nyara Barry
Office Administrator



Alexandre Viric
Legal Assistant

In 2024–2025, the CCP also benefited from the support of two law students, Kim Plourde and Qurat-ul Ain.

Human Rights Branch

The CCP provides financial support to cases aimed at affirming and clarifying the following human rights guaranteed by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*:

- section 2 (fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, expression, peaceful assembly and association)
- section 3 (democratic rights)
- section 7 (right to life, liberty and security of person)
- section 15 (equality rights)
- section 27 (multiculturalism)
- section 28 (equality of the sexes)



Human Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Matters*

1 The Human Rights Branch of the CCP recently funded a test case development exploring the obligations of elected officials when using social media. The funding recipient seeks to clarify whether officials have certain *Charter* obligations when engaging with constituents on social media, in a context where elected officials are increasingly using social media platforms as a tool of political discourse and to communicate with constituents. Specifically, they argue that blocking constituents on social media prevents them from engaging with their Member of Parliament on community, policy issues and other matters of public concern, thereby violating the right of freedom of expression pursuant to section 2(b) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. This novel test case development raises important questions surrounding the widespread use of social media as a main communicative and political tool by elected officials and the degree to which that use attracts *Charter* scrutiny.

2 The CCP provided support for the appeal of an unsuccessful challenge to the eligibility criteria for federal pandemic benefits on the basis that they violated section 15 *Charter* rights. The impugned pandemic benefits limited eligibility to those who had received at least a specific minimum income from “eligible income sources” in the previous 12 months. However, disability benefits were not considered to be an eligible income source and as a result, the funding recipient, who suffers from a chronic illness and was unable to work more than part-time before being laid off due to the pandemic, did not qualify for the pandemic benefits.

The court of first instance found that this exclusion did not constitute discrimination on the basis of disability, but rather a distinction on the basis of income (and so not a prohibited ground). In the funding recipient’s view, the Court’s section 15 analysis incorrectly focused on the income threshold instead of the exclusion of disability benefits as an eligible source of income. The appeal in this case therefore sought clarification of the legal test for adverse effect discrimination in the context of section 15 of the *Charter*.

**The funding recipients concerned have consented, in the public interest, to the publication of an anonymized summary of their funded matter.*

Human Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Cases

3 The CCP is funding an intervention in a case in which the plaintiff seeks to establish that the denial of health care to migrants with irregular status is contrary to sections 7 and 15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The recipient of intervention funding is seeking to position these sections 7 and 15 *Charter* claims in the context of a decision from the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC), which found that Canada had failed to meet its international human rights obligations by denying health care to migrants with irregular status. Both the intervention and the underlying case seek to clarify Canada's *Charter* and international obligations towards migrants with irregular status.

In its decision granting intervenor status to numerous organizations, including the one funded by the CCP, the Court recognized the complexity of the case and the important role that intervenors would play in assisting the Court. To facilitate this assistance, and for the benefit of the Court, it granted some intervenors additional participatory rights in the fact-finding process, including access to documentary discovery and attendance at examinations for discovery. The Court also granted them leave to intervene in any pre-trial motions that could be dispositive of the Plaintiff's claims.

4 The Human Rights Branch funded a test case development seeking to question whether federal subsidies for oil and gas, by contributing to climate change, violate section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The funding recipient intends to demonstrate that these subsidies prop up the oil economy and distort the market, thereby slowing down the transition to the use of renewable energy. By doing so, the recipient seeks to establish that the federal government is actively contributing to climate change, which threatens the life and security of the person of all people in Canada.

Cases about climate are relatively novel in Canada and so the government's *Charter* obligations regarding climate change, if any, remain uncertain. As climate change is becoming an increasingly urgent issue both in Canada and internationally, the proposed test case raises important questions regarding the government's *Charter* obligations when making decisions about sectors that could negatively impact the climate. It might also further clarify the parameters that could trigger a positive obligation of the federal government with respect to the section 7 protections of life and security of the person.

