Court of King's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Shodunke v Clean Harbors Industrial Services Canada Inc., 2026 ABKB 813

Date: 20261118
Docket: 2513 00330
Registry: Ft. McMurray

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

Between:

Chief Olufemi Shodunke

Applicant

- and -

Clean Harbors Industrial Services Canada Inc. and Alberta Human Rights Commission

Respondents

Reasons for Decision
of the
Honourable Justice K.A. McLeod

I. Introduction

[1] Chief Olufemi Shodunke applied on July 9, 2025, for judicial review of six reconsideration decisions (Reconsideration Decisions) of delegates of the Human Rights Commission Director, which upheld Human Rights Officers' decisions to dismiss Mr. Shodunke's human rights complaints against Clean Harbors Industrial Services Canada Inc.

[2] In each of his dismissed complaints, the Chief Shodunke claims that Clean Harbors discriminated against him on various grounds while he was their employee in Fort McMurray.

[3] Chief Shodunke sought to admit an affidavit for the purposes of his judicial review applications. He made a number of over-arching arguments that are not necessarily limited to a single judicial review application.

[4] For the reasons set out below, I dismiss Chief Shodunke's application.

II. Reconsideration Decisions Under Review

[5] Chief Shodunke's complaints are organized under Inquiry numbers assigned by the Human Rights Commission, and can be summarized as the following:

(a) **Inquiry 351373** filed January 11, 2024: Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of religious beliefs, race, place of origin, ethnic background, and ancestry when Mr. Shodunke was not allowed to wear a beard on January 12, 2023. He later added the ground of membership in a trade union. The Reconsideration Decision issued on February 18, 2025.

(b) **Inquiry 353007** filed March 24, 2024: Clean Harbors retaliated against Mr. Shodunke by suspending him from his employment on January 20, 2024, after he disclosed his intention to make a human rights complaint to the Commission. The Reconsideration Decision issued on November 6, 2024.

(c) **Inquiry 354291** filed April 30, 2024: Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of race, colour, place of origin, and ancestry on August 24, 2023, when it issued a warning letters and suspension that were racially motivated. The Reconsideration Decision issued on November 6, 2024.

(d) **Inquiry 355782** filed August 2, 2024: Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of race, colour, place of origin, and ancestry on August 3 & 24, and September 1, 2023, when a co-worker stated racial slurs and bullied him but he received warning letters. The Reconsideration Decision issued on December 11, 2024.

(e) **Inquiry 355793** filed August 6, 2024: Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of race, colour, place of origin, and ancestry on April 10, 2024, when it terminated him from employment. The Reconsideration Decision issued on January 9, 2025.

(f) **Inquiry 358811** filed November 29, 2024: Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of race, colour, place of origin, religious beliefs, and ancestry on November 29, 2023, when it issued a warning letter for failure to perform a risk assessment that was another worker's responsibility. The Reconsideration Decision issued on May 30, 2025.

[6] In some instances, Human Rights Officers asked Chief Shodunke for more information about his complaints. In each case, Human Rights Officers wrote to the Applicant rejecting the complaints, and provided him with an opportunity to apply for reconsideration of their decisions.

[7] I dismiss three of Chief Shodunke's applications because they are out of time. I dismiss three of Chief Shodunke's applications because they failed to show that the original decision-maker was unreasonable. While I do not doubt that Chief Shodunke felt that he has been treated

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

unfairly and discriminated against by Clean Harbors (or the "Employer"), I must dismiss his application.

III. Issues

[8] The issues to be decided in this judicial review are as follows:

i. Is the Applicant's new affidavit admissible?

ii. Are the Reconsideration Decisions relating to inquiries 353007, 354291, and 355782 time-barred under the limitation found in Rule 3.15?

iii. What is the standard of review for the Reconsideration Decisions?

iv. Were the Reconsideration Decisions reasonable?

v. Do Chief Shodunke's other arguments support his application and undermine the reasonableness of the Reconsideration Decisions?

IV. Legal Framework

A. Human Rights

[9] The ***Alberta Human Rights Act***, RSA 2000 c-A-25.5 (the "*Act*"), allows any person who has reasonable grounds to believe that the *Act* has been contravened to make a complaint to the Commission within one year (ss 20(1) and 20(2)). Employers may not discriminate on the basis of any of the enumerated grounds; race, religious beliefs, colour, gender, gender identity, gender expression, physical disability, mental disability, age, ancestry, place of origin, marital status, source of income, family status or sexual orientation of that person or of any other person (s 7).

