

A black and white photograph of a pair of scales of justice. The scales are suspended by three chains from an unseen point above. The central chain is vertical, while the two side chains are angled outwards. The scales are empty and appear to be made of a polished metal. The background is a blurred, light-colored surface with a repeating pattern of dark, pointed shapes, possibly a flag or a decorative wall.

APPLICATIONS FOR
MINISTERIAL REVIEW —
MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE

ANNUAL REPORT 2025
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.

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada,
represented by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, 2025

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
 4. Ministerial Decisions on Remedy Since 2003
- APPENDIX 1: Contacting the Criminal Conviction Review Group
- APPENDIX 2: Ministerial Decisions on Remedy Since 2003

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 23rd annual report, and it covers the period from April 1, 2024 to March 31, 2025. 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. At the end of this reporting period, the CCRG consisted of six lawyers, two paralegals and one administrative assistant. The CCRG 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. This can be 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.¹

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;

¹ 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, 2024 to March 31, 2025. Table 1 provides an overview of active files during the reporting period.

Active Files³	62
New completed applications received	15
Preliminary assessments completed	16
Preliminary assessments underway or awaiting assignment	40
Investigations completed	3
Investigations underway	6
Decisions by Minister on remedy	3

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 **37** 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” and thus eligible for review when a person has submitted the forms, information and supporting documents required by the Regulations. During this period, the Minister received 22 applications, 15 completed. This is up from last year but still 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 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 22 applications made to the Minister during the reporting period, 7 were still “partially completed” at year’s end.

² The total for active files (62) is the sum of all decisions by the Minister on remedy (3), rejections at the preliminary stage (13), preliminary assessments underway or awaiting assignment (40), and active investigations (6).

³ This is compared to 76 active files in the 2023/24 reporting period, 77 active files in 2022/23, 64 in 2021/22, 50 in 2020/21, 51 in 2019/20, and 47 in 2018/19.

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. Eight applications were screened out during this reporting period, five because of a failure to exhaust rights of appeal, two because they did not relate to a federal conviction, and one because it was a civil matter.

TABLE 2: APPLICATIONS MADE TO THE MINISTER FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025

Applications completed	15
Applications partially completed	7
Applications screened out	8

Progress of Applications through the Conviction Review Process

Table 3 summarizes the work completed in the first three stages of the conviction review process. Sixteen preliminary assessments were completed during the period. Three investigations were completed and one application was 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. Every conviction review is different, but by the time a full investigation is completed the CCRG will have reviewed a voluminous amount of material, including transcripts, submissions from the applicant, relevant case law, and expert reports. CCRG counsel may also have acquired and reviewed police, Crown and defence files, and interviewed former counsel and key witnesses. The CCRG will also have drafted a comprehensive investigation report and requested and reviewed submissions from the applicant and prosecuting agency.

TABLE 3: PROGRESS OF APPLICATIONS THROUGH THE CONVICTION REVIEW PROCESS FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025

Preliminary assessments completed	16
Investigations completed	3
Applications abandoned	1

Preliminary Assessments

Tables 4 and 5 provide further information about the work done at the preliminary assessment stage. Table 4 summarizes the 59 applications that were at the preliminary assessment stage during the reporting period. At year’s end, there were 12 applications awaiting preliminary assessment, and 16 were completed. Twenty-eight more were underway but not yet completed. One preliminary assessment was abandoned. Two are on hold. Table 5 shows that of the 16 preliminary assessments completed, three proceeded to the investigation stage, while 13 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 59 applicants at the preliminary assessment stage, two identified as women and the rest as men. 37 applications were from individuals not represented by counsel, while

22 were represented. Twenty-seven applicants were in custody, while 32 were not in custody.

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS AT THE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025	
Preliminary assessments completed	16
Preliminary assessments abandoned or on hold	3
Preliminary assessments under way but not yet completed	28
Applications awaiting preliminary assessment	12
TOTAL	59

TABLE 5: DISPOSITION OF APPLICATIONS FOLLOWING PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025	
Applications that did not proceed to the investigation stage following a preliminary assessment	13
Applications that proceeded to the investigation stage following a preliminary assessment	3
TOTAL	16

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.

