

Court File No.:

CU-18-00001938-0000

Ontario

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:

KELLY LYNN DONOVAN

Plaintiff

- and -

WATERLOO REGIONAL POLICE SERVICES BOARD, and

BRYAN LARKIN

Defendants



STATEMENT OF CLAIM

TO THE DEFENDANTS

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the plaintiff. The claim made against you is set out in the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, you or an Ontario lawyer acting for you must prepare a statement of defence in Form 18A prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure, serve it on the plaintiff's lawyer or, where the plaintiff does not have a lawyer, serve it on the plaintiff, and file it, with proof of service in this court office, **WITHIN TWENTY DAYS** after this statement of claim is served on you, if you are served in Ontario.

If you are served in another province or territory of Canada or in the United States of America, the period for serving and filing your statement of defence is forty days. If you are served outside Canada and the United States of America, the period is sixty days.

Instead of serving and filing a statement of defence, you may serve and file a notice of intent to defend in Form 1 8B prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure. This will entitle you to ten more days within which to serve and file your statement of defence.

IF YOU FAIL TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, JUDGMENT MAY BE GIVEN AGAINST YOU IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU. IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING BUT ARE UNABLE TO PAY LEGAL FEES, LEGAL AID MAY BE AVAILABLE TO YOU BY CONTACTING A LOCAL LEGAL AID OFFICE.

IF YOU PAY THE PLAINTIFFS' CLAIM, and \$1,000.00 for costs, within the time for serving and filing your statement of defence you may move to have this proceeding

dismissed by the court. If you believe the amount claimed for costs is excessive, you may pay the plaintiffs' claim and \$400 for costs and have the costs assessed by the court.

Date: 09 May 2018

Issued by: _____

Name: _____

Local Registrar

Address of Court Office:

7755 Hurontario Street

Brampton, Ontario

L6W 4T6

TO: **WATERLOO REGIONAL POLICE SERVICES BOARD**

200 Maple Grove Road

Cambridge, Ontario

N0B 1M0

AND TO: **BRYAN LARKIN**

378 Golf Course Road

Conestogo, Ontario

N0B 1N0

CLAIM

I. Relief Claimed

1. The plaintiff Kelly Lynn Donovan, claims against the defendants, jointly and severally, the following relief:
 - a. Damages for breach of contract, in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000.00);
 - b. Punitive, exemplary and/or aggravated damages in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00);
 - c. To be reinstated as a sworn member of the Waterloo Regional Police Service at full pay of a first-class constable with all the rights, privileges and prerogatives she formerly enjoyed, on terms mutually agreed upon by both the defendants and plaintiff.
 - d. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest in accordance with the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, as amended;
 - e. Costs of this proceeding on a solicitor and his own client scale, together with applicable HST; and
 - f. Such further and other relief as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court deems just.

II. Parties

2. The plaintiff, Kelly Lynn Donovan, is a former police officer who resides in the City of Brantford in the Province of Ontario. Prior to June 26, 2017, the Plaintiff

was employed by the defendant Waterloo Regional Police Services Board (“defendant board”).

3. The defendant Bryan Larkin is chief of Waterloo Regional Police Service and is employed by the defendant board.

III. Facts

Class action lawsuit

4. On May 30, 2017, a class action lawsuit was filed against the defendants in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in Brampton; Court File Number CV-17-2346-00, (furthermore referred to as “the class action lawsuit”). The plaintiff is not a party to the class action lawsuit. The class action lawsuit alleges systemic and institutional gender-based discrimination and harassment and seeks total damages of One Hundred and Sixty-Seven Million Dollars (\$167,000,000.00).