Human Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Cases

5 The Human Rights Expert Panel granted funding to litigation challenging the federal government’s refusal to fund remediation of the on-reserve home of an Indigenous family, and to provide alternate housing, in a context where a government inspection had found that the condition of the home created health problems for the children living in it. Despite this finding, Canada found that the family’s request for financial support and alternative housing so that the necessary remediation work could be undertaken did not meet the minimum requirements to be approved under Jordan’s Principle. Jordan’s Principle, established in 2007, seeks to ensure a “child-first” approach to supporting First Nations children. The funding recipient argues that the government refusal is not only contrary to Jordan’s Principle, but also contrary to section 15 of the *Charter*. This litigation seeks not only to clarify our understanding of Canada’s obligations towards First Nations children generally but, more specifically, to clarify the relationship between section 15 of the *Charter* and Jordan’s Principle.



Human Rights Branch

Concluded Cases

Constitutional litigation is complex and takes a long time. While a case is ongoing, all information about that case is subject to litigation privilege. This means that the CCP cannot disclose any information about funded cases until they are fully and finally concluded, in that all avenues of legal recourse have been exhausted or the case has been abandoned.

The cases listed below were fully and finally concluded at some point in 2024-2025, and so the CCP is now able to report them. In addition to the concluded cases listed below, 13 test case development files, 18 litigation files and 8 legal intervention files funded by the Human Rights Branch of the CCP were completed and closed before 31 March 2025 but cannot yet be disclosed due to potential or ongoing legal proceedings.

Case in which the funding recipient was (or supported) a party	Outcome	Province/Territory
<i>Bjorkquist et al v. Attorney General of Canada</i> , 2023 ONSC 7152	Decision of the Ontario Superior Court granting the application. (The CCP also funded this case at the test case development level.)	Ontario
<i>Hutlet v. Attorney General of Canada et al</i> , 2022 MBKB 223	Decision of Court of King's Bench of Manitoba denying the application. (The CCP also funded this case at the test case development level.)	Manitoba
<i>Kiss et al. v. Minister of Citizenship and Immigration</i> , 2023 FC 1147	Decision of the Federal Court granting the applications for judicial review.	Federal
<i>Julia Lamb and British Columbia Civil Liberties Association v. Attorney General of Canada</i> (BCSC)	Case alleging violations of sections 7 and 15 of the <i>Charter</i> was discontinued following legislative amendment.	British Columbia
<i>Reference re An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families</i> , 2024 SCC 5	Former intervenor was named as respondent in appeal to Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) challenging the constitutionality of the <i>Act</i> . Decision of the SCC upholding the constitutionality of the <i>Act</i> .	Québec
<i>Susan Hume Smith v. Attorney General of Canada</i> , 2021 SST 412	Decision of the Appeal Division of the Social Security Tribunal (SST-AD) allowing the Minister's appeal.	Federal
<i>Susan Hume Smith v. Attorney General of Canada</i> , 2023 FCA 122	Decision of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissing the application for judicial review of the SST-AD's decision.	Federal
<i>Susan Hume Smith v. Attorney General of Canada</i> , 2024 CanLII 12551	Decision of the Supreme Court of Canada dismissing the application for leave to appeal.	Federal
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	The funding recipient opted not to pursue their proposed constitutional challenge based on alleged violations of sections 2, 7 and 15 of the <i>Charter</i> when a legislative amendment resolved the central issue. (The CCP also funded this case at the test case development level.)	Federal

Human Rights Branch

FUNDING GRANTED IN 2024–2025

Number of applications	Test Case Development	Trial	Appeal	Intervention	Total
Received*	30	46	19	14	109
Funded	17	29	11	13	70

*This includes applications received and decided by the Expert Panel in 2024-2025, including applications for additional or extraordinary funding in previously funded matters.

