

2026 ONSC 4751 (CanLII)

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

HEARD: August 6, 2026

[1] Motion, by applicant/moving party for interlocutory injunctions against the respondent, requiring the removal of published statement and forbidding further publication pending the disposition of this application.

Service

[2] The applicant/moving party, SGS, obtained permission from the court to bring this motion on an urgent basis. The court issued an endorsement on July 24, 2026, setting out service deadlines.

[3] On July 24, 2026, Mr. Carrier was personally served with the materials for this application and the motion at his home address in Alexandria, Ontario.

[4] On the same date, Mr. Carrier posted on social media a photo and text which suggested that he burned the motion materials.

[5] Out of an abundance of caution, SGS re-served the same materials via email and via courier to Mr. Carrier. The email was sent July 27, 2026, and the overnight courier arrived on July 28, 2026.

[6] SGS also served its supplementary affidavit via email on August 5, 2026.

[7] Mr. Carrier did not respond to this motion. He did not serve any materials. He did not appear in court. SGS counsel advises that he received an email from Mr. Carrier stating that he would not be coming to Toronto, which counsel took to mean that Mr. Carrier did not intend to appear on the motion.

[8] At the outset of the motion, Mr. Carrier was paged to the courtroom. He did not attend.

[9] This court finds that Mr. Carrier was given ample notice of the application and the motion for injunctive relief.

The Parties

[10] The applicant/moving party, SGS Canada Inc., is the Canadian subsidiary of SGS S.A., a global testing, inspection and certification company

which provides services across the country. SGS Canada Inc. has offices and laboratories in several Canadian cities. In these reasons, the applicant/moving party shall be referred to as SGS.

[11] The respondent/responding party, Jason Ronald Carrier, is a former employee of SGS. In these reasons, the respondent/responding is referred to as Mr. Carrier.

[12] Mr. Carrier worked for SGS for two years, from October 2023 to October 2025 as a manager of business development, crop science in the natural resources department. Mr. Carrier's employment was terminated without cause in October 2025.

[13] By application dated February 2, 2026, Mr. Carrier started a human rights proceeding against SGS at the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO), alleging that he was discriminated against based on disability. Broadly speaking, Mr. Carrier alleges that he was in a car accident while travelling for work, sustained a concussion, and required workplace accommodations.

[14] Mr. Carrier presently resides in Alexandria, Ontario.

[15] The evidence demonstrates that Mr. Carrier identifies himself online and in direct communications using his real name, but also using the names The Grey King, Head Janitor, Local Food Champion and LFC Network.

Scope of Motion

[16] SGS issued a notice of application on July 22, 2026.

[17] SGS then brought a motion seeking interlocutory injunctive relief. This decision addresses the motion. The application will be determined at a later time. Mr. Carrier has the right to respond to the application and is urged to do so.

[18] On this motion, SGS seeks orders requiring Mr. Carrier to do certain things and/or refrain from doing certain things until the application is decided.

[19] As noted above, Mr. Carrier started a proceeding before the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario. This decision makes no findings about the merits of the HRTTO proceeding, which is a separate adjudicative process.

Relief Sought

[20] SGS seeks broad detailed injunctive relief. SGS seeks a court order compelling Mr. Carrier (whether in his own name or any other name or account) to do the following:

- a. Preserve, offline, confidential copies of all his online posts pertaining to SGS or its employees;
- b. Delete the same posts so that they can no longer be publicly accessed;
- c. Refrain from making further posts on any social media platform;
- d. Refrain from engaging in harassing communications in social media tags, public postings, or direct messages.
- e. Refrain from contacting anyone at or associated with SGS
- f. Direct communications concerning the HRTTO proceeding only to SGS legal counsel.

Communications by Mr. Carrier

[21] After Mr. Carrier stated his HRTTO proceeding, SGS hired Stringer LLP ("Stringer") to represent its interests with respect to Mr. Carrier. On December 11, 2025, January 19, February 11, May 28 and June 5, 2026, Stringer advised Mr. Carrier to direct all communications to the law firm. Mr. Carrier was instructed to cease all communications with SGS employees, whether by way of

email, text, social media posts, comments, and/or private messages. Mr. Carrier ignored these requests. Stringer ultimately served Mr. Carrier with a libel notice on July 7, 2026.

