

CITATION: Shapcott v. Canada Post Corporation et al., 2026 ONSC 4506
COURT FILE NO.: CV-26-00006525-0000
DATE: 2026-08-04

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: Stephen Shapcott, Plaintiff

AND:

Canada Post Corporation, Dawit Tesfaye, Stacy Hewitt-Bignall, Antzela “Angie” Gotsis, Tanya Allen, Chris Meaney, The Home Depot of Canada Inc., Cheryl Papageorgiou, T. Wayne King, Cliff Ringuette, Troy Reed, Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW), Joanne Leader, Bhargav Trivedi, Cavalluzzo LLP, Aminah Hanif, Toronto Police Services Board, DC Tam Wo (Badge #11051), PC Paul Barry (Badge #11259), Christine Braund (Analyst #86050) and His Majesty The King in Right of Ontario (Represented by the Ministry of the Attorney General’s Crown Law Office) , Defendants

BEFORE: Justice Grant R. Dow

COUNSEL: Stephen Shapcott, Self-Represented

Jennifer Hodgins, Brian Wood, for Canada Post Corporation, Dawit Tesfaye, Stacy Hewitt-Bignall, Antzela “Angie” Gotsis, Tanya Allen and Chris Meaney

HEARD: August 4, 2026

ENDORSEMENT

- [1] This matter was referred to me on July 30, 2026 by the Registrar’s office pursuant to Rule 2.1.01(7) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* following a request from counsel for the defendants, Canada Post Corporation, Dawit Tesfaye, Stacy Hewitt-Bignall, Antzela “Angie” Gotsis, Tanya Allen and Chris Meaney. The form requested that the action be dismissed as frivolous or vexatious and/or an abuse of the process of the Court.
- [2] The Request Form attached an eleven page Statement of Claim dated April 28, 2026 (the Notice of Action having apparently been issued April 2, 2026). It alleges the plaintiff was dismissed from his employment with Canada Post Corporation following an alleged incident on or about July 24, 2023 at a Home Depot location. There were resulting criminal charges (later withdrawn), a union grievance and alleged improper transfer of information between the defendants. It is a pleading that names precise causes of action with facts giving rise to the causes of action seeking both monetary damages and declaratory relief. It is in a form suggesting its drafting was by someone with legal training.

- [3] In accordance with Rule 2.1.01(1), the pleading, is evaluated “on its face” or without any other material. As indicated, the pleading appears to meet the various requirements for pleading as set out in Rule 25. There may well be reasons and/or defences why the claim ought to be dismissed as against the requested defendants or other defendants but same was not apparent from the pleading itself. The request does not meet the requisite test of being “frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the Court”.
- [4] This does not mean that the plaintiff will be successful in this action or that the plaintiff may face an early dismissal of this claim under rules such as Rule 20 or Rule 21.
- [5] The plaintiff is also risking the Court may order payment of some or substantially all of the successful defendant’s legal cost. I urge the plaintiff to obtain and consider legal advice.
- [6] The request for dismissal under Rule 2.1.01(1) is rejected.

Mr. Justice G. Dow

Date: August 4, 2026