[10] The Human Rights Director may at any time dismiss a complaint if he or she is satisfied the complaint is without merit, was made in bad faith for an improper purpose or motive, has no reasonable prospect of success, or is a complaint that is more appropriately dealt with in another forum or under another *Act* (s 21(1)). Parties may apply for reconsideration of dismissals (s 33).

[11] Human rights decision makers analyze the facts of any claim with the basic test for discrimination from ***Moore v British Columbia (Education)***, 2012 SCC 6. The test is whether the complainant has established that:

1. they have a characteristic protected from discrimination;

2. they experienced an adverse impact; and

3. the protected characteristic was a factor in the adverse impact.

[12] The test has been upheld many times in Alberta, including in ***United Nurses of Alberta v Alberta Health Services***, 2021 ABCA 194, in which the Court of Appeal held that the test for discrimination does not change on the basis of the ground being protected, and found that everyone benefits from a certain and uniform test for discrimination (paras 80, 96, 99).

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

B. *Alberta Rules of Court* and Interpretations for Judicial Review

[13] After complainants' claims are dismissed (including dismissal on reconsideration), they may seek judicial review of the dismissals. Applicants for judicial review of human rights decisions must apply within six months after the decision to be reviewed, per Rule 3.15 of the ***Alberta Rules of Court***, Alta Reg 24/2010. Courts have interpreted this Rule in the context of human rights decisions, acknowledging that though it is a strict and harsh rule, applications for judicial review must be both filed and served on all parties within six months after the decision is made: ***Tartal v Alberta (Human Rights Commission)***, 2023 ABKB 381 and ***WW v Alberta (Human Rights Tribunal)***, 2023 ABKB 340.

[14] The Rules permit flexible applications of some time limits in Rule 13.5, but specifically exclude judicial review from this flexibility (Rule 3.15(2)).

[15] Rule 3.22 sets out the materials courts may consider when exercising its supervisory judicial review function. Rule 22(d) allows the court to admit additional evidence.

[16] Rule 3.22(d) has been considered by the Alberta Court of Appeal to have limited applications. In ***Northern Air Charters (PR) Inc v Alberta Health Services***, 2023 ABCA 114 at paras 8-12, the Court upheld ***Alberta Liquor Store Association v Alberta (Gaming and Liquor Commission)***, 2006 ABQB 904, which articulated at para 41 the narrow exceptions when courts should allow additional evidence on judicial review:

> 1. To show bias or a reasonable apprehension of bias, where the facts in support of the allegation do not appear on the record.
>
> 2. To demonstrate breaches of the rules of natural justice which are not apparent from the record.
>
> 3. Background information for other issues such as standing.
>
> 4. When the administrative decision maker makes no record, or an inadequate record.

[17] Courts limit new evidence because new evidence is "irrelevant to the issues before the court on judicial review", as the court does not assess the merits of the decision, but does assess whether the decision of the administrative body is supported by the record before it, and whether that decision aligns with the rules of natural justice: *Northern Charters* at para 8, citing *Alberta Liquor* at paras 43-44.

C. Standard of Review is Reasonableness

[18] Chief Shodunke must demonstrate that the human rights decisions he applies to review are unreasonable: ***Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov***, 2019 SCC 65 at para 100, ***Wojtasiewicz v Alberta (Human Rights Commission)***, 2020 ABCA 23 at para 9, ***Al-Ghamdi v Peace Country Health Region***, 2017 ABCA 31 at para 10, ***Shodunke v Alberta (Human Rights Commission)***, 2023 ABKB 260 at paras 22 & 30 (***Shodunke***).

[19] Reasonableness is a deferential standard of review, which can be displaced for a correctness standard of review in a few limited situations, none of which apply here. Human rights tribunals are owed substantial deference (***Stewart v Elk Valley Coal Corp***, 2017 SCC 30 at para 20), including decisions to dismiss complaints rather than refer them to a hearing (***Wojtasiewicz*** at paras 11-12; ***Shodunke*** at para 22).

