

**SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA**  
**FAMILY DIVISION**

**Citation:** *Christie v. Dickson*, 2026 NSSC 87

**Date:** 20260323

**Docket:** HFD *SFH* No. 1201-074837

**Registry:** Halifax

**Between:**

Shannon Christie

Petitioner

v.

Craig Dickson

Respondent

**Judge:** The Honourable Justice Theresa M Forgeron

**Heard:** October 23, 2025, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

**Final Submissions:** October 30 and November 6, 2025

**Decision:** March 23, 2026

**Counsel:** Sinead Russell for the Petitioner, Shannon Christie  
Julia Cornish, KC for the Respondent, Craig Dickson

**By the Court:**

**Introduction**

[1] Shannon Christie seeks an order compelling Craig Dickson to disclose information which she states is required for her to litigate the property and spousal support issues currently before the court. Mr. Dickson disputes the request.

**Issue**

[2] Did Ms. Christie prove that a disclosure order should issue?

**Background**

[3] On May 16, and August 22, 2025, Ms. Christie filed disclosure motions. The first motion was directed to Mr. Dickson. The second was a non-party production motion involving Pinchin Ltd, the company who employs Mr. Dickson.

[4] On October 23, 2025, the disclosure motions were heard. The parties agreed that the non-party disclosure motion would be scheduled after the decision was rendered in the motion involving Mr. Dickson. Further, if after receiving the decision, the non-party still contested the motion, then another hearing would be scheduled, which would include the evidence tendered during the parties' disclosure motion.

[5] Ms. Christie and Mr. Dickson testified during the hearing. The non-party also attended and participated. At the conclusion of the hearing, Ms. Christie was directed to file an order specifying the relief sought, together with particulars as to when and where the original disclosure requests were made.

[6] On October 30, 2025, Ms. Christie filed the proposed order and particulars. On November 6, 2025, Mr. Dickson filed his response.

**Position of Ms. Christie**

[7] Ms. Christie seeks a disclosure order as she is concerned that Mr. Dickson did not provide her with all trial relevant information about his past and present share holdings and money due from his corporate employer. In support of her motion, she stated that:

- Mr. Dickson rigidly controlled the parties' finances and provided her with few details.
- Mr. Dickson has an ownership interest in the company which employs him as well as previous companies that were eventually amalgamated with his current corporate employer.
- The couple lived frugally and for their retirement acquired shares in the various companies that employed Mr. Dickson.
- Mr. Dickson paid company expenses with family money and did not appear to refund the family once his corporate expenses were reimbursed.
- The disclosure process was arduous – “a three-year exercise in patience and diligence, regarding the painful extraction of disclosure piece of paper by piece of paper”.<sup>i</sup>
- Mr. Dickson may have provided almost 2000 pages of documents, but the information did not include the material sought in the disclosure motion and also included documents that were never requested.
- In his affidavit, Mr. Dickson provided some of the outstanding disclosure which reduced the amount of disclosure currently outstanding.
- The request is not a fishing expedition. Ms. Christie needs the additional information to properly prepare her case and to be in a position to discuss settlement. The requested information relates to matrimonial property and the value of the Pichen shares, and any payouts that may have been re-invested back into Pinchin or its affiliates. The requested information also relates to income and financial records that track money owed between the company and Mr. Dickson.
- The information is likely discoverable and reliable as the corporation must have records of the information sought.
- The requests are proportional as the anticipated time and expense required to discover the information is reasonable having regard to the importance of the issues in dispute.
- There are no reasonable alternatives to acquire the information.

- Privacy and balancing can be achieved by having the order subject to the usual confidentiality clauses.

### **Position of Mr. Dickson**

[8] Mr. Dickson seeks costs because he states that the disclosure hearing was unnecessary:

- He already disclosed all available relevant information – disclosure was exhaustive and voluminous. Other than updates to the value of certain matrimonial assets and debts, and disclosure of his 2025 income tax return once completed, nothing more should be necessary.
- Mr. Dickson is an engineer who, since 2003, worked for a private company and its successor. After 10 years of employment, Mr. Dickson purchased shares in the company. A 2019 merger provided him with the opportunity to cash in shares or purchase new shares in Pinchin. Mr. Dickson purchased new shares which shares ceased to exist in 2022 when Pinchin was purchased by Keystone, thus crystallizing the value of the Pinchin shares.
- Throughout, Mr. Dickson was and remains a true minority shareholder with no control of the company. He is an employee shareholder who possesses a small fraction of an ownership interest in the corporate employer. He is not a senior executive.
- The additional material sought does not appear to be closely connected to the determination of income or the value of matrimonial assets. Further, Mr. Dickson believes he supplied all information in his possession or control.
- Mr. Dickson has already spent countless hours, and thousand of dollars in legal fees, providing the information requested and disclosed. Further time and expense is neither reasonable nor proportional.
- Ms. Christie did not file a draft order to clarify what disclosure was sought until after the conclusion of the motion hearing. That order referenced new requests not previously made. Had the information been previously requested, Mr. Dickson would have provided it.

