

A close-up, black and white photograph of a single pan of a scale of justice. The pan is suspended by three chains and is empty. The background is a blurred, light-colored surface with a repeating pattern of dark, pointed shapes, possibly representing a flag or a decorative wall.

APPLICATIONS FOR  
MINISTERIAL REVIEW —  
MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE

ANNUAL REPORT 2024  
MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Information contained in this publication or product may be reproduced, in part or in whole, and by any means, for personal or public non-commercial purposes, without charge or further permission, unless otherwise specified.

You are asked to:

- exercise due diligence in ensuring the accuracy of the materials reproduced;
- indicate both the complete title of the materials reproduced, as well as the author organization; and
- indicate that the reproduction is a copy of an official work that is published by the Government of Canada and that the reproduction has not been produced in affiliation with or with the endorsement of the Government of Canada.

Commercial reproduction and distribution is prohibited except with written permission from the Department of Justice Canada. For more information, please contact the Department of Justice Canada at: [www.justice.gc.ca](http://www.justice.gc.ca).

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada,  
represented by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, 2024

Cat. No. J1-3  
ISSN 1708-5977

# Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Addressing Possible Miscarriages of Justice
  - History of the Power to Review Criminal Convictions
  - The Current Conviction Review Process
  - The Criminal Conviction Review Group
  - The Special Advisor on Wrongful Convictions
  - Conviction Reviews by Outside Agents
  - How the Conviction Review Process Works
    - Applying for a Conviction Review
    - Stages of the Review
3. Statistical Information
  - Overview
  - Inquiries
  - Applications Made to the Minister
  - Progress of Applications through the Conviction Review Process
  - Preliminary Assessments
  - Investigations
  - Decisions by the Minister

APPENDIX 1: Contacting the Criminal Conviction Review Group

# 1. Introduction

Since 1892, the Minister of Justice has had the power, in one form or another, to review a criminal conviction under federal law to determine whether there may have been a miscarriage of justice. The current regime is set out in sections 696.1 to 696.6 of the *Criminal Code*. The conviction review process begins when a person submits an “application for ministerial review (miscarriages of justice)”, also known as a conviction review application.

The Minister must take into account all relevant matters in assessing an application, including whether the application is supported by “new matters of significance” – usually important new information or evidence that was not previously considered by the courts. If the Minister is satisfied that there is a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred, the Minister may grant the convicted person a remedy and return the case to the courts – either referring the case to a court of appeal to be heard as a new appeal or directing that a new trial be held. The Minister may also, at any time, refer a question to the court of appeal in the appropriate province.

The Minister’s decision that there is a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred in a case does not amount to a declaration that the convicted person is innocent. Rather, such a decision leads to a case being returned to the judicial system, where the relevant legal issues may be determined by the courts according to the law.

Under section 696.5 of the *Criminal Code*, the Minister of Justice is required to submit an annual report to Parliament regarding applications for ministerial review (miscarriages of justice) within six months of the end of the fiscal year. This is the 22<sup>nd</sup> annual report, and it covers the period from April 1, 2023 to March 31, 2024. Under the *Regulations Respecting Applications for Ministerial Review – Miscarriages of Justice* (the Regulations), the report must address the following matters:

- the number of applications for ministerial review made to the Minister;
- the number of applications that have been abandoned or that are incomplete;
- the number of applications that are at the preliminary assessment stage;
- the number of applications that are at the investigation stage;
- the number of decisions that the Minister has made; and
- any other information that the Minister considers appropriate.

## **2. Addressing Possible Miscarriages of Justice**

### **History of the Power to Review Criminal Convictions**

Historically, at common law, the only power to revisit a criminal conviction was found in the Royal Prerogative of Mercy, a body of extraordinary powers held by the Crown that allowed it to pardon offenders, reduce the severity of criminal punishments, and correct miscarriages of justice.

