

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

(On Appeal from the Court of Appeal for
the Province of Ontario)

BETWEEN:

ACME BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION LIMITED

APPLICANT
(Plaintiff)

-and-

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF NEWCASTLE

RESPONDENT
(Defendant)

**MEMORANDUM OF THE RESPONDENT ON APPLICATION
FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL**

POOLE, MILLIGAN
Barristers & Solicitors
330 - 4100 Young Street
Toronto, Ontario M2P 2B5

Kenneth E. Wise
Tel: (416) 221-4100
Fax: (416) 221-6340

Counsel for the Respondent

LANG MICHENER
Barristers & Solicitors
50 O'Connor, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6L2

Eugene Meehan, Q.C.
Tel.: (613) 232-7171
Fax: (613) 231-3191

Agent for Counsel for the Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
PART I – STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
1. Nature of Case: clear contractual covenants govern	1
2. Issues fully considered by Courts below	1
3. Factual History	1
(a) Standard Tender procedures followed	2
(b) Call for Tenders	3
(c) Forms used were standard construction documents: “any or lowest tender need not be accepted”	3
(d) Tenders received	3
(e) Appropriate factors considered by Town	4
i. savings on shorter construction time	4
ii. savings on storage costs	4
iii. minimizing interruption with Town’s municipal work	4
iv. minimizing business interruption	5
v. region benefits from use of local subcontractors	5
(f) Town’s decision: second lowest bid better for Town	5
(g) Despite findings by Courts below to the contrary, the Applicant still alleges a “hidden agenda” used by the Town	5
(h) Applicant who did not build the building still claims for loss of profits	6
(i) Decision at trial	6
i. Court accepted evidence of Town witnesses	6
ii. No custom of the trade superceding clear and standard contractual terms	6
iii. Weight of factors in tender selection process is Town’s prerogative	7

iv.	Applicant knew that use of local labour was a factor in tender selection process	7
(j)	Court of Appeal Decisions	8
i.	Court of Appeal fully upheld Trial Judge's findings of fact	8
ii.	Clear and express contractual terms govern	8
iii.	Contract gave Town legal right to reject lowest bid	9
iv.	No custom of trade existed	9
v.	Town had no undisclosed policy in tender selection process	10
vi.	No factual basis for claim for negligent misrepresentation	10
PART II – STATEMENT OF POINTS IN ISSUE		10
1.	Matter not of national or public importance	10
2.	Standard Construction Tender Forms used	11
PART III – STATEMENT OF ARGUMENT		12
1.	Matter not of national or public importance	12
2.	Parties governed by provisions in standard tender documentation which are clear and unambiguous	12
3.	Contractual terms govern	13
4.	No custom of the trade altering clear and unambiguous contractual terms	13
PART IV – ORDER REQUESTED		14
1.	Application for Leave to Appeal be dismissed	14