Citation: 2009 TCC 151

Docket: 2008-1269(IT)I

BETWEEN:

RON S. WARNER,

Appellant,

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN,

Respondent,

and

ALICE WARNER,

Third Party.

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Let the attached certified transcript of my Reasons for Judgment delivered orally from the Bench at Toronto, Ontario on February 25, 2009, be filed.

"Diane Campbell"
Campbell J.

Signed in Ottawa, Canada, this 23rd day of March 2009.

TAX COURT OF CANADA

BETWEEN:

RON S. WARNER

Appellant

- and -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

- and -

ALICE WARNER

Third Party

ORAL REASONS AND DECISION RENDERED BY THE HONOURABLE MADAM JUSTICE CAMPBELL

at Courts Administration Service, Room 6B 180 Queen Street West, 6th Floor, Toronto, Ontario on Wednesday, February 25, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.

APPEARANCES

Mr. Ron S. Warner on his own behalf Mr. Edward G. Spong for Alice Warner

Mr. Thang Trieu for the Respondent

Also Present:

Ms Roberta Colombo Court Registrar
Ms Shirley Sereney Court Reporter

A.S.A.P. Reporting Services Inc. © 2009

200 Elgin Street, Suite 1105 Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1L5 130 King Street W., Suite 1800 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1E3

1	Toronto,	Ontario
---	----------	---------

- 2 --- Upon commencing the Oral Reasons and Decision
- on Wednesday, February 25, 2009.
- 4 JUSTICE CAMPBELL: Let the record
- 5 show that I am delivering oral reasons in the appeal
- 6 of Ron Warner which I heard earlier today.
- 7 This appeal is in respect to
- 8 Mr. Warner's 2006 taxation year. He is seeking to
- 9 deduct from his income a lump sum payment of
- 10 \$5,000 paid to his former spouse, Alice Warner.
- 11 Ms. Warner did not include this amount in her income.
- The parties separated in 2002 and
- 13 were divorced by Order dated October 4, 2004.
- 14 Subsequently on February 13, 2006, Minutes of
- 15 Settlement were signed by the Appellant, his former
- 16 spouse, and their respective solicitors. Although the
- 17 Minutes of Settlement were handwritten, they were
- 18 endorsed by the Court on February 13, 2006.
- One of the terms of the Minutes of
- 20 Settlement was that Mr. Warner would pay spousal
- 21 support of \$271 per month commencing March 1, 2006 to
- 22 Alice Warner. Mr. Warner has been permitted the
- 23 deduction for those payments relating to the monthly
- 24 \$271 amount which he paid in 2006.
- What is in dispute is the

Τ	\$5,000 payment. The clause respecting this, as
2	contained in the Minutes of Settlement, states:
3	"The Respondent shall pay the
4	sum of \$5,000 by bank draft or
5	certified cheque to the
6	Applicant within 45 days
7	hereof in full satisfaction of
8	all spousal support claims up
9	to and including February 28,
10	2006."
11	Mr. Warner on a number of occasions
12	throughout the hearing expressed concerns over the
13	manner in which the terms of the Minutes of
14	Settlement were dealt with. I understand his
15	frustration with the process and how it has affected
16	his life. I hear it many times from individuals
17	before me who have gone through family and divorce
18	proceedings. However, although Mr. Warner may be
19	unhappy with the agreement and his participation in
20	negotiating the terms (which he felt he was denied by
21	the process), the Minutes constitute a binding and
22	legally-enforceable document sanctioned by the Court.
23	The narrow issue before me is simply
24	whether I can permit Mr. Warner to deduct the
25	\$5,000 payment. The deduction has been denied by the

1	Minister	of	National	Revenue	because	it	does	not
		\circ	IVACTOTIAT	I CC V CII CC	DCCGGGC	± C	accc	1100

- comply with the definition requirements of "support 2
- 3 amount", contained in subsection 56.1(4) of the
- Income Tax Act (the "Act"), as it was not payable on
- 5 a periodic basis. The relevant portion of the
- definition states: 6
- 7 "Support amount" means
- amount payable or receivable 8
- 9 as an allowance on a periodic
- 10 basis for the maintenance of
- 11 the recipient...
- 12 The Appellant can deduct under subsection 60(b) of
- 13 the Act only if he meets this definition.
- 14 I heard evidence from Mr. Warner,
- 15 Alice Warner being represented in Court by her
- 16 solicitor. Much of Mr. Warner's evidence related to
- the frustration he has felt over the years in dealing 17
- with the process. In respect of the actual issue, he 18
- 19 seemed to be saying that the \$5,000 figure was, as he
- 20 it, a number "pulled out of the put air".
- 21 From the time of separation
- 22 2002 until the Minutes of Settlement were signed in
- 2006, he testified that he did not pay Alice Warner 23

