

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
DIVISIONAL COURT**

RE: MIR KAMAL, *Applicant/Moving Party*

and

LAW SOCIETY OF ONTARIO and HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF
ONTARIO, *Responding Parties*

BEFORE: Schreck J.

COUNSEL: *Mir Kamal*, Moving Party, self-represented

Antonios Antoniou and Mariam Hanna, for the Responding Party, Law Society of
Ontario

No submissions from the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario

HEARD: In writing

ENDORSEMENT

[1] This is a motion by Mir Kamal to extend the time in which to file an application for judicial review of a decision of the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (“HRTTO”), dated January 14, 2025, dismissing his application as abandoned.¹ The application before the HRTTO had alleged that the respondent, the Law Society of Ontario (“LSO”), had violated the *Human Rights Code*, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19.

[2] There is a long history between Mr. Kamal and the LSO dating back to 2008 when he became licensed as a paralegal after failing to be accredited as a lawyer. In 2015, the LSO began an investigation into alleged misleading advertising by Mr. Kamal, which resulted in disciplinary proceedings against him. In 2018, the Law Society Tribunal found that Mr. Kamal had engaged in professional misconduct,² suspended his licence for 30 days, and ordered that he pay costs of \$7500.00.³ An appeal to the Law Society Tribunal Appeal Division was dismissed,⁴ resulting in

¹ *Kamal v. Law Society of Ontario*, 2025 HRTTO 90.

² *Law Society of Ontario v. Kamal*, 2018 ONLSTH 76.

³ *Law Society of Ontario v. Kamal*, 20218 ONLSTH 110.

⁴ *Kamal v. Law Society of Ontario*, 2019 ONLSTA 20.

further costs against Mr. Kamal of \$10,000.⁵ Mr. Kamal initiated a further appeal to this court, but failed to pursue it and it was eventually dismissed as abandoned.

[3] In 2019, Mr. Kamal commenced an action against the LSO in Small Claims Court claiming damages arising from the disciplinary proceedings against him. In 2021, he and the LSO reached a settlement, which included Mr. Kamal signing a Full and Final Release in relation to all claims, losses and demands for damages arising from the LSO investigation and disciplinary proceedings. The Small Claims Court action was accordingly dismissed on consent without costs.

[4] Mr. Kamal did not pay the costs arising from the disciplinary proceedings and, as a result, his paralegal licence was suspended in 2023. In response to this, Mr. Kamal commenced another action in Small Claims Court against the LSO, claiming damages of \$25,000.00. When that claim was struck as disclosing no reasonable cause of action, he commenced an action in the Superior Court claiming damages of \$1,000,000.00, also in relation to the suspension of his licence. That claim was later settled.

[5] In 2023, Mr. Kamal commenced the HRTTO proceedings that are the subject of this motion, seeking various forms of relief, including damages of \$210,000 and reinstatement of his licence. The LSO filed a response. On a date that is unclear from the record, the HRTTO sent Mr. Kamal a request for additional submissions responding to the HRTTO's concern that his application fell outside the Tribunal's jurisdiction. The request included a deadline, which is also not clear on the record. According to the HRTTO's decision, the request for submissions was sent to the e-mail address provided by Mr. Kamal and was "not returned as undeliverable." When no submissions were received by the deadline, the HRTTO dismissed the application as abandoned.

[6] The HRTTO's decision was released on January 14, 2025. At some point, Mr. Kamal attempted to file a Notice of Application for Judicial Review in this court. The date on which he did so is not clear from the record, but the notice is dated October 30, 2025 and there are affidavits of service sworn by Mr. Kamal in the court file which are dated November 25, 2025. When Mr. Kamal became aware that his application was out of time, he brought this motion.

[7] Section 5(1) of the *Judicial Review Procedure Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. J.1 ("JRPA") provides that an application for judicial review must be brought within 30 days of the date of the decision being reviewed. Section 5(2) provides that the court may extend that time "if it is satisfied that there are apparent grounds for relief and that no substantial prejudice or hardship will result to any person affected by reason of the delay."

[8] To succeed on a judicial review of the HRTTO's decision, Mr. Kamal would have to establish that the decision was unreasonable : *Ontario (Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care) v. Assn. of Ontario Midwives*, 2022 ONCA 458, 161 O.R. (3d) 561, at paras. 75-84. Mr. Kamal filed a 101-page motion record, much of which appears to have no relevance to the application for judicial review. The only materials that appear to relate to the reasonableness of the HRTTO's decision are an affidavit from Mr. Kamal and the Notice of Application that he attempted to file

⁵ *Kamal v. Law Society of Ontario*, 2019 ONLSTA 27.

in this court. The affidavit includes an assertion that the HRTO “gave a decision, against me accusing wrongly, that ‘I did not respond to their inquiry.’” The Notice includes an assertion that Mr. Kamal did respond to the HRTO’s request for submissions and that he “the same day provided the required information consisting of 26 pages evidence.” No further detail is provided. This is insufficient to establish that decision was unreasonable and that there are “apparent grounds for relief,” as required by s. 5(2) of the *JRPA*. As a result, the motion must fail.

[9] While this conclusion is sufficient to dispose of this motion, I also note that there is no explanation for why Mr. Kamal did not attempt to commence his judicial review application until nine months after the HRTO’s decision. While s. 5(2) of the *JRPA* does not require that the delay be explained, this is nonetheless a relevant factor because judicial review is an equitable and discretionary remedy: *Unifor and its Local 303 v. Scepter Canada Inc.*, 2022 ONSC 5683 (Div. Ct.), 350 L.A.C. (4th) 223, at paras. 12-18; *Belyavsky v. Walsh*, 2022 ONSC 3135 (Div. Ct.), at para. 8. I would also dismiss the motion on this basis.

[10] The motion is dismissed. While the respondent has requested costs, no bill of costs or costs outline was filed, as required by para. 52(c)(iii) of the *Consolidated Practice Direction for Divisional Court Proceedings*. As a result, there will be no order as to costs: *Con-Sult Mechanical Inc. v. Anderson Webb Ltd.*, 2026 ONSC 1685, at paras. 2-5.

Schreck J.

Date: May 22, 2026