Three investigations were completed during the reporting period. Three investigations were carried over from the previous period and three new investigations began following preliminary assessment.

All applicants at the investigation stage were represented by counsel. Two identified as women and the rest as men. Two were in custody during the reporting period. Of the remaining seven applicants, six were already out of custody prior to an application being submitted, and one had previously been released on bail pending the outcome of their review.

TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS AT THE INVESTIGATION STAGE FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025	
Investigations completed	3
Investigations under way but not yet completed	6
TOTAL	9

Decisions by the Minister

Table 7 summarizes the decisions made by the Minister during the reporting period. Three remedies were granted, all for a new trial. 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.

TABLE 7: DECISIONS MADE BY THE MINISTER
--

FROM APRIL 1, 2024 TO MARCH 31, 2025	
Applications dismissed	0
Remedies granted	3
Decisions pending	0
TOTAL	3

4. Ministerial Decisions on Remedy Since 2003

It has been 23 years since the legislative amendments to the *Criminal Code* that created the current conviction review regime. During that time, 220 completed applications were received, and the Minister of Justice was asked to make decisions on remedy in relation to 33 individuals, all identifying as male. 14 of those decisions were made in the last 5 years. The Minister has ordered 16 new trials and 15 new appeals. Two applications were ultimately rejected.

To assist readers looking for more information about these cases, a chart has been included as Appendix #2 to this year's annual report. It sets out the name of the applicant, the underlying criminal conviction(s), the date and nature of the decision on remedy, and the final result in the courts, if known.

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

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>

APPENDIX #2

MINISTERIAL DECISIONS ON REMEDY SINCE 2003

Applicant and Charge	Date of Minister's Decision	Disposition by Minister	Final Result
Kaminski, Steven Richard (Alberta) Sexual Assault	January 27, 2003	New trial ordered	Proceedings stayed by the Crown at retrial
Cain, Rodney (Ontario) Second-Degree Murder	May 19, 2004	New trial ordered	Convicted of manslaughter at retrial in 2007
Truscott, Steven (Ontario) Capital Murder	October 28, 2004	Reference to Ontario Court of Appeal for legal question and possible appeal	Court of Appeal entered an acquittal on August 28, 2007
Bjorge, Darcy (Alberta) Possession of Stolen Property	February 10, 2005	New trial ordered	Charge stayed in the Alberta Provincial Court
Wood, Daniel (Alberta) First-Degree Murder	February 10, 2005	New appeal ordered	Court of Appeal ordered a new trial on November 27, 2006; Charges stayed by Crown
Driskell, James (Manitoba) First-Degree Murder	March 5, 2005	New trial ordered	Proceedings stayed in the Court of Queen's Bench on the same day as the Minister's order
Tremblay, André (Quebec) First-Degree Murder	July 12, 2005	New appeal ordered	Court of Appeal overturned conviction on May 31, 2010 and ordered a new trial for manslaughter; Crown called no evidence; Court

			entered an acquittal on July 8, 2010
Phillion, Romeo (Ontario) Non-Capital Murder	August 23, 2006	Reference to Ontario Court of Appeal for legal questions and possible appeal	Court of Appeal ordered a new trial; Charge withdrawn by Crown on April 29, 2010
Mullins-Johnson, William (Ontario) First-Degree Murder	July 17, 2007	New appeal ordered	Court of Appeal entered an acquittal on October 15, 2007
L.G.P. (Alberta) Sexual Assault	September 21, 2007	Reference to Alberta Court of Appeal for legal questions and possible appeal	Court of Appeal ordered a new trial; Charge stayed by the Crown
Walsh, Erin (New Brunswick) Non-Capital Murder	February 28, 2008	New appeal ordered	Court of Appeal entered an acquittal on March 14, 2008
Unger, Kyle Wayne (Manitoba) First-Degree Murder	March 11, 2009	New trial ordered	Crown called no evidence; Court entered an acquittal on October 23, 2009
D.S. (Alberta) Sexual Assault	January 12, 2010	Reference to the Alberta Court of Appeal for legal questions and possible appeal	Court of Appeal entered an acquittal on January 21, 2013
Ross, Deveryn (Manitoba) 2 Counts of Fraud	September 29, 2010	Application dismissed	On April 7, 2014, the Federal Court ordered the Minister to reconsider the decision