Over the years, the Minister's power underwent various legislative changes, culminating in the creation of the former section 690 of the *Criminal Code* in 1968. This section remained in effect for more than 30 years.

### **The Current Conviction Review Process**

In 2002, following public consultations, section 690 of the *Criminal Code* was repealed and replaced by sections 696.1 to 696.6. These provisions, together with the Regulations, set out the law and procedures governing applications for ministerial review (miscarriages of justice).

The revised conviction review process improved transparency and addressed deficiencies in the previous process by:

- including clear guidelines for when a person is eligible for a conviction review;
- providing a straightforward application form and clear direction on the information and documents needed to support it;
- describing the various stages in the conviction review process;
- specifying the criteria the Minister must consider in deciding whether a remedy should be granted;
- expanding the category of offences for which a conviction review is available to include not only indictable offences but also summary conviction offences;
- giving those who investigate applications on behalf of the Minister the authority to compel the production of documents as well as the appearance and testimony of witnesses; and
- requiring the Minister to submit an annual report to Parliament.

### **The Criminal Conviction Review Group**

The Criminal Conviction Review Group (CCRG) is a separate unit of the Department of Justice. It has five main responsibilities:

- liaising with applicants, their lawyers, agents of the provincial attorneys general, the police, and various other interested parties;
- reviewing applications for ministerial review and conducting preliminary assessments;
- conducting investigations where warranted;
- compiling the findings of investigations into an investigation report; and
- providing objective and independent legal advice to the Minister on the disposition of applications for ministerial review.

In conducting its review, the CCRG is not limited to considering only the information provided by the applicant. Information may be uncovered as a result of the CCRG's independent review that was not known to, or put forth by, the applicant. The CCRG may also hire experts or arrange for scientific testing where warranted. Furthermore, pursuant to s. 696.2 of the *Criminal Code*, the Minister has the powers of a commissioner under Part I of the *Inquiries Act*. Specifically, the Minister has the investigative power during the conviction review process to subpoena witnesses, documents and other information, and to compel testimony under oath or solemn affirmation. The CCRG is usually able to acquire the necessary information and documents through voluntary cooperation but will use this investigative power when necessary to ensure a thorough review.

## **The Special Advisor on Wrongful Convictions**

The Special Advisor on Wrongful Convictions has a mandate to review applications at the various stages of review and to provide independent expert legal advice directly to the Minister of Justice, including advice and recommendations on the appropriate remedy, if any. In 2018, the mandate of the Special Advisor was expanded by Order-in-Council to include the ability to make recommendations to the Minister of Justice to improve the review process and address any systemic problems that are identified during the review of applications.

The current Special Advisor on Wrongful Convictions is the Honourable Morris J. Fish, C.C., K.C. He was appointed on November 29, 2018. As a former Supreme Court of Canada justice and defence lawyer, and renowned expert in criminal law, he brings a wealth of experience to the role. His presence brings an additional level of independence and scrutiny to the criminal conviction review process, and helps to ensure that reviews are fair, transparent, and complete.

## **Conviction Reviews by Outside Agents**

In some circumstances, the Minister may retain an agent from outside the Department of Justice to conduct the review of an application. Typically, this is done where there is a potential conflict of interest. However, the Minister has also made use of outside agents to ensure that files are assigned in a timely fashion.

## **How the Conviction Review Process Works**

### *Applying for a Conviction Review*

The conviction review process requires an applicant to submit a formal application form and a number of supporting documents.

The requirements for a completed application, as well as a description of the various steps in the application process, are set out in detail on the CCRG's website.

Anyone convicted of an offence under a federal law or regulation may submit an application for ministerial review. For example, a person who has been convicted under the *Criminal Code* or the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* is eligible to apply. Convictions for indictable and summary conviction offences are both eligible for review. A person found to be a dangerous offender or a long-term offender under the *Criminal Code* may also submit an application for ministerial review of that finding.