[22] SGS's evidence is that as the HRT0 proceeding progressed, Mr. Carrier's conduct became increasingly erratic, hostile, threatening, and harassing. Mr. Carrier did not limit his communications to the HRT0 proceeding, but started making social media posts, private messages and emails targeting SGS and employees.

[23] Having reviewed the SGS evidence, the court is satisfied that Mr. Carrier posts using accounts in his own name and also uses the following publicly accessible accounts:

a. X (formerly Twitter): @Treegasm5;

b. Instagram:

i. @thecartcanum

ii. @shadowsunseen

c. Facebook: Jason.carrier.777

d. LinkedIn: Ifcnetwork

e. TikTok: @thegreyking2

[24] It is impossible for SGS to know how many people view these accounts. Further, it is impossible to assess the true wide reach of these publications given the incessant tagging and reposting, but the evidence on this motion demonstrates that there are at least 4300 followers of these various accounts.

The Allegedly Defamatory Statements

[25] Between May 27, 2026, and July 22, 2026 (the date this application was issued), SGS identified at least 700 online publications from Mr. Carrier. These publications consisted of posts, videos, stories, livestreams, comments on his own publications, comments on third party accounts, comments accompanying reposted publications, private messages, and hyperlinks to external content, including Google Drive folders. These publications all concerned SGS and related parties. These publications directly tagged SGS, its officers, employees, clients, external legal counsel, and other associated with SGS, including regulatory bodies and government organizations.

[26] These posts made broad and serious allegations against SGS, including:

- a. SGS poisons children;
- b. SGS sends young men to war for financial gain;
- c. SGS is responsible for the loss of human life;
- d. SGS and its CEO are murderers;
- e. SGS and other may be behind Covid-19, Ebola, and other diseases;
- f. SGS is controlled by a shadow board which operates behind its executive committee;
- g. SGS's leadership is corrupt and uses its employees as fodder.
- h. A specific employee (who Mr. Carrier used to report to) was described as the "seed devil".
- i. SGS is not a legitimate corporation, but is a scam;

[27] After this application was issued on July 22, 2026, Mr. Carrier escalated the pace and volume of his posts. Between July 24 and August 5 (13

days), Mr. Carrier published or republished 300 posts concerning SGS or people associated with SGS.

[28] In addition to increasing his pace and volume, Mr. Carrier doubled down on his prior allegations. For instance, he now alleges that SGS “created cancer and Covid”. He accuses SGS of treason. Another post overtly stated that he had no intention of following the law: “You aren’t following the laws that are supposed to protect the people from you. So do you think that I am going to follow the laws that are going to protect you from me? You’re out of your fucking mind”.

[29] SGS has received inquiries from clients and other people in its industry about these posts and whether Mr. Carrier poses a threat to the business or individuals.

The Alleged Harassment

[30] Apart from the communications which are allegedly defamatory, SGS submits that Mr. Carrier has engaged in harassing behaviour. He will frequently publish dozens of posts within a single hour. He directs his communications not only to SGS as a corporate entity, but also to employees, officers, external legal counsel, clients and others associated with SGS.

[31] Many of these communications are overtly threatening, including unsettling words and images, including:

- a. Using music lyrics that includes a reference to a “bloodbath”;
- b. Referring to unsheathed blades;
- c. Demanding that people kneel before “the king”

- d. Threatening to attend at the SGS offices or private events, such as personal family barbecues.
- e. Telling a senior executive that “I am coming for you bubba. May God have mercy on your soul because I’m all out, were coming for you and you’re not getting away this time.”
- f. Telling employees of SGS that they will be “hunted” and they will be lucky to last through the weekend, implying that they will be caught (or worse) by Friday.
- g. Specifically targeting the employee Mr. Carrier used to report to;
- h. Mr. Carrier intends to perform a “citizen’s arrest” of the “rats” at SGS.

Action Taken to Date by SGS

[32] As noted above, SGS has made several formal requests for Mr. Carrier to cease his behaviour. They served a notice of libel. They have contacted the relevant police forces.

