

# Ontario Court of Appeal Clarifies the Bounds of 'Constructive Fraud' in Arbitration Awards

April 3, 2024

## Brief

The Ontario Court of Appeal's decision in *Campbell v. Toronto Standard Condominium Corporation No. 2600*, 2024 ONCA 218 critically examines the conceptual boundaries of "fraud" within the ambit of the Arbitration Act, 1991. At the heart of this deliberation is whether "constructive fraud" falls under the legislative framework's definition of "fraud," particularly in sections 46(1)(g) and 47(2), concerning the setting aside of arbitral awards and the exceptions to the appeal time limit, respectively.

## Facts

The dispute traces back to the alleged breach by the respondents, Walter Campbell and Olakemi Sobomehin, of condominium rules against short-term rentals, culminating in an arbitration award in favor of Toronto Standard Condominium Corporation No. 2600 (the "Condo Corp."), ordering costs of \$30,641.72. The respondents sought to vacate the award, invoking "constructive fraud" due to the Condo Corp.'s expansion of arbitration issues beyond agreed terms.

## Arguments

In the Superior Court (the prior level of litigation), the application judge approached the term "fraud" within the Arbitration Act, 1991, with a broader lens, concluding that it

encompassed “constructive fraud.”

The Condo Corp. challenged the Superior Court’s inclusion of “constructive fraud” within the statutory interpretation of “fraud” in the Act, arguing for a narrower, conventional understanding that excludes such an expansive interpretation. The respondents countered, urging a broader, equitable reading of “fraud” to encompass instances of “constructive fraud,” aimed at preserving fairness and justice within the arbitration process.

The appellants, Condo Corp., posited that the statutory language of the Act does not support the inclusion of “constructive fraud” within the ambit of “fraud,” emphasizing the need for a strict construction that aligns with the Act’s objectives of efficiency and finality in arbitration.

### **Court Interpretation**

The Ontario Court of Appeal anchored its reasoning in the statutory language and precedent, underscoring a principle of legal interpretation that the same words within a statute are presumed to have consistent meanings across its provisions. This presumption applies directly to the usage of “fraud” in sections 46(1)9 and 47(2) of the Act, implying a need for a consistent, narrow interpretation aligned with established legal definitions.

The court observed that “fraud” possesses a well-established meaning in common law, typically requiring an element of dishonesty or intent to deceive. The Supreme Court has clarified that statutory terms with well-understood legal meanings should be interpreted in line with those meanings unless the legislature explicitly indicates a broader or different application. The Superior Court’s inclusion of “constructive fraud,” a concept markedly broader and not necessitating dishonesty for its establishment, into the definition of “fraud” was found to deviate from this

principle. The court reasoned that if the legislature had intended for “fraud” within the Act to include “constructive fraud,” it would have explicitly done so.

Moreover, the Court of Appeal considered the broader implications of interpreting “fraud” to include “constructive fraud” within the framework of arbitration disputes. It highlighted that such an interpretation would be incongruent with the overarching objectives of the Arbitration Act, 1991, namely efficiency and finality. The Act and relevant case law emphasize a narrow basis for court intervention in arbitration awards to prevent the arbitration process from becoming merely a precursor to prolonged judicial proceedings. Expanding the definition of “fraud” to include “constructive fraud” could potentially open the floodgates to strategic litigation efforts, undermining the arbitration process’s efficiency and finality.

The court also pointed out that, in this particular case, the respondents attempted to utilize the broader interpretation of “fraud” to circumvent the strict 30-day time limit for contesting arbitration awards set by section 47(1) of the Act. This strategic move was criticized as it sought to exploit the judicial system to review the arbitrator’s decision under the guise of “constructive fraud.” The court deemed such actions as contrary to the spirit of arbitration, which relies on the finality and binding nature of arbitration awards, barring exceptional circumstances like actual fraud.

In its decision, the Court of Appeal firmly rejected the Superior Courts’ interpretation that “constructive fraud” falls within the scope of “fraud” under the Arbitration Act, 1991. It concluded that such an interpretation not only lacks statutory and jurisprudential support but also poses significant risks to the arbitration framework’s intended efficiency and finality. The court thereby restored the original arbitral award, reinforcing the narrow path for legal recourse against arbitration decisions, strictly confined to

instances of actual fraud as traditionally understood in legal practice.

## **Significance**

The *Campbell v. Toronto Standard Condominium Corporation No. 2600* judgment marks a pivotal moment in clarifying the distinction between “fraud” and “constructive fraud” within the Arbitration Act, 1991. By explicitly excluding “constructive fraud” from the ambit of “fraud,” the Ontario Court of Appeal fortifies the arbitration process’s efficiency and finality. This delineation not only restricts the avenues for challenging arbitral awards but also reinforces the paramountcy of adhering to the explicit terms of arbitration agreements. Consequently, this decision shapes future arbitration conduct, emphasizing the necessity for parties to precisely define their terms of engagement and for arbitrators to navigate disputes with a clear understanding of the boundaries set by statutory law.

**Author:** Mahmoud Abuwasel

**Title:** Partner – Disputes

**Email:** [mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com](mailto:mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com)

**Profile:**

<https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/>

**Lawyers and consultants.**

Tier-1 services since 1799.

[www.waselandwasel.com](http://www.waselandwasel.com)

[business@waselandwasel.com](mailto:business@waselandwasel.com)