However, an application will not be accepted until the applicant has exhausted all available rights of appeal. A conviction review by the Minister of Justice is not meant to be a substitute for, or an alternative to, a judicial review or an appeal of a conviction. Nor is an application for ministerial review meant to be another level of appeal or a mechanism that would allow the Minister of Justice to consider the same evidence and arguments presented to the courts and substitute his or her own judgment.

Judicial review and appeals to higher courts are the usual ways to correct legal errors and miscarriages of justice. Indeed, the *Criminal Code* specifically allows a court of appeal to overturn a conviction on the grounds that there has been a miscarriage of justice. Convicted persons are therefore expected to appeal their convictions, including ones resulting from a guilty plea, before submitting an application. This may involve seeking an extension of time for leave to appeal. In addition, there may be other legal mechanisms available for correcting a miscarriage of justice in the courts where an individual's case is no longer in the legal system, particularly where the Crown concedes that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.<sup>1</sup>

In making a decision on an application, the Minister must consider all relevant factors including whether the application is supported by "new matters of significance" – usually new information that has surfaced since the trial and appeal and therefore has not been presented to the courts and has not been considered by the Minister on a prior application. The new matter of significance may be identified by the applicant or discovered by the CCRG during its independent review. Whatever the case, it is highly unlikely that an application will be successful in the absence of such information.

Although it is not required, applicants may seek the assistance of a lawyer or an organization specializing in wrongful conviction issues such as Innocence Canada (formerly the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted or AIDWYC) or the various Innocence Projects throughout the country.

### ***Stages of the Review***

There are four stages in the review process: preliminary assessment; investigation; preparation of an investigation report; and the decision by the Minister. They are described in detail on the CCRG's website and in [earlier annual reports](#).

As a practical matter, the Minister is not personally involved in the preliminary assessment, investigation, and preparation of the investigation report stages. These stages are usually carried out on behalf of the Minister by the CCRG. The Minister does, however, personally decide on all applications for ministerial review that proceed to the investigation stage.

In this final stage, the Minister of Justice personally reviews the investigation report and supporting materials, which typically include the submissions from the applicant and the prosecuting agency (usually the provincial attorney general), the legal advice and recommendations of the CCRG or outside agent, and the legal advice and recommendations of the Special Advisor on Wrongful Convictions.

The Minister then decides to grant a remedy or dismiss the application. In arriving at a decision, the Minister must take into account all relevant matters, including:

- whether the application is supported by new matters of significance that were not considered by the courts or by the Minister in a previous application for ministerial review;

---

<sup>1</sup> See *McArthur v Ontario (Attorney General)*, 2012 ONSC 5773; 2013 ONCA 668 for a discussion of what it means to exhaust one's rights of appeal.

- the relevance and reliability of information that is presented in the application; and
- the fact that an application for ministerial review is not intended to serve as a further appeal and that any remedy available on such an application is an extraordinary remedy.

In some circumstances, an application may raise a question on which the Minister may request the assistance of a court of appeal. The court's opinion on the question may help the Minister make the decision. The Minister, therefore, has the legal authority, at any time and prior to any decision, to refer a question or questions about an application to the court of appeal for its opinion. Typically, the court of appeal's opinion would be sought on a legal issue central to the application, such as the admissibility of fresh evidence.

If the Minister is satisfied that there is a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred, pursuant to subsection 696.3(3) of the *Criminal Code*, the Minister may order a new trial, or a new hearing in the case of a person found to be a dangerous or long-term offender, or may refer the matter to the court of appeal as if it were an appeal by the convicted person or person found to be a dangerous or long-term offender.

Over the years, the following guidelines and general principles concerning the exercise of ministerial discretion have developed and remain applicable today. Some have in fact been incorporated into the current *Criminal Code* provisions.