	May 14, 2014	Reference to the Manitoba Court of Appeal for legal questions and possible appeal	Reference questions decided against the applicant on December 14, 2022; No full appeal resulting
Walchuk, Leon (Saskatchewan) Second-Degree Murder	November 4, 2011	Application dismissed	On September 17, 2013, the Federal Court upheld the Minister's decision On April 7, 2015, the Federal Court of Appeal upheld the decision of the Federal Court On October 15, 2015, the Supreme Court of Canada denied leave to appeal
Plamondon, Yves (Quebec) First-Degree Murder	June 1, 2012	Reference to the Quebec Court of Appeal for legal questions and possible appeal	Reference questions decided in applicant's favour on November 22, 2013; New trial ordered On March 14, 2014, the Crown stayed two murder charges and did not contest the acquittal on the third
Ostrowski, Stanley Frank (Manitoba) First-Degree Murder	November 25, 2014	New appeal ordered	On November 27, 2018, the Court of Appeal quashed the conviction, ordered a new trial and then entered a judicial stay of any further proceedings
Biddle, Eric (Ontario) Break and enter a dwelling house and cause bodily harm; Assault	February 22, 2017	Reference to the Ontario Court of Appeal for legal	Court of Appeal ordered a new trial on June 7, 2018; Crown subsequently withdrew charges

causing bodily harm; Overcoming resistance by strangulation		questions and possible appeal	
Assoun, Glen (Nova Scotia) Second-Degree Murder	February 28, 2019	New trial ordered	Crown called no evidence and Court entered an acquittal on March 1, 2019
Yebes, Tomas (British Columbia) 2 x Second-Degree Murder	November 2, 2020	New trial ordered	Crown called no evidence and Court entered an acquittal on November 12, 2020
Delisle, Jacques (Quebec) First-Degree Murder	April 7, 2021	New trial ordered	On March 14, 2024, the applicant entered a plea to manslaughter in Quebec Superior Court
Klassen, Gerald (British Columbia) First-Degree Murder	March 28, 2022	New trial ordered	Charges stayed April 28, 2023 in BC Supreme Court
Skiffington, Wade (British Columbia) Second-Degree murder	December 19, 2022	New appeal ordered	The matter is still before the courts as of March 31, 2025
Sanderson, Robert (Manitoba) First-Degree Murder	Feb 13, 2023	New appeal ordered	On May 30, 2025, the Court of Appeal admitted fresh evidence on appeal and ordered a new trial; Crown subsequently stayed the charges
Brian Anderson & Allan Woodhouse (Manitoba) Non-Capital Murder	June 22, 2023	New trials ordered	On July 18, 2023, applicants arraigned, Crown called no evidence, and Court entered an acquittal
Rees, Timothy (Ontario) Second-Degree Murder	August 9, 2023	New appeal ordered	The matter is still before the courts as of March 31, 2025

M.R. (Quebec) Child Sexual Assault	October 26, 2023	New appeal ordered	Court of Appeal ordered a stay on June 6, 2025
Robert Mailman & Walter Gillespie (New Brunswick) Second-Degree Murder	December 22, 2023	New trial ordered	On January 4, 2024, applicants arraigned, plead not guilty, and acquitted, with no evidence led
Claude Paquin (Quebec) 2 x First-Degree Murder	April 29, 2024	New trial ordered	On November 6, 2024, applicant arraigned and acquitted, with no evidence led
Woodhouse, Clarence (Manitoba) Non-Capital Murder	July 2, 2024	New trial ordered	On October 3, 2024, applicant arraigned and acquitted, with no evidence led
Sobotiak, Roy (Alberta) Second-Degree Murder	February 26, 2025	New trial ordered	The matter is still before the courts as of March 31, 2025