## **SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA**

Citation: Spidell v LaHave Equipment Ltd., 2014 NSSC 255

Date: 20140708 Docket: Bwt. 193703 Registry: Bridgewater

**Between:** 

Laurie W. Spidell

Plaintiff

and

LaHave Equipment Limited, Case Credit Limited and Case Canada Limited

**Defendants** 

## LIBRARY HEADING

**Judge**: The Honourable Justice C. Richard Coughlan

**Subject:** Summary Judgment

**Summary:** LaHave Equipment Ltd. was a dealer for Case Canada Ltd. The

plaintiff approached LaHave Equipment to discuss the acquisition of a harvester for use in his forestry business. The plaintiff purchased a case excavator with a Keto harvesting head. The plaintiff claims LaHave Equipment employees made representations as to how much

wood the machine could harvest. The plaintiff purchased the

harvester. He failed to make the required payment and the equipment

was repossessed.

The plaintiff sued LaHave Equipment claiming damages for alleged misrepresentations. LaHave Equipment defended the action. Subsequently, LaHave Equipment made an assignment in bankruptcy. The plaintiff amended his claim adding Case Canada and Case Credit Limited claiming LaHave Equipment was their agent. Case Canada and Case Credit move for summary judgment.

**Issue:** Is this an appropriate case for summary judgment.

**Result:** At the hearing the plaintiff argued his claim against Case Credit should be dismissed. Case Canada objected to certain evidence on the basis it was hearsay. A portion of the evidence objected to was ruled inadmissible.

The plaintiff's claim was based on LaHave Equipment being an agent for Case Canada. There was no evidence that LaHave Equipment was the agent of Case Canada. There was no issue of material fact requiring trial. The plaintiff did not establish his claim as one with a real chance of success.

THIS INFORMATION SHEET DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE COURT'S DECISION. QUOTES MUST BE FROM THE DECISION, NOT THIS LIBRARY SHEET.