1. The remedy contemplated by section 696.1 is extraordinary. It is intended to ensure that no miscarriage of justice occurs when all conventional avenues of appeal have been exhausted.
2. Section 696.1 does not exist to permit the Minister to substitute a ministerial opinion for a trial verdict or a result on appeal based solely on the Minister's view of the same evidence.
3. Similarly, the procedure created by section 696.1 is not intended to create a further level of appeal. Something more will ordinarily be required than simply a repetition of the same evidence and arguments that were put before the trial and appellate courts. Applicants under section 696.1 who rely solely on alleged weaknesses in the evidence, or on arguments of the law that were put before a court and considered, can expect that their application will be refused.
4. Applications under section 696.1 should ordinarily be based on new matters of significance that either were not considered by the courts or occurred or arose after the conventional avenues of appeal had been exhausted.
5. Where the applicant is able to identify such new matters or where they are discovered by the CCRG or outside counsel during the review process, the Minister will consider the reliability of the information and relevance to the issue of guilt. The Minister will also have to determine the overall effect of the new matters when taken together with the evidence adduced at trial.
6. Finally, for an application under section 696.1 to succeed, the Minister does not need to be convinced of the applicant's innocence nor must it be proved conclusively that a miscarriage of justice has *actually* occurred. Rather, an application will be successful where it has been demonstrated, based on the above analysis, that there is a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice *likely* occurred.



### 3. Statistical Information

#### Overview

The period covered by this annual report is from April 1, 2023 to March 31, 2024. Table 1 provides an overview of active files during the reporting period.

<b>Active Files<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>76</b>
New completed applications received	12
Preliminary assessments completed	22
Preliminary assessments underway or awaiting assignment	42
Investigations completed	6
Investigations underway	7
Decisions by Minister on remedy	6

#### Inquiries

This includes people who contact the CCRG for the first time for general information about the conviction review process or to request a copy of the booklet *Applying for a Conviction Review* or other information. It does not include follow-up inquiries after initial contact.

During the reporting period, the CCRG received **41** such inquiries.

#### Applications Made to the Minister

Table 2 indicates the number of applications that the Minister actually received during this period. An application is considered "completed" when a person has submitted the forms, information and supporting documents required by the Regulations. During this period, the Minister received 30 applications, 12 completed.<sup>4</sup>

An application is considered "partially completed" where a person has submitted some, but not all, of the forms, information, and supporting documents required by the Regulations. For example, a person may have submitted the application form but not the supporting documents required. Although it is the applicant's responsibility to provide the required documentation, CCRG staff frequently assist. It is not unusual for an application to remain "partially completed" for a period of time while the applicant gathers and submits the necessary documents and information. Of the 30 applications made to the Minister during the reporting period, 12 were still "partially completed" at year's end.

---

<sup>2</sup> The total for active files (76) is the sum of all decisions by the Minister on remedy (6), rejections at the preliminary stage (21), preliminary assessments underway or awaiting assignment (42), and active investigations (7).

<sup>3</sup> This is compared to 77 active files in the 2022/23 reporting period, 64 active files in 2021/22, 50 in 2020/21, 51 in 2019/20, 47 in 2018/19, and 43 in 2017/18.

<sup>4</sup> This is a slight decrease in completed applications compared to recent years. The CCRG averaged 17 or 18 new completed applications per year from 2016 to 2023. The average was five per year from 2003 to 2015.

An application is “screened out” if the person is not eligible to make an application for ministerial review. This covers a variety of circumstances – for example, if an application relates to a provincial offence, involves a civil matter, or deals with the same subject as a previously denied application and does not raise any new matters of significance. The most common reason for screening out applications, however, is where an applicant has not yet exhausted their rights of appeal in the court system. Six applications were screened out during this reporting period, four because of a failure to exhaust rights of appeal and two because they did not relate to a federal conviction.

**TABLE 2: APPLICATIONS MADE TO THE MINISTER FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024**

<b>Applications completed</b>	12
<b>Applications partially completed</b>	12
<b>Applications screened out</b>	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>

### Progress of Applications through the Conviction Review Process

Table 3 summarizes the work completed in the first three stages of the conviction review process. Twenty-two preliminary assessments were completed during the period. Six investigations were completed and no applications were abandoned.