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS FUNDED BY CATEGORY OF RIGHTS COVERED BY THE CCP

(Note that the totals may be higher than the number of applications funded because some cases involve more than one category of rights.)

	Fundamental freedoms	Democratic rights	Right to life, liberty and security of person	Equality rights	Multiculturalism	Equality of the sexes
Test Case Development	2	2	8	15	1	4
Trial	2	0	21	23	1	2
Appeal**	1	1	5	8	0	0
Intervention***	1	4	6	11	0	2

**Applications for appeal funding may include applications for a motion for leave to appeal.

***Applications for intervention funding may include applications for leave to intervene.

Official Language Rights Branch

The CCP provides financial support to cases aimed at affirming and clarifying the following official language rights:

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE RIGHTS ENSHRINED IN:

- Sections 93 and 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*
- Section 23 of the *Manitoba Act, 1870*
- Sections 16 to 23 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*
- The language aspect of freedom of expression in section 2 of the *Charter* when invoked in a case involving official language minorities
- Any parallel constitutional provision

THE JUSTICIABLE PARTS OF THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT:

- Part I, section 4 (proceedings of Parliament)
- Part II, sections 5 to 7 and 10 to 13 (legislative and other instruments)
- Part IV (communications with and services to the public)
- Part V (language of work)
- Part VII (advancement of equality of status and use of English and French)
- Section 91 (staffing)



Official Language Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Cases*

1 Having funded test case development, in 2024-2025 the CCP funded litigation seeking to consider the impact on the rights protected by section 23 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* of a government's decision not to fund the renovation of a minority language school. Without government investment to renovate the school, the recipient says that the global educational experience of students attending that school was inferior to that of the linguistic majority: students had to attend classes in run-down buildings, leased from a majority-language school board, that were generally unsuitable due to a lack of certain educational infrastructure, such as a gymnasium or a library. Representing a group of Francophone rights holders, the funding recipient sought a determination of the provincial government's responsibilities in this context, notably with respect to the right to substantive equivalence for minority language students enrolled in that school. Happily, in September 2025, the government announced that funding would be made available for this renovation, demonstrating how cases funded by the CCP can succeed in vindicating rights without necessarily resulting in a judicial decision.

**The funding recipients concerned have consented, in the public interest, to the publication of an anonymized summary of their funded matter.*



Official Language Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Cases

2 The Official Language Rights Expert Panel granted funding to litigation, arising from a previously funded test case development file, about effective electoral representation for an official language minority community. The funding recipient challenged the Provincial Electoral Boundaries Commission's failure to recommend that a region historically considered to be Francophone be identified as an exceptional electoral district. This challenge resulted in a court ruling that the Commission must reconsider this electoral district using the same criteria as those used to recommend the creation of other exceptional electoral districts in the province, with the Commission being required to submit a new report within 20 months of the judgment.

3 The Official Language Rights Branch funded litigation regarding a hospital's obligation to offer services in French. According to the funding recipient, the inability of healthcare staff to interact in French with the representatives of hospitalized persons contravened sections 16.1 and 20 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Given that the official language rights violations continued after the provincial Commissioner of Official Languages had investigated the allegations, drafted a report, and issued recommendations, the funding recipient now wanted the court to compel the health facility to deliver services to them in French. This litigation also seeks to clarify if, in the case of an official language rights violation, a remedy under section 24 of the *Charter* may include damages.



Official Language Rights Branch

Examples of Funded Cases

4 The Official Language Rights Expert Panel granted funding for litigation concerning access to proceedings in French before an adjudicative tribunal. In their case before a provincial human rights tribunal, in which all parties involved were French-speaking, the funding recipient had asked for the proceedings to be in French, but his request was denied because none of the tribunal's adjudicators had sufficient proficiency in French to hear the case. The funding recipient therefore sought clarification from the courts as to whether he had a right, pursuant to (among others) section 16(3) of the *Charter*, to a hearing before the provincial tribunal conducted entirely in French. The funding recipient also sought to determine whether the failure to appoint adjudicators with the necessary language skills, which resulted in the tribunal being unable to fulfill its own linguistic obligations, gives rise to a reasonable apprehension of a lack of institutional independence on the part of the tribunal vis-à-vis the executive branch who appoint the adjudicators. Although the funding recipient's legal case was itself unsuccessful, in the months following its conclusion, no fewer than four bilingual adjudicators were appointed to this tribunal.

Official Language Rights Branch

Concluded Cases

Constitutional litigation is complex and takes a long time. While a case is ongoing, all information about that case is subject to litigation privilege. This means that the CCP cannot disclose any information about funded cases until they are fully and finally concluded, in that all avenues of legal recourse have been exhausted or the case has been abandoned.

The cases listed below were fully and finally concluded at some point in 2024-2025, and so the CCP is now able to report them. In addition to the concluded cases listed below, 8 test case development files, 10 litigation files and 1 legal intervention file funded by the Official Language Rights Branch of the CCP were completed and closed before 31 March 2025 but cannot yet be disclosed due to potential or ongoing legal proceedings.

Case in which recipient was (or supported) a party	Outcome	Province/ Territory
<i>Alliance nationale de l'industrie musicale v. Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission</i> , 2022 FCA 156	Decision of the Federal Court of Appeal partially granting an appeal of an interlocutory decision (and dismissing the government's cross-appeal).	Federal
<i>Alliance nationale de l'industrie musicale v. Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission</i> , 2023 CanLII 57198	Decision of the Supreme Court of Canada dismissing the application for leave to appeal of an interlocutory decision.	Federal
<i>Alliance nationale de l'industrie musicale v. Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission</i>	Out-of-court settlement of a case filed with the Federal Court under sections 16 and 20 of the <i>Charter</i> and Parts IV and VII of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> following the adoption of Bill C-11 and Bill C-13.	Federal
<i>Association des juristes d'expression française du Nouveau-Brunswick v. Canada (Justice)</i> , 2024 FC 1464	Decision of the Federal Court dismissing a case filed under section 77 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> .	Federal
<i>Darius Bossé v. Public Health Agency of Canada and Minister of Health</i>	Out-of-court settlement of a claim filed in the Federal Court under section 77 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> relating to Part IV of the <i>Act</i> and section 20 of the <i>Charter</i> , under which the Government of Canada acknowledged that improvements had been made to the ArriveCAN app following the complaint and apologized for the fact that the complainant had been unable to use the ArriveCAN app in the official language of his choice.	Federal
<i>Natalie Davis et al. v. Corporation of the Town of Parry Sound</i>	Out-of-court settlement of an application for judicial review filed with the Superior Court of Justice (Divisional Court) pursuant to section 23 of the <i>Charter</i> .	Ontario

Case in which recipient was (or supported) a party	Outcome	Province/ Territory
<i>Don C. Donderi et al v. Attorney General of Quebec</i>	The proposed application for a declaratory judgment based on the linguistic dimension of section 2(b) of the <i>Charter</i> (freedom of expression) was not pursued.	Québec
<i>Jocelyn Leblanc v. Public Health Agency of Canada</i>	Out-of-court settlement of a claim filed with the Federal Court under section 77 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> relating to Part IV of the <i>Act</i> and sections 16, 20, and 21 of the <i>Charter</i> .	Federal
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	Settlement of proposed challenge under section 23 of the <i>Charter</i> .	British Columbia
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	The funding recipient decided not to pursue a case based on sections 16(3) and 20(2) of the <i>Charter</i> due to a promising change in underlying circumstances. <i>(The CCP also funded this case at the test case development level.)</i>	New Brunswick/ Ontario
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	Settlement of a proposed challenge based on Part IV of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> .	Federal
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	The funding recipient opted not to pursue their proposed challenge under section 23 of the <i>Charter</i> in order to prioritize negotiations.	Prince Edward Island
As this case was not pursued, no case name or citation is available.	The funding recipient opted not to pursue their proposed challenge under section 23 of the <i>Charter</i> in order to prioritize negotiations.	Ontario

Case in which the funding recipient was an intervenor	Outcome	Province/ Territory
The CCP sometimes funds multiple intervenors representing different perspectives in the same case, especially in particularly significant cases. This was what happened in <i>Commission scolaire francophone des Territoires du Nord-Ouest v. Northwest Territories (Education, Culture and Employment)</i> , 2023 SCC 31 (CSFTNO) , a landmark case about language rights, notably the <i>Charter</i> values reflected in section 23 of the <i>Charter</i> .		Northwest Territories
In our 2023-2024 Annual Report, we listed two (2) funded interventions in the <i>CSFTNO</i> case, as well as three (3) other funded files in which the funding recipient had sought leave to intervene but leave was not granted. Now that all of the relevant files have been closed, the CCP is able to report that a total of four (4) intervenors (as well as the three (3) proposed intervenors who were not granted leave) were funded to intervene in the <i>CSFTNO</i> case at the Supreme Court of Canada.		

Official Language Rights Branch

FUNDING GRANTED IN 2024–2025

Number of applications	Test Case Development	Trial	Appeal	Intervention	Total
Received*	3	38	17	3	61
Funded	2	33	11	2	48

*This includes applications received and decided by the Expert Panel in 2024-2025, including applications for additional and extraordinary funding in previously funded matters.

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS FUNDED BY CATEGORY OF RIGHTS COVERED BY THE CCP

(Note that the totals may be higher than the number of applications funded because some cases involve more than one category of rights.)

	Education rights	Legislative and legal rights	Equality and linguistic advancement	Right to services and communication	Right to freedom of expression
Test Case Development	2	0	0	0	0
Trial	22	1	12	10	0
Appeal**	2	3	4	6	0
Intervention***	1	0	1	0	0

**Applications for appeal funding may include applications for leave to appeal.

***Applications for intervention funding may include applications for leave to intervene.

Spending by Branch

APPLICATIONS FUNDED IN 2024–2025

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE RIGHTS	3 067 581 \$
Test Case Development	40 000 \$
Trial	2 413 142 \$
Appeal	514 439 \$
Intervention	100 000 \$
HUMAN RIGHTS	4 899 017 \$
Test Case Development	341 672 \$
Trial	3 752 345 \$
Appeal	323 000 \$
Intervention	482 000 \$

Statement of Revenue and Expenses (Cash Flow)

YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2025

REVENUE		10 391 405 \$
<hr/>		
Contribution from the Department of Canadian Heritage		10 391 405 \$
 EXPENSES		 8 698 618 \$
<hr/>		
Administration		1 550 901 \$
Cases – Official Language Rights		2 738 664 \$*
Funded Applications	3 067 581 \$	
Less unused funds returned	(328 917 \$)	
Cases – Human Rights		4 409 053 \$*
Funded Applications	4 899 017 \$	
Less unused funds returned	(489 964 \$)	
 SURPLUS		 1 692 787 \$
<hr/>		

**Net figures, which include applications funded in 2024-2025 as well as unused funds returned at the conclusion of previously funded cases.*

FOLLOW US



[pcj-ccp.ca](https://www.pcj-ccp.ca)

COURT CHALLENGES PROGRAM

1 NICHOLAS STREET, SUITE 1507, OTTAWA (ONTARIO) K1N 7B7

613-562-5702 • INFOPCJ.CCP@UOTTAWA.CA

The Court Challenges Program recognizes that it has its offices and does most of its work on the unceded territory of the Anishinaabeg people. We thank the Anishinaabeg people for the privilege of working in this place and we honour them as the traditional guardians of these lands.