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

[20] The reasonableness standard focuses on the administrative decision-maker's decision, with the Court acting in a supervisory capacity. Mah, J explained the ***Vavilov*** deferential approach to reasonableness in ***Wint v Alberta (Human Rights Commission)***, 2022 ABQB 87 at para 21, noting that deference still requires accountability to supervising courts. An administrative decision-maker must provide reasons in a transparent, intelligible manner, and if those reasons contain a fundamental gap or an unreasonable chain of analysis, courts will require the decision-maker to re-do the analysis.

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

V. Affidavit is Not Admissible

[21] Chief Shodunke sought to adduce fresh evidence that he says became available to him only after his spouse returned to Nigeria to collect it. He argues this evidence fits within the circumstances in which applicants may rely on fresh evidence in their applications for judicial review. I do not find the affidavit fits within the circumstances in which applicants for judicial review may adduce new evidence.

[22] Although the affidavit does mention bias, it does not provide evidence of bias. Otherwise, the affidavit provides documents about Chief Shodunke's employer's alleged unfair and discriminatory practices, the collective agreement, and additional information which was not before the Commission regarding Chief Shodunke's beliefs, background, and harms.

[23] None of the permissible exceptions are contained in the affidavit, and they do not change the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the Commission's Reconsideration decisions.

VI. Judicial Review is Time-Barred for Reconsideration Decisions on Inquiries 353007, 354291, and 355782

[24] Chief Shodunke filed three of the six applications to judicially review Reconsideration Decisions after the six-month time limit, and on this basis, I conclude I must dismiss those three applications without considering their merits. The six-month time limit is found in Rule 3.15. Chief Shodunke filed a single Judicial Review Application on July 9, 2025, but some of the Reconsideration Decisions contained within it for Inquiries 353007, 354291, and 355782 were made more than six months prior to the Judicial Review Application (i.e., earlier than January 9, 2025, which is six months before July 9, 2025):

- The Reconsideration Decisions for Inquiry 353007 and Inquiry 354291 were both made on November 6, 2024.
- The Reconsideration Decision for Inquiry 355782 was made on December 11, 2024.

[25] The time limit in Rule 3.15 does not depend on any merit in the application or alleged deficiency in the Reconsideration Decisions. Rule 3.15 is harsh and strictly applied: ***Julien v Alberta (Appeals Commission for Alberta Workers' Compensation)***, 2023 ABCA 81 at para 13. However, the rule is not *arbitrarily* applied. Rather, the policy reasons behind this strict rule include that all litigants need finality, and the judicial system needs efficiency through reasonable limits on litigants' abilities to continue litigation after decisions are made.

[26] To ensure the finality of Rule 3.15, legislators explicitly omitted it from the rule that allows courts to extend deadlines in certain circumstances. In other words, there is no jurisdiction for this Court to extend the six-month deadline to apply to review a Reconsideration Decision.

[27] The Applicant cites Ontario cases for his argument that the deadline can be extended, but each province sets the court rules within their jurisdiction and they are not transferable. He cites a case in which he was involved, in which the Ontario court considered Ontario rules for extending deadlines for judicial review applications. Chief Shodunke argues accurately that other *Alberta Rules of Court* cite judicial economy as a principle, and notes the improved efficiency to have six judicial review applications contained in a single court case compared to having six separate judicial review applications filed in the appropriate timeframes. I agree with him that combining his applications makes his litigation more efficient, but his is a unique situation in having six decisions he challenged. More significantly, however, I have no authority under the Rules or in any Alberta cases to suspend Rule 3.15 for the principle of judicial economy, and I cannot apply Ontario's rules of court in Alberta.

[28] Because of Rule 3.15 and my inability to suspend the six-month limitation for applicants to file and serve judicial reviews, I dismiss the application to review Inquiries 353007, 354291, and 355782. The remainder of the issues outlined below apply to the other three Reconsideration Decisions, relating to the other three inquiries.

VII. Reasonableness of the Reconsideration Decisions

[29] I will discuss the reasonableness of each Reconsideration Decision independently of the others, with reference to the parties' positions on each, however some of the Applicant's submissions pertain to more than one Reconsideration Decision.