- 1 as she was not co-operating with the process and he
- 2 did not believe she would be eligible for any support
- 3 from him. He stated that he only agreed to this
- 4 amount because, if he did not, he was told that his
- pension could be garnisheed for a much higher amount 5
- 6 at a later date.
- 7 I have little else upon which to
- characterize this payment except this evidence from 8
- 9 the actual provisions Mr. Warner and in
- 10 Minutes of Settlement. Certainly there is nothing in
- Mr. Warner's evidence that would indicate that the 11
- 12 payment was anything other than a lump sum payment
- 13 which will not be deductible. He did not relate the
- payment to any type of periodic payment that he was 14
- 15 voluntarily making or paying pursuant to an Order of
- 16 the Court prior to the Minutes of Settlement in 2006.
- In fact, he testified to quite the contrary: that in 17
- 18 fact he did not believe that Alice Warner was
- 19 entitled to any support from him prior to 2006.
- 20 The eight factors set out
- The Queen v. McKimmon, 90 DTC 6088, which, although 21
- 22 not exhaustive, are intended to assist the Court in
- the determination of such a payment as deductible or 23

- 1 Briefly, the \$5,000 payment is not a weekly or
- 2 monthly amount; it is a one-time payment which,
- 3 according to his evidence, represented a sizeable
- 4 portion of his pension income in 2006 and, according
- to the evidence, released him from his obligation to 5
- 6 pay Alice Warner support prior to 2006. Applying the
- 7 McKimmon factors would support that it can be nothing
- else except a lump sum capital payment. 8
- 9 According also to the principles set
- 10 forth by the Federal Court of Appeal in Peterson v.
- Canada (appeal by Tossell), [2005] 3 C.T.C. 277, the 11
- 12 Minutes of Settlement give no recognition to a
- 13 pre-existing obligation to pay support
- 14 Alice Warner or of arrears that existed in 2006 as a
- result of such a prior obligation. Without this 15
- 16 connection or link, I am simply bound by the
- provisions of the Minutes of Settlement and the 17
- evidence, and they provide no connection or link 18
- 19 between the \$5,000 payment and any pre-existing
- 20 obligation to pay support between or the
- 21 \$5,000 payment and any amount of existing arrears.
- 22 It was payment to satisfy amounts he
- 23 may have owed prior to 2006 for support, but which

- 1 were not payable prior to 2006 on a periodic basis or
- 2 any other basis because they were not ascertained.
- 3 Since they cannot be characterized
- 4 as arrears or as a catch-up of amounts otherwise
- 5 payable on a periodic basis, I must dismiss the
- 6 appeal without costs, Mr. Warner, because the
- 7 \$5,000 payment is a lump sum payment which, according
- 8 to the provisions of the Act, simply is not
- 9 deductible.
- 10 That concludes my reasons. Thank
- 11 you.
- 12 --- Whereupon the excerpt concluded.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I have, to the best of my skill and ability, accurately recorded by Shorthand and transcribed therefrom, the foregoing proceeding.

Shirley Sereney, Shorthand Reporter

COURT FILE NO.:	2008-1269(IT)I		
STYLE OF CAUSE:	Ron S. Warner and Her Majesty the Queen and Alice Warner		
PLACE OF HEARING:	Toronto, Ontario		
DATE OF HEARING:	February 25, 2009		
REASONS FOR JUDGMENT BY:	The Honourable Justice Diane Campbell		
DATE OF ORAL JUDGMENT:	February 25, 2009		
APPEARANCES:			
For the Appellant:	The Appellant himself		
Counsel for the Respondent:	Thang Trieu		
Counsel for the Third Party:	Edward G. Spong		
COUNSEL OF RECORD:			
For the Appellant:			
Name:			
Firm:			
For the Respondent:	John H. Sims, Q.C. Deputy Attorney General of Canada Ottawa, Canada		

2009 TCC 151

CITATION: