Your Application has been scheduled by the clerk.
**Date:** Nov 30, 2026 @ 10:00
**Location:** Justice Chambers
**In person:** 601 - 5 St SW, Calgary, AB T2P 5P7

Clerk's Stamp

JUDICIAL CENTRE OF CALGARY
FILED DIGITALLY
2601 19778
Oct 29, 2026 4:08 PM
CLERK OF THE COURT

| | |
|---|---|
| COURT | COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA |
| JUDICIAL CENTRE | CALGARY |
| APPLICANTS | ALBERTA WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION;<br>BOW BIOREGION REGENERATION ASSOCIATION;<br>CANADIAN PARKS AND WILDERNESS SOCIETY, NORTHERN ALBERTA;<br>CANADIAN PARKS AND WILDERNESS SOCIETY SOUTHERN ALBERTA CHAPTER;<br>CASTLE-CROWN WILDERNESS COALITION SOCIETY;<br>CROWSNEST CONSERVATION SOCIETY;<br>LIVINGSTONE LANDOWNERS GROUP;<br>PEMBINA INSTITUTE FOR APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT;<br>and SOUTHERN ALBERTA ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP |
| RESPONDENT | ALBERTA ENERGY REGULATOR |
| DOCUMENT | **ORIGINATING APPLICATION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW** |
| ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT | Napoli Shkolnik Canada<br>Attention: Adam Bordignon<br>Suite 400, 1000 – 7th Avenue SW<br>Calgary, Alberta T2P 5L5<br>Tel: 519-984-6339<br>Email: abordignon@napolilaw.ca |

**NOTICE TO THE RESPONDENT:**

This application is made against you. You are a respondent. You have the right to state your side of this matter before the Court.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | |
| **Time:** | |
| **Where:** | Calgary Courts Centre, 601 5 St. SW, Calgary, AB T2P 5P7 |
| **Before Whom:** | Justice in Chambers |

Go to the end of this document to see what you can do and when you must do it.

## I. Factual Basis For this Claim

### A. Overview

1. The Applicants seek judicial review of the following amendments to the *Alberta Energy Regulator Rules of Practice*, Alta Reg 99/2013 (the "***Rules***"), promulgated by the Alberta Energy Regulator ("**AER**") pursuant to section 61 of the *Responsible Energy Development Act*, SA 2012, c R-17.3 ("***REDA***"), and filed as Alta Reg 88/2026:

   a. 6(1)(a)(ii) and 6(1)(c)(ii);
   b. 7(b.1) and 7(f.1);
   c. 9.01;
   d. 34.1; and
   e. 58(1)(c) and 58(1.1) (collectively the "**Amendments**").

2. The Amendments exceed the AER's delegated rule-making authority under section 61 of *REDA*, which is limited to prescribing rules respecting certain aspects of its practices and procedures. The Amendments purport to restrict statutory rights and impose substantive requirements inconsistent with *REDA* by:

   a. requiring the mandatory discontinuance of hearings where all directly and adversely affected participants withdraw, notwithstanding the continued participation of other hearing participants;
   b. requiring or permitting the AER to give special consideration to Crown requests concerning whether a hearing should proceed and whether a decision to hold a hearing should be reconsidered;
   c. excluding non-profit organizations from eligibility for participant costs unless they are themselves directly and adversely affected; and
   d. expanding the statutory statement of concern process to permit statements filed in support of an application by persons claiming to be adversely affected by the refusal or delay of an approval.

3. The Amendments also establish a separate costs regime for non-profit organizations that unlawfully discriminates between classes of hearing participants without express or implied statutory authority.

4. Further, the AER failed to comply with the mandatory notice requirements under section 22 of *REDA* before making the Amendments.

5. Accordingly, the Applicants seek declarations and orders that the Amendments are *ultra vires* and of no force or effect, with such further relief as this Honourable Court considers just.

**B. The Parties**

6. Alberta Wilderness Association ("**AWA**") is an Alberta-based conservation group with more than 10,000 members that advocates for the protection of Alberta's wilderness, wildlife, and natural ecosystems. They regularly participate in AER proceedings respecting proposed energy developments and environmental protection and were recently granted full participant status in AER Proceeding 449 concerning Summit Coal Inc.'s Mine 14 applications.

7. Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Northern Alberta ("**CPAWS-NA**") is an Alberta-based conservation organization dedicated to the protection and sustainability of public lands. They have over 2,230 active members and engage with over 13,000 Albertans. They regularly participate in AER proceedings respecting proposed energy developments and environmental protection and were recently granted full participant status in AER Proceeding 449 concerning Summit Coal Inc.'s Mine 14 applications.

8. Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society Southern Alberta Chapter, ("**CPAWS-SA**") is an Alberta-based conservation organization dedicated to protecting Southern Alberta's public lands, waters, biodiversity, and ecosystems. CPAWS-SA has a longstanding history of participation in energy regulatory proceedings, including before the AER and its predecessors and were recently granted full participant status in the Grassy Mountain Coal Project hearing, where it retained experts to provide evidence concerning coal quality, adaptive management, and selenium mitigation. CPAWS-SA has also filed numerous Statements of Concern respecting proposed coal exploration activities in the Livingstone region.

9. Castle-Crown Wilderness Coalition Society ("**CCWC**") is an Alberta-based conservation organization dedicated to protecting the wilderness, wildlife, and ecological integrity of

southwestern Alberta's Castle region. CCWC has a longstanding history of participating in regulatory proceedings before the AER's predecessors, including in hearings concerning proposed sour gas wells, pipelines, and related facilities in the Castle River and Waterton areas. Its participation has included representing affected landowners, presenting evidence and submissions concerning environmental impacts, and seeking and receiving participant costs.

10. Crowsnest Conservation Society ("**CCS**") is an Alberta-based charitable organization dedicated to protecting the natural environment of the Crowsnest Pass region. CCS has participated in regulatory proceedings before the AER, including as a full participant in the Grassy Mountain Coal Project hearing and as a limited participant in the Northback coal exploration proceedings. Its participation reflects its longstanding interest in the environmental impacts of proposed coal developments and the protection of the region's lands and waters.

11. Livingstone Landowners Group ("**LLG**") is an Alberta-based non-profit organization that represents landowners and residents in the Livingstone–Porcupine Hills region. LLG advocates for responsible land use and the protection of the region's environmentally sensitive lands and waters. LLG has participated in numerous AER proceedings, including as a full participant in the Grassy Mountain Coal Project hearing and in subsequent proceedings concerning proposed coal exploration activities.

12. Pembina Institute for Appropriate Development ("**Pembina**") is an Alberta-based charitable organization specializing in environmental research and policy analysis, with a focus on responsible energy development and minimizing the environmental impacts of fossil fuel production. Pembina has participated in numerous energy regulatory proceedings, including as a full participant before the AER and its predecessors, providing research, evidence, and submissions respecting environmental protection and responsible resource development.

13. Southern Alberta Environmental Group ("**SAGE**") is an Alberta-based non-profit organization dedicated to environmental protection and sustainable development in southern Alberta. SAGE has participated in regulatory proceedings before the AER, including being granted full participation rights in a 2018 hearing concerning proposed oil wells near the Twin

River Heritage Rangeland Natural Area. In granting participation, the AER recognized SAGE's tangible interest in the proceeding and found that its local knowledge and conservation expertise would materially assist the hearing panel.

14. Bow Bioregion Regeneration Association ("**BBRA**") is an Alberta-based non-profit organization established in 2024 and dedicated to ecological restoration, watershed protection, and responsible land stewardship throughout southern Alberta. BBRA works with Indigenous Nations, environmental organizations, and community groups on conservation initiatives, including the protection and restoration of Alberta's Eastern Slopes. Although recently established, BBRA's activities concern lands and waters potentially affected by energy resource development and regulated by the AER.

15. The Respondent, the AER, is a statutory corporation established under *REDA*. Under section 2(1)(a) of *REDA*, the mandate of the AER is to provide for the efficient, safe, orderly and environmentally responsible development of energy resources and mineral resources in Alberta. The AER is responsible for regulating Alberta's energy resource activities and exercises adjudicative, regulatory, and rule-making powers under *REDA*.

**C. The Statutory Scheme**

16. *REDA* establishes the framework governing applications for energy resource approvals and participation in AER proceedings, hearings, reconsiderations, and regulatory appeals.

17. *REDA* authorizes the AER to make rules respecting specified matters relating to its practices and procedures, including statements of concern, hearings, reconsiderations, appeals, and costs. It does not authorize the AER to make regulations respecting substantive aspects of the hearing process, a matter which is reserved exclusively to the Lieutenant Governor in Council ("**LGiC**")

18. Pursuant to its rule-making authority, the AER promulgated the *Rules*, which govern the procedures applicable to proceedings before the AER.

### D. The Amendments

19. On February 5, 2026, the AER approved the Amendments to the *Rules* pursuant to s. 61 of *REDA*. The Amendments were filed as Alta Reg 88/2026 on April 30, 2026, first publicly announced on May 5, 2026, and first published in the Alberta Gazette on May 15, 2026.

20. The Amendments include four principal changes that are the subject of this application.

a. The addition of Rule 9.01 requires the AER to discontinue a hearing where all directly and adversely affected participants withdraw, even where other participants remain ("**Mandatory Discontinuance**").

b. The addition of Rules 7(f.1) and 34.1 introduce special consideration of Crown requests concerning whether hearings should proceed or decisions to conduct hearings should be reconsidered ("**Crown Reconsideration Amendments**").

c. The modifications to Rule 58(1)(c) and addition of Rule 58(1.1) introduce restrictions on the eligibility of non-profit organizations to recover participant costs, excluding most non-profit organizations unless they are themselves directly and adversely affected ("**Costs Amendments**").

d. The modifications to Rules 6(1)(a)(ii) and 6(1)(c)(ii), and addition of Rule 7(b.1), expand the statement of concern process to permit statements supporting an application based on alleged adverse effects arising from the refusal or delay of an approval ("**Statements of Support Amendments**").

## I. Legal Basis for Claim

### A. The Applicants' Interest

21. The Applicants have a longstanding interest in the responsible development of Alberta's energy resources and substantial experience participating in AER proceedings concerning proposed developments affecting Alberta's communities, lands, waters, and wildlife.

22. The Applicants have a direct and substantial interest in the legality of the Amendments, which affect their participation in AER proceedings and raise serious justiciable questions concerning the AER's delegated rule-making authority under *REDA*. In particular:

a. The Mandatory Discontinuance Amendments may require the termination of hearings in which the Applicants have been granted participant status, notwithstanding their continued participation. The Applicants possess significant technical, scientific, and policy expertise that assists the AER in its decision-making. By requiring hearings to terminate upon the withdrawal of directly and adversely affected participants, the Amendments prevent the Applicants from contributing their distinct expertise, regardless of its relevance to the AER's statutory mandate.
b. The Mandatory Crown Reconsideration Amendments permit Crown requests to influence whether hearings proceed or are reconsidered, potentially resulting in the cancellation of hearings in which the Applicants have been granted participant status and depriving them of the opportunity to present evidence and submissions.
c. The Costs Amendments substantially restrict the eligibility of non-profit organizations, including the Applicants, to recover participant costs, thereby creating financial barriers to meaningful participation in AER proceedings. The Applicants have limited resources and rely on the cost recovery mechanism to participate in AER proceedings.
d. The Statements of Support Amendments permit persons supporting an energy resource application to file statements of concern based on the potential refusal or delay of an approval, thereby expanding the scope of the statutory process in which the Applicants participate and potentially affecting how their concerns are considered and adjudicated by the AER.

23. The Amendments apply broadly to proceedings before the AER and directly affect the Applicants' ability to participate in those proceedings. Given their extensive experience with the AER's regulatory processes and the general application of the Amendments, the Applicants are well-positioned to challenge their legality through this application.

24. AWA and CPAWS-NA have a particularly direct interest in the legality of the Amendments. Both organizations were granted full participant status in proceedings concerning Summit Coal Inc.'s proposed Mine 14 coal mine near Grande Cache. Following the withdrawal of certain

directly and adversely affected participants, the AER's Chief Executive Officer reconsidered a hearing panel decision and unilaterally cancelled the hearing. The lawfulness of that decision is presently before the Alberta Court of Appeal. The Amendments were introduced against the backdrop of those proceedings and appear to respond directly to the circumstances giving rise to that appeal.

**B. The AER Did Not Provide the Required Notice to the Minister**

25. Section 22 of *REDA* requires the AER to provide the Minister with at least 120 days' written notice before making a rule under *REDA*, unless the Minister directs otherwise. The Minister has not made any direction dispensing with this requirement.

26. According to the Alberta Gazette, the AER claimed it made the Amendments to the *Rules* on February 5, 2026, pursuant to section 61 of *REDA*. It wasn't until February 9, 2026, that the AER first provided a memo and a "final draft" of proposed amendments to the *Rules* to the Integrated Resource Management System Secretariat and ministerial officials.

27. The AER did not provide the Minister with the 120 days' written notice prior to purporting to make the Amendments on February 5, 2026, announcing the Amendments on May 5, 2026, or when they first appeared in the Alberta Gazette on May 15, 2026.

28. The AER therefore made the Amendments without complying with the mandatory procedural requirements prescribed by section 22 of *REDA*.

**C. The Mandatory Discontinuance is *Ultra Vires***

29. The AER may only make regulations to the extent that those regulations are reasonable and *intra vires* the authority granted to it by its enabling statutory scheme. The AER's use of its delegated powers must be consistent with the overriding purpose and object of *REDA*.

i. *The Mandatory Discontinuance exceeds the AER's rule-making ability*

30. *REDA* establishes a clear division between the regulation-making authority of the LGiC and the rule-making authority of the AER. Section 60 authorizes the LGiC to make regulations

respecting substantive aspects of the hearing process, including prescribing the circumstances under which a hearing is required. By contrast, section 61 authorizes the AER to make rules respecting its practices and procedures, including the conduct of hearings.

31. Read in their statutory context, sections 60 and 61 distinguish between regulations governing hearing entitlement and timing, which are reserved to the LGiC, and procedural rules governing how hearings are conducted, which may be made by the AER. Section 61 does not confer a free-standing authority on the AER to redesign *REDA*'s hearing framework or prescribe the circumstances in which hearings must proceed, be avoided, or be terminated.

32. Indeed, subsection 60(1) lists seven situations for which the LGiC may make regulations. Nearly half of these give the LGiC explicit authority to prescribe circumstances under which a hearing is required. Section 61 grants no such authority to the AER.

33. Rule 9.01 exceeds the AER's delegated authority. The Mandatory Discontinuance does not merely regulate the conduct of a hearing. Rather, it requires the termination of a hearing once all directly and adversely affected participants withdraw, regardless of whether other participants remain. In substance and effect, Rule 9.01 prescribes circumstances in which a hearing must end, a matter which is granted exclusively to the LGiC under section 60 of *REDA*.

ii. *The Mandatory Discontinuance is incompatible with REDA's hearing scheme*

34. Rule 9.01 is also inconsistent with the hearing framework established by *REDA*. Section 33 of *REDA* requires the AER to determine whether to conduct a hearing where a statement of concern has been filed by a person who believes they may be directly and adversely affected. Where the AER decides not to conduct a hearing, it must publish that decision.

35. However, *REDA* does not limit the AER's authority to conduct hearings to circumstances where a statement of concern has been filed. Subsection 34(1) preserves the AER's broader discretion to determine an application with or without conducting a hearing, while subsection 34(2) identifies circumstances in which a hearing is mandatory. Where a hearing is conducted, subsection 34(3) provides that persons who may be directly and adversely affected are entitled

to be heard. *REDA* intentionally forewent the requirement that a hearing may only be held when a directly and adversely affected person participates It does not make that person's participation a condition of the hearing's continuation.

36. Rule 9.01 therefore adds a statutory precondition and an ongoing requirement for hearing continuation that is not contemplated by *REDA*. Under Rule 9.01, a hearing may continue only while at least one directly and adversely affected participant remains, notwithstanding that *REDA* imposes no such requirement.

37. Rule 9.01 further removes the ability of hearing commissioners to determine whether a hearing should continue in light of the circumstances before them, restricting their authority over the conduct of hearings under section 12(1) of *REDA*. By mandating discontinuance regardless of the continued participation of other parties or the relevance of their evidence, Rile 9.01 substitutes an inflexible requirement for the discretionary hearing framework established by *REDA*.