[33] None of these steps have deterred Mr. Carrier. They have only caused him to post more content and more aggressive content.

Test for Injunctive Relief re: Defamatory Posts

[34] In the case of defamation, there is a three-part test for injunctive relief:

- a. The publication complained of is clearly defamatory;
- b. The defences of justification and fair comment will inevitably fail (if the respondent states an intention to rely on either defence); and

c. The applicant will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is refused¹.

[35] For the reasons that follow, the court finds that this three-part test is met.

[36] First, the publications of Mr. Carrier are clearly defamatory.

Specifically, they meet the three-part test for defamation:

a. Mr. Carrier's words and allegations would tend to lower the reputation of SGS and its employees in the eyes of a reasonable person: this branch of the test is easily met by all of the defamatory posts in evidence.

b. The words referred to SGS, its officers, its employees and other associated with SGS; and

c. The words were published in that they were communicated to at least one person in addition to SGS².

[37] Second, for the purposes of this motion, the court assumes that Mr. Carrier will rely on the defences of fair comment and/or justification. On the content in evidence on this motion, those defences would not succeed. There is no actual evidence in these posts that any of the allegations are, in fact, accurate. Fair comment cannot be made out as the posts are clearly driven by malice. These posts are not comments, just wild, bald, salacious accusations.

[38] Third, there will be irreparable harm if this injunction is not granted. SGS is the Canadian entity of a large multinational corporation, with over two thousand laboratories and offices across 115 countries. The international corporation has over 100,000 employees. The SGS business is dependent on providing reliable testing, inspections and certifications. The broad allegations

¹ *Bagwalla v. Ronin*, 2017 ONSC 6693, at para 17 (Div Ct).

² *Grant v. Torstar Corp.*, 2009 SCC 61.

made by Mr. Carrier that SGS engages in illegal, unethical and criminal conduct will cause uncertainty among clients and industry. There is already evidence of these communications being an unwelcome distraction and eroding confidence. SGS is at further risk of harm because of the wide distribution of these materials across the internet, a medium which the court has described as “instantaneous, seamless, interactive, blunt, borderless, and far-reaching”³.

[39] In finding that the test for an injunction is met for the defamatory posts, the court is mindful that there is a strong public interest in free speech. However, this court finds that the defamatory posts are focused on personal attacks, threats and vitriol, rather than legitimate discourse⁴.

Test for Injunctive Relief re: Harassing Posts

[40] The test for injunctive relief for Mr. Carrier’s allegedly harassing posts is the three-part test in *RJR*:

- a. There is a serious issue to be tried;
- b. Irreparable harm will follow if the injunction is not granted; and
- c. The balance of convenience favours granting the injunction⁵.

[41] For the reasons that follow, this court finds that the test for an injunction regarding the harassing posts is met.

[42] First, there is a serious issue to be tried. The serious issue is whether Mr. Carrier constitutes internet harassment.

[43] Internet harassment was recognized as a tort in the 2021 case of *Caplan*. It is a stringent test, which asks if the defendant maliciously or

³ *CNSX Markets Inc. v. Marks*, 2026 ONSC 3952 at para 72.

⁴ *Levant v. Day*, 2019 ONCA 244 at para 22 and 23.

⁵ *RJR MacDonald Inc. v. Canada*, 1994 CanLII 117 (SCC).

recklessness engaged in communications so outrageous in character, duration, and extreme in degree, so as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency and tolerance, with the intent to cause fear, anxiety, emotional upset or to impugn the dignity of the plaintiff and the plaintiff suffers such harm⁶.

[44] The evidence before this court, including the number, frequency, tone and threats of Mr. Carrier's communications raise the prospect that he has committed internet harassment. There is a serious issue to be tried on this point.

[45] Second, I find that there will be irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted. There is ample evidence before the court that these communications have caused understandable fear and anxiety among the individuals targeted. This leads to irreparable harm to the individuals and to the corporate entity as it diverts time and energy to dealing with Mr. Carrier's onslaught.