[30] The Applicant has reviewed and cited an impressive amount of caselaw from Alberta and across the country. Unfortunately, much of his submissions cited the conclusions in those cases rather than analyzing how those cases apply here, and many of his submissions are not directly relevant to a judicial review application. I do not summarize all of the Applicants' submissions and focus on his submissions that argue the three Reconsideration Decisions are unreasonable.

VIII. Inquiry 351373 Discrimination Regarding Beard

[31] Chief Shodunke claimed Clean Harbors discriminated against him on the basis of religious beliefs, race, place of origin, ethnic background, and ancestry when he was not allowed to wear a beard on January 12, 2023. Chief Shodunke claimed he was a leader in a religion that required him to wear a beard during a certain festival.

[32] The Director dismissed the reconsideration request because Chief Shodunke had not demonstrated that he was required for religious reasons to wear a beard on the day he was disciplined for wearing a beard, January 12, 2023. Although he provided information about being a traditional religious chief in his community in Nigeria and that an "Oloja festival" required traditional religious chiefs to wear beards during the festival, there is no information in his complaint showing when this festival took place.

[33] In the alternative, the Director dismissed this complaint because Chief Shodunke's information showed that he did not request accommodation before attending work with a beard on January 12, 2023.

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

[34] Finally, the Director dismissed Chief Shodunke's argument that some white workers were allowed to wear a beard, as not providing sufficient information to establish that he was treated differently because of race, colour, ancestry, or place of origin.

[35] Chief Shodunke states that there is no consideration of his comparative evidence showing that other workers of different races and ethnicity had beards. After initially processing this complaint, a human rights officer requested that Chief Shodunke provide examples of the company treating workers differently based on their race and colour. His response a few weeks later does not provide examples. He submitted argument about why his original submission was sufficient. There was no information provided at the time showing that others who had beards were doing the same job as Chief Shodunke or other jobs that also required clean-shaven faces (which is usually for safety purposes). Chief Shodunke brought forward examples in other complaints that came later and were not before the decision-maker for this inquiry (e.g., in 355793) and emphasized those at the judicial review, but again without the specific information about what positions those individuals held. In both cases, Chief Shodunke did not show that other workers were subject to the same rules but experienced different treatment on the basis of their race, colour, ancestry, or place of origin. Accordingly, I do not find the Reconsideration conclusion on this point to be unreasonable.

[36] Chief Shodunke also argues that the Commission unreasonably failed to protect his truly held religious beliefs, and his religious necessity to wear a beard during a certain festival. The Commission's reasons do not question his beliefs. Rather, the reasons for dismissal conclude the Commission lacked evidence of when the beard must be worn and whether Chief Shodunke had sought accommodation for the festival before the date in question. These reasons demonstrate that the third step of the ***Moore*** test is not met.

[37] I conclude the Reconsideration decision for Inquiry 351373 is reasonable.

IX. Inquiry 355793 Termination

[38] Chief Shodunke claimed that Clean Harbors discriminated against Mr. Shodunke on the basis of race, colour, place of origin, and ancestry on April 10, 2024, when it terminated him from employment.

[39] Chief Shodunke argues that the Commission unreasonably dismissed his termination complaint because the Commission was biased against him, ignored the discrimination against him, and failed to account for the Employer's retaliatory treatment of him. He also argued that the Record confused two of the six complaints, and problems with the initial filed Record indicated that there was a deliberate attempt to undermine his judicial review application.

[40] Chief Shodunke has made many complaints to the Human Rights Commission, and asserts the Commission is biased against him. Making a decision in one instance does not bias a decision-maker against the same part in another instance. More than negative results must be shown to demonstrate bias against an administrative decision-maker.

[41] Chief Shodunke's termination was, according to his complaint, because he took more than the prescribed time to finish required courses for his work. He claims that another worker took "similar courses" and took "more hours, too, to complete his courses." The Commission requested additional information, and let him know he had not demonstrated a reasonable connection between the protected ground and the negative treatment (step 3 of the ***Moore*** test).

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

[42] Chief Shodunke responded with pictures of coworkers with their eyes closed, with safety booties, and wearing beards. However, again the Commission dismissed the complaint in its Reconsideration because the information did not show that Chief Shodunke and white workers violated the same policies and procedures to show that he was treated differently. In my view, the complaint with additional information does not show sufficient information demonstrating that Chief Shodunke's race (or other grounds) were the reason for his dismissal, and the Reconsideration decision is reasonable.