38. Rule 9.01 also creates operational inconsistency within *REDA*. Where an energy resource enactment requires the AER to conduct a hearing pursuant to subsection 34(2), the hearing would remain mandatory regardless of whether any person filed a statement of concern. If directly and adversely affected participants subsequently obtained participant status and later withdrew, Rule 9.01 would nevertheless require the hearing to be discontinued. Rule 9.01 would therefore compel the AER to terminate a hearing that *REDA* expressly requires it to conduct.

iii. *The Mandatory Discontinuance is incompatible with REDA's environmental mandate*

39. Under *REDA*, the AER is responsible for providing for the efficient, safe, orderly, and environmentally responsible development of Alberta's energy resources. In carrying out that mandate, the AER is responsible for regulating environmental protection, the management of public lands, and the conservation and management of water in relation to energy resource activities.

40. Participants who are not directly and adversely affected often include public-interest organizations, Indigenous organizations, municipalities, and other participants possessing specialized expertise. These participants may be granted participation rights because their evidence and submissions assist the AER in fulfilling those statutory responsibilities.

41. If all directly and adversely affected participants withdraw, Rule 9.01 requires the hearing to be discontinued, even where other participants remain prepared to present evidence and submissions relevant to environmental protection or other matters that fall within the AER's statutory mandate and would assist the AER in its decision-making.

42. By requiring hearings to terminate in those circumstances, Rule 9.01 severely undermines the AER's ability to receive and consider evidence relevant to the purposes and mandate of *REDA*. Rather than merely prescribing hearing procedure, Rule 9.01 frustrates the statutory objectives *REDA* and is therefore inconsistent with its purpose.

**D. The Crown Reconsideration Amendments are *Ultra Vires***

43. *REDA* establishes the statutory framework governing the Crown's participation in AER proceedings. Section 49 expressly authorizes the Crown to participate in hearings, present evidence, cross-examine witnesses, make submissions, and file written statements.

44. The Crown Reconsideration Amendments depart from that framework by requiring or permitting special consideration of Crown requests concerning whether hearings should proceed or be reconsidered. In particular, Rule 34.1 requires the AER to consider whether a Crown request for reconsideration concerns the timeliness of its decision-making or the impact of a hearing on the underlying energy resource activity. Similarly, Rule 7(f.1) permits the AER to consider Crown requests for immediate or expedited decisions when determining whether to conduct a hearing.

45. These Amendments exceed the AER's delegated rule-making authority under section 61 of *REDA*. While section 60 reserves to the LGiC the authority to prescribe circumstances in which hearings are required, section 61 limits the AER's authority to matters of practice and procedure. By introducing additional considerations governing whether hearings should proceed or be

reconsidered, these Amendments go beyond regulating hearing procedure and intrude upon matters outside the AER's delegated authority.

46. Moreover, the Crown Reconsideration Amendments afford the Crown a privileged role in hearing decisions beyond its participation rights under section 49 of *REDA*. This preferential treatment undermines the AER's independent exercise of its statutory discretion and alters the legislative framework governing hearing decisions. Had the Legislature intended to confer such a role upon the Crown, it could have expressly provided for it in *REDA*.

**E. The Costs Amendments Are a Form of Unauthorized Discrimination**

47. The Costs Amendments establish a discriminatory participant costs regime by excluding from costs eligibility non-profit organizations whose business or activities include soliciting or receiving contributions for the purpose of carrying out their objects or purposes, unless they are themselves directly and adversely affected by the decision of the AER.

48. This distinction discriminates between classes of participants who are not directly and adversely affected. A non-profit organization that solicits or receives contributions for its objects or purposes is categorically excluded from participant costs, while other organizations and participants who are likewise not directly and adversely affected remain eligible to receive costs.

49. *REDA* does not expressly authorize the AER to create discriminatory classes of participants for the purpose of awarding costs. Nor is such discrimination authorized by necessary implication. Section 61 does not authorize the AER to distinguish between participants on the basis of their organizational structure, funding model, or whether any portion of their business or activities involved soliciting or receiving contributions.

50. The purpose of participant costs is to facilitate meaningful participation in proceedings before the AER and to assist the AER in making informed decisions based on a complete evidentiary record. Public-interest organizations are frequently granted participation rights because their evidence and submissions assist the AER in carrying out its statutory responsibilities respecting environmental protection, public lands, and water management.

Excluding such participants from costs eligibility undermines those statutory objectives by making meaningful participation more difficult.