[46] Third, I find that the balance of convenience favours the injunction. The orders sought by the applicant/moving party are crafted to ensure that Mr. Carrier is not restricted from:

- a. Participating in the HRTO proceeding;
- b. Defending this application;
- c. Communicating with SGS legal counsel;
- d. Making lawful statements and comments.

[47] However, the draft orders are quite properly crafted to enjoin Mr. Carrier from making threats, including threats of personal harm and being literally hunted.

⁶ *Caplan v. Atas*, 2021 ONSC 670, at para 171.

Costs

[48] SGS seeks substantial indemnity costs in the amount of \$51,877.19, inclusive of all fees, disbursements and HST.

[49] SGS argues that substantial indemnity is the appropriate scale because Mr. Carrier failed to respond to written demands that he ceases his campaign of posting. In addition to these written demands, SGS served a Notice of Libel.

[50] Mr. Carrier could have responded by:

- a. halting his posts;
- b. negotiating with SGS regarding the nature and frequency of his posts; and/or
- c. appearing on this motion to defend his publications.

[51] Mr. Carrier did none of these things. Instead, Mr. Carrier responded by escalating the number, frequency and tone of his posts. Given the finding of the court that Mr. Carrier's publications and communications are defamatory and/or harassing and/or threatening, I find that substantial indemnity is the appropriate scale.

[52] SGS was entirely successful on this motion.

[53] The professionals who worked on this motion were a senior and junior lawyer. Their hourly rates are within market standards observed by this court. The moving party kept costs down by delegating to the junior counsel.

[54] Approximately 60% of the professional fees are attributable to preparing the motion materials, which consisted of a notice of motion, two affidavits and over 50 exhibits, comprising 1,034 pages. Tracking and

marshalling this evidence was necessary to demonstrate Mr. Carrier's volume and content of social media posts over several months.

[55] In addition to assembling the motion record, SGS prepared a comprehensive factum.

[56] SGS seeks disbursements in the amount of \$532.19, which consist of the motion filing fee and costs for service of the materials on Mr. Carrier (personal service and overnight courier). These disbursements are reasonable and supported.

[57] Given all of the circumstances of this case, I find that reasonable and proportionate costs for this motion are \$50,000, inclusive of all legal fees, disbursements and HST.

[58] These costs are payable by Mr. Carrier by October 13, 2026, at 4pm.

[59] Post judgment interest on this costs award shall run at 4% in accordance with the 2026 third quarter interest rate established pursuant to the *Courts of Justice Act*.

Relief Granted and Draft Order

[60] The order as requested by the applicant/moving party is granted.

[61] The applicant is at liberty to serve this endorsement and the order on any person or entity required to enforce the order.

[62] The draft order, including the costs provisions, may be forwarded for my signature through the Brampton Trial Coordinator. Mr. Carrier's approval of the draft order is dispensed with.

[63] The order sets out the relief in detail. The order is the operative document. However, for the benefit of Mr. Carrier, I summarize the order here. The order requires Mr. Carrier to do the following:

- a. Stop publishing: Mr. Carrier may not post, publish or distribute anything, on any platform, that pertains to SGS, anyone associated with SGS or Stringer
- b. Stop communicating: Mr. Carrier may not communicate with anyone associated with SGS. Mr. Carrier may only communicate with Stringer as it pertains to legal proceedings, including the HRTO application and this application.
- c. Stop forwarding: Mr. Carrier may not send any harassing communications.
- d. Preserve materials already sent: Mr. Carrier must make a confidential copy of all posts he has made to date about SGS, anyone associated with SGS or Stringer.
- e. Delete publications: after saving copies of his publications, Mr. Carrier must delete any publications which pertain to SGS, individuals associated with SGS or Stringer. These publications cannot be publicly available.
- f. Duration of order: this order remains in place until application is decided.

Stewart J.

Released: August 10, 2026

CITATION: SGS Canada Inc. v. Carrier, 2026 ONSC 4751
COURT FILE NO.: CV-26-00005682-0000
DATE: 2026 08 10

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

B E T W E E N:

SGS Canada Inc.

Plaintiff

- and -

Jason Ronald Carrier

Defendant

ENDORSEMENT
RE: INTERLOCUTORY INJUNCTION

Stewart J.

Released: August 10, 2026