[43] An initial Record lacked some documents, which the Commission rectified. The Applicant argued that the Record for this judicial review mixed up two of his complaints: 355793 and 355782. He argues the Commission's January 9, 2025, letter at p. 133 of the Record described what he supposedly said in his Complaint Form concerning termination and differential treatment and disputes that this accurately reflected what he wrote. He also says the Complaint Form appearing at p. 136 was actually for a different complaint, file 355782 (the judicial review for which was dismissed as out of time), not his termination complaint. He argues this lack of attention in the Record demonstrates that the process at the AHRC cannot be trusted.

[44] I carefully reviewed the correct and filed Record, and found that the decisions, complaints, and supporting documents were all organized with each inquiry number. The complaint starting at p 136 of the record is with respect to Chief Shodunke's termination and this inquiry 355793.

[45] The Court's copy of the Record did have one page from the original termination complaint that was separated from the rest of the complaint (p 139 and 144), but that may be just because the initial page was on the form. In any event, the Human Rights Director's response makes it clear they were responding to the appropriate complaint. The slightly out of order page of the original complaint in the Record does not alter the reasons for Reconsideration. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the Commission misapprehended the nature of his complaint or confused two complaints. Nothing in the filing and correcting of the Record indicates any problematic attitude on the part of the Commission. I find this aspect of the review application does not demonstrate unreasonableness on the part of the Commission.

[46] With respect to retaliation, Chief Shodunke argues in judicial review that the Employer had retaliated against him for human rights complaints and other workplace conduct complaints, but these complaints were not contained in his termination complaint or would need to be addressed through the grievance process under the Collective Agreement. Chief Shodunke does not cite retaliation in the complaint that commenced this inquiry. In fact, the form Chief Shodunke used for his termination complaint specifically notifies claimants to use a separate form "if you believe you were retaliated against because you were involved in a human rights complaint or issue." Additionally, retaliation for other workplace conduct, not connected with his human rights complaints, would need to be pursued through the grievance process of the union.

[47] I do not find the Commission's decisions for this inquiry to be unreasonable.

X. Inquiry 358811 Risk Assessment Form

[48] Chief Shodunke submitted a complaint on November 29, 2024, which contained several complaints of discriminatory treatment, however it is centred around what Chief Shodunke characterized as an event that started the Employer's discriminatory treatment of him and ultimately lead to his termination the following spring. The complaint concerned the blame on

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

him for not filling in a Field Level Risk Assessment form on November 23, 2023. Chief Shodunke was reprimanded, but says this was the responsibility of another worker.

[49] The initial dismissal of the complaint listed six other complaints by Chief Shodunke against Clean Harbors, noting that they were similar in nature to the most recent one and had been dismissed, and declining to process the most recent complaint. The human rights officer cited the Commission's bylaws for the authority to dismiss complaints if a similar complaint was previously received and addressed.

[50] The request for Reconsideration provides a few new photos of coworkers, and argument about Chief Shodunke's human rights and right to natural justice. The Reconsideration decision repeated that many of the complaints were similar to other complaints that Chief Shodunke previously submitted, and noted that some of the instances of discrimination cited in this complaint were prior to one year before the complaint was filed. With respect to the complaint about the Risk Assessment form, the Director notes that the complaint and request for reconsideration contained too little information to conclude that the reprimand was issued for discriminatory reasons. In other words, the complaint failed the third part of the ***Moore*** test.

[51] I find no fault with the Director's reasoning. Although the specific instance regarding the reprimand was not part of the other complaints included in this judicial review, it is clear that Chief Shodunke's complaints bear much common ground in terms of his views of the Employer's conduct, fellow coworkers' conduct, and the significant effects on him regarding his perceptions of humiliating and disparaging discrimination. Chief Shodunke is adept at citing the principles underlying discrimination law and many cases that established those principles, but as the Director finds, he falls short in his complaints by failing to underscore the principles with the facts on which he bases his conclusions.

XI. Other Arguments Do Not Undermine the Reasonableness of the Decisions

[52] Chief Shodunke made a number of arguments that were not always directly connected with one of the six Reconsideration Decisions he judicially reviewed. I consider those here, including those that have some overlap with the three decisions that are out of time for judicial review. I dismiss these arguments for the reasons that follow.