Plaintiff's resignation

5. On June 8, 2017, the plaintiff and defendant board entered into a Resignation Agreement, written by counsel for the defendant board, containing the following clause:

- a. *“Except where disclosure is required by law, or where disclosure is to Donovan’s immediate family members or to persons providing*

professional financial/legal advice (all of whom agree to be bound by this non-disclosure and confidentiality clause), the parties undertake and agree that they will keep the terms and existence of this Resignation Agreement in absolute and strict confidence at all times, without time limitation, and not disclose its contents to any third party, person or entity. For added certainty, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the parties undertake and agree that they will not publicize, discuss, disclose or communicate in any way with any person, entity or organization, in any form whatsoever, the contents or terms of all or any part of this Resignation Agreement. If asked, the parties (and anyone subject to the terms of this non-disclosure and confidentiality clause) will indicate only that all outstanding matters between the parties were settled to their mutual satisfaction, the terms of which settlement are strictly confidential.”

6. The Resignation Agreement was signed by the defendant Bryan Larkin on behalf of the defendant board.

Plaintiff's health

7. Prior to February, 2011, the plaintiff did not have any health issues. The plaintiff was healthy, educated and highly employable. She was hired by the defendant board on her first attempt in December, 2010.
8. Starting in February, 2017, the plaintiff could not attend work due to the severity

of her post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms. The plaintiff's medical condition was caused by her employment with the defendant board; both from a training accident and the moral injury she suffered in 2015 pertaining to alleged internal corrupt practices she had witnessed.

9. The plaintiff was frequently triggered by her ongoing human rights case and disciplinary proceeding. The plaintiff's symptoms briefly improved when she resigned from the police service in June, 2017.

IV. Overview

10. On December 21, 2017, defendant Bryan Larkin swore an affidavit in defense of the class action lawsuit and the document was submitted to record.

11. In the affidavit, the defendant Bryan Larkin states, at para. 13:

- a. *“Attached hereto and marked as “Exhibit F” to this my Affidavit, is an additional chart that I had requested the Human Resources Division of WRPS prepare, showing where the Human Rights Tribunal complaints that had been commenced by female employees in the last five years, and their status or resolution. Again, this chart has non-identifying information, with the exception of the Plaintiff, [name removed], who’s Complaint is to the Human Rights Tribunal as it is still outstanding, and the status of which is referred to in detail below.”*

12. The attachment to the defendant Bryan Larkin's affidavit is a chart titled “Police Officer Initiated Ontario Human Rights Complaints” and lists four female officers.

Those officers are identified in the following ways:

- a. One female officer is named and the three remaining female officers are not.
 - b. Of the three-unnamed female officers, two are listed as “Constables” and one as “Sergeant.”
13. Of the two-unnamed female “Constables” in the chart, one shows as having been resolved in the following manner:
- i. *“SETTLED: - monetary settlement, - withdrawal of OHRT application, - voluntary resignation.”*
14. There is only one female officer showing on this chart as having “voluntarily” resigned.
15. The plaintiff is the only female constable who was employed by the defendant board over the past five years, had filed a human rights complaint and who voluntarily resigned.
16. The public disclosure made by defendant Bryan Larkin was not required by law, contained sufficient information for the plaintiff to be identified and violates the terms of the Resignation Agreement.
17. The actions of defendant Bryan Larkin have caused the plaintiff a great deal of stress, anxiety and re-lived trauma. From December, 2017, to March, 2018, the plaintiff’s PTSD symptoms worsened.
18. Defendant Bryan Larkin is aware that the plaintiff was on medical leave from February, 2017, until her resignation in June, 2017.
19. The plaintiff therefore claims the relief as set out in paragraph 1 of the Statement

of Claim.

20. The defendants are jointly and severally liable for the damages caused to the plaintiff. Further, the defendant board is vicariously liable for the conduct, representations, omissions and/or negligence of the police service's employees, agents, servants and contractors, which includes the defendant Bryan Larkin.

Kelly Lynn Donovan vs. Waterloo Regional Police Services Board et al.

FORM 4C
Court of Justice Act
BACKSHEET

Court file no. **QU-18-00001928-000**

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT Brampton

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

KELLY DONOVAN
11 Daniel Place
Bramford, Ontario
N3R1K6
Phone: 519-209-5721
Email: kelly@fid duty.ca