- The privacy of other shareholders should not be violated by further disclosure.
- The disclosure motion is not an effective use of the court's time.
- The progression of this matter has been slowed by the ongoing demands for more information. Denying the motion will prevent further harm.
- The motion should be dismissed with costs.

### **Law**

[9] The parties agree that the law as stated in *Rule 14; Laushway v. Messervey*, 2014 NSCA 7; and *Anthony v. Anthony*, 2024 NSSC 100 applies. In addition, Mr. Dickson relies upon *Intact Insurance Company v. Malloy*, 2020 NSCA 18; *Armoyan v. Armoyan*, 2015 NSSC 241; *Bezanson v. Bezanson*, 2021 NSSC 126. I reviewed and applied the case law provided.

### **Decision**

[10] At the conclusion of the motion hearing, Ms. Christie filed a draft order listing five outstanding disclosure requests. I will deal with each individually.

#### *Shareholder Register from 2013 to Date*

[11] Although objecting, Mr. Dickson also noted that if the court requires it, Mr. Dickson believes he can obtain copies of the relevant shareholder registers, as they relate to him, from Pinchin within 60 days.

[12] The shareholders registers were previously requested and have trial relevancy as they relate and are connected to issues surrounding the division of assets. The disclosure request is not a fishing expedition. The share registers should be easily discoverable and reliable given that they are corporate records. The request is proportional as neither significant time nor money should be required to access basic corporate records. Privacy interests are protected by virtue of the proposed confidentiality clauses. On balance, the objectives of the Rules and fairness to the litigants dictate the granting of this disclosure request.

[13] The registers are to be produced as they relate to Mr. Dickson.

#### *Securities Register from 2013 to Date*

[14] It appears that the request for securities registers was only made after the motion hearing was held. Mr. Dickson states that although his share redemptions have all been reported on his tax returns, if the court requires it, he believes he can obtain a letter from Pinchin confirming this information. Given the trust issues at play, such a letter would be helpful. I will not, however, rule on this issue given that it was only raised after the hearing was concluded.

*Pinchin Topco Limited Partnership Agreement from the 2022 Pinchin Keystone Partnership Acquisition*

[15] Mr. Dickson did not recall being specifically asked for the agreement but will provide it if required by the court. Mr. Dickson provided examples of other employment related materials provided, including a summary of the contents of the Pinchin Topco Limited Partnership Agreement. Mr. Dickson noted that a follow up request would have resulted in the production of the partnership agreement.

[16] I order Mr. Dickson to produce the partnership agreement. It was previously requested and has trial relevancy as it relates and is connected to issues involving both property division and spousal support. The disclosure request is not a fishing expedition. The agreement is easily discoverable and reliable given that it is a corporate record. The request is proportional as neither significant time nor money should be required to access the agreement. Privacy interests are protected by virtue of the proposed confidentiality clauses. On balance, the objectives of the Rules and fairness to the litigants dictate the granting of this disclosure request.

*Employee Share Option Programs, Purchase Plans, and Deferred Profit Sharing Plans*

[17] Mr. Dickson states that he is part of the Employee Share Ownership Program and previously provided all information regarding his share purchases and participation in the plan. He also notes that any deferred profit sharing plan amounts are found in Box 52 of his T4 and included as income. In addition, he confirmed that the company matches his RRSP's contributions. If the court requires, Mr. Dickson believes he can obtain a letter from Pinchin confirming this disclosure within 60 days.

[18] I order the disclosure to the extent any information remains outstanding. The requested information has trial relevancy as it is connected and relates to issues involving spousal support and division of assets. The request is not a fishing expedition. The information is discoverable and reliable as it would be recorded in

the corporate records. The request is proportional as neither significant time nor money should be required to access and produce the information. Privacy interests are protected by virtue of the proposed confidentiality clauses. On balance, the objectives of the Rules and fairness to the litigants dictate the granting of this disclosure request.

[19] Mr. Dickson is to obtain employer confirmation outlining his participation in all employment related plans that involve share options, share purchases, and deferred profit sharing for the requested years.

### *Corporate Financial Statements*

[20] The annual corporate financial statements were not previously requested. Mr. Dickson states that he has no difficulty obtaining and providing these statements for the requested timeframe, although it is his belief that such will not provide the current value of his shares. As he has consented, the corporate financial statements, from 2019 to date, to include the balance sheets, income statements, and cash flow statements are to be produced. I also note that the financial statements have trial relevancy.

### **Conclusion**

[21] The disclosure motion as between the parties is now resolved. Costs are not ordered as there was mixed success and Ms. Christie attempted to secure additional disclosure after the conclusion of evidence. Counsel for Ms. Christie is to draft and circulate the order.

[22] A copy of this decision is being provided to counsel for Pinchin Ltd. who I suggest confer with each of the parties' counsel to determine if the non-party production motion is necessary. Counsel are to advise the court of their decision.

Forgeron, J.

---

<sup>i</sup> Page 3 of Ms. Christie's pretrial brief.