The time required to conduct a preliminary assessment typically ranges from a few weeks to several months. An investigation usually takes a number of additional months to complete. Both preliminary assessments and investigations can take even longer if the case is particularly complex or a large volume of material has been submitted.

**TABLE 3: PROGRESS OF APPLICATIONS THROUGH THE CONVICTION REVIEW PROCESS FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024**

<b>Preliminary assessments completed</b>	22
<b>Investigations completed</b>	6
<b>Applications abandoned</b>	0

### Preliminary Assessments

Tables 4 and 5 provide further information about the work done at the preliminary assessment stage. Table 4 summarizes the 66 applications that were at the preliminary assessment stage during the reporting period. At year’s end, there were 7 applications awaiting preliminary assessment, and 22 were completed. Thirty-five more were underway but not yet completed. No preliminary assessments were abandoned. Two are on hold. Table 5 shows that of the 22 preliminary assessments completed, one proceeded to the investigation stage, while 21 were rejected. An application is rejected at the preliminary assessment stage because the CCRG determined that there was no reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred. When a decision was made to proceed to the investigation stage, the CCRG determined that there may be a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred.

Of the 66 applicants at the preliminary assessment stage, three were women and the rest men. Forty-two applications were from individuals not represented by counsel, while 24 were represented. Twenty-five applicants were in custody, while 41 were not in custody.

<b>TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS AT THE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024</b>	
<b>Preliminary assessments completed</b>	22
<b>Preliminary assessments abandoned or on hold</b>	2
<b>Preliminary assessments under way but not yet completed</b>	35
<b>Applications awaiting preliminary assessment</b>	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66</b>

<b>TABLE 5: DISPOSITION OF APPLICATIONS FOLLOWING PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024</b>	
<b>Applications that did not proceed to the investigation stage following a preliminary assessment</b>	21
<b>Applications that proceeded to the investigation stage following a preliminary assessment</b>	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>

## Investigations

Table 6 summarizes the work done on applications that were at the investigation stage. An investigation is considered complete when an investigation report is forwarded to the Minister for review and decision.

Six investigations were completed during the reporting period. Six investigations were carried over from the previous period and one new investigation began following preliminary assessment.

All applicants at the investigation stage were represented by counsel. Two were women and the rest were men. One was in custody for all of the reporting period. Of the remaining twelve applicants, ten were already out of custody prior to submitting their applications, and two had been released on bail pending the outcome of their review.

<b>TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS AT THE INVESTIGATION STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024</b>	
<b>Investigations completed</b>	6
<b>Investigations under way but not yet completed</b>	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13</b>

## Decisions by the Minister

Table 7 summarizes the decisions made by the Minister during the reporting period. Six remedies were granted, no matters were with the Minister for decision at the end of this reporting period, and no applications were dismissed by the Minister following investigation. Of the remedies granted, four were for a new trial and two for a new appeal.

<b>TABLE 7: DECISIONS MADE BY THE MINISTER FROM APRIL 1, 2023 TO MARCH 31, 2024</b>	
<b>Applications dismissed</b>	0

<b>Remedies granted</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Decisions pending</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>

## **APPENDIX #1**

### **CONTACTING THE CRIMINAL CONVICTION REVIEW GROUP**

Applicants and interested parties are encouraged to communicate with the CCRG in writing. Initial contact may also be made by e-mail.

#### **Mail**

Minister of Justice  
Criminal Conviction Review Group  
284 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, ON  
K1A 0H8

#### **E-mail**

Initial inquiries: [ccrg-grcc@justice.gc.ca](mailto:ccrg-grcc@justice.gc.ca)

#### **Telephone**

Information for contact by telephone will be provided following the initial contact by mail or e-mail.

#### **CCRG Website**

<http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/ccr-rc/index.html>