A. Procedural Fairness and Collective Agreement Arguments

[53] Chief Shodunke raises a procedural fairness argument. He claims the Human Rights Commission did not consider his arguments that the Employer failed to provide him with fair processes when they disciplined him and terminated him, and that their actions and omissions are contrary to the Collective Agreement between Clean Harbors and the union.

[54] Chief Shodunke's complaints about the Employer's processes and their compliance with the Collective Agreement in the workplace are not within the jurisdiction of the Commission unless he can make out a prima facie case that the Employer's approach to its processes were discriminatory with respect to him. Upon review of his arguments, he does not identify a discriminatory link between his Employer's processes, alleged denial of procedural fairness, and a protected ground.

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

[55] Several of the complaints in the inquiries concern Chief Shodunke's allegations that the Employer was not following the Collective Agreement, including his allegation that his locker was improperly searched. The Human Rights Commission has only the jurisdiction to consider complaints that fall under the *Act*. Every Collective Agreement is required to have a dispute resolution mechanism per Alberta's *Labour Relations Code*, RSA 2000, c L-1, s 135. Most collective agreements require unresolved complaints under them to be disputed at arbitration, and individual union members who dispute how their unions have processed their complaints may apply to the Labour Board if they dispute that they have been represented fairly (s 153 of the *Labour Code*).

[56] Chief Shodunke has not provided a prima facie discriminatory complaint against Clean Harbors with respect to the complaints that concern procedural fairness from the Employer or breaches of the Collective Agreement by the Employer, and I dismiss this aspect of Chief Shodunke's application for judicial review.

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)

B. Bias

[57] In addition to Chief Shodunke's bias argument specifically addressed with respect to Inquiry 355793, he alleges the Commission is biased in dealing with his complaints and his religion, race, and evidence. With respect to his race, Chief Shodunke alleges the Commission has unconscious bias against black people.

[58] To demonstrate bias, Chief Shodunke would need to show that an informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically, and having thought the matter through, would conclude that it is more likely than not that the decision-maker would not decide fairly, whether consciously or unconsciously: ***Committee for Justice and Liberty v National Energy Board***, [1978] 1 SCR 369 and ***Gahir v Alberta (Workers' Compensation, Appeals Commission)***, 2009 ABCA 59 at para 18.

[59] Without more than a bare assertion of bias on the basis of previous negative decisions, I cannot support this aspect of Chief Shodunke's application for judicial review, and therefore dismiss it.

C. Freedom of Speech and Charter Values

[60] Chief Shodunke argues that he spoke out at workplace safety meetings and criticized unsafe work practices, that these were protected forms of speech in his workplace, and that his transfer and eventual dismissal flowed from the exercises of that right. He argues this as a protected Charter right and that the Human Rights Commission should use Charter values in considering complaints. This is a variation on others of his arguments, that the Employer improperly disciplined and terminated him.

[61] The Charter applies to government action, not private Employer actions. Though it can apply to the *Act*, that is because enacting legislation is government action (see ***Vriend v Alberta***, 1998 CanLII 816 (SCC), [1998] 1 SCR 493).

[62] To the extent that Chief Shodunke wants to assert that the Employer improperly disciplined him for speaking out about unsafe workplace practices, he needed to make that complaint through workplace complaint mechanisms (such as the grievance process under the

Collective Agreement), not the Human Rights Commission which can only adjudicate human rights complaints under the *Act*.

[63] I dismiss this aspect of Chief Shodunke's application.

XII. Conclusion

[64] Chief Shodunke has cited many cases that uphold the principles of anti-discrimination. However, he has not provided any argument that the decisions issued by the Human Rights Commission were unreasonable, and his judicial review applications are dismissed in their entirety.

[65] The parties may submit costs submissions of no more than five pages each by December 15, 2026, if they cannot agree.

Heard on the 1st day of May, 2026.
Dated at the City of Ft. McMurray, Alberta this 18th day of November, 2026.

K.A. McLeod
J.C.K.B.A.

Appearances:

Chief Olufemi Shodunke
Applicant (Self-Represented)

Adam Christopher Sopka
for the Respondent, Alberta Human Rights Commission

Maddison Lee Croden
for the Respondent, Clean Harbors Industrial Services Canada Inc.

2026 ABKB 813 (CanLII)