51. The distinction drawn by the Costs Amendments is also arbitrary. Eligibility for participant costs turns not on the nature or value of the participant's contribution to the goals of *REDA* furthered by a proceeding, but on whether the organization solicits or receives contributions to advance its purposes. Two organizations making identical submissions and contributing equally to the hearing may therefore be treated differently solely because one receives donations while the other does not; a completely arbitrary distinction unsupported by any provision of *REDA*.

52. The practical effect of the Costs Amendments is to discourage the participation of public-interest non-profit organizations in proceedings before the AER, notwithstanding that those organizations may make substantial contributions to the AER's decision-making process.

**F. The Statements of Support Amendments Are Incompatible with the Statutory Scheme**

53. Section 32 of *REDA* permits a person or group who believes they may be directly and *adversely* affected by an application to file a Statement of Concern ("**SOC**"). An "application" is defined under section 1(1)(a) of *REDA* as an "application to the Regulatory for the issuance of an approval." *REDA* authorizes the AER to make rules respecting the form and content of Statements of Concern and the manner in which they may be filed.

54. Prior to the Statements of Support Amendments, Rule 6 required a person filing an SOC to explain why they believed they may be directly and adversely affected by a proposed project subject to an application. The rule therefore reflected the statutory framework established by section 32.

55. The Statements of Support Amendments fundamentally alter that framework. Rule 6 now requires a person filing an SOC in support of an application to explain why they believe they may be directly and adversely affected by a decision of the AER not to issue the requested approval. Rule 6 therefore creates a new category of Statements of Concern that is not contemplated by *REDA*.

56. Section 32 of *REDA* authorizes SOC from persons who believe they may be directly and adversely affected by an application. It does not authorize SOC from persons who claim they will be adversely affected if the application is refused or delayed. By creating a new category of SOC's that is outside those authorized by *REDA*, Rule 6 goes beyond prescribing the form and content of an SOC and instead alters the substantive operation of the statutory scheme.

57. The Statements of Support Amendments are also inconsistent with the AER's interpretation of the phrase "directly and adversely affected". The AER, this Court, and the Court of Appeal, have consistently interpreted that phrase as referring to adverse effects arising from the proposed energy resource activity that is the subject of an application. The Statement of Concern Amendments nevertheless require supporters of an application to explain how they would be directly and adversely affected by the absence of an approval, a concept that is inconsistent with the established interpretation of the statutory test.

## II. Remedy Sought:

58. The Applicants seek:

a. a declaration that Rules 6(1)(a)(ii), 6(1)(c)(ii), 7(b.1), 7(f.1), 9.01, 34.1, 58(1)(c), and 58(1.1) of the *Alberta Energy Regulator Rules of Practice*, Alta Reg 99/2013, as amended by Alta Reg 88/2026, are *ultra vires* the *Responsible Energy Development Act*, SA 2012, c R-17.3, and are of no force or effect;

b. an order in the nature of certiorari quashing the Amendments;

c. an order granting the Applicants the costs of this application; and

d. such further and other relief as this Honourable Court deems appropriate and just.

## III. Affidavit or other evidence to be used in support of this application:

59. The Applicants intends to rely on:

a. the record that will be provided by the Respondents;

b. affidavit(s) on behalf of the Applicants, to be filed; and

c. such further and other material as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

## IV. Applicable Acts and Regulations

60. Applicable Acts and Regulations include:

a. *Responsible Energy Development Act,* SA 2012, c R-17.3;

b. *Responsible Energy Development Act General Regulation,* Alta Reg 90/2013;

c. *Alberta Energy Regulator Rules of Practice*, Alta Reg 99/2013;

d. *Alberta Energy Regulator Rules of Practice Amendment Regulations*, Alta Reg 88/2026

e. *Alberta Rules of Court*, AR 124/2010; and

f. such further and other Acts and regulations as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

***WARNING***

You are named as a respondent because you have made or are expected to make an adverse claim in respect of this originating application. If you do not come to Court either in person or by your lawyer, the Court may make an order declaring you and all persons claiming under you to be barred from taking any further proceedings against the applicants and against all persons claiming under the applicants. You will be bound by any order the Court makes, or another order might be given or other proceedings taken which the applicants are entitled to make without any further notice to you. If you want to take part in the application, you or your lawyer must attend in Court on the date and the time shown at the beginning of this form. If you intend to give evidence in response to the application, you must reply by filing an affidavit or other evidence with the Court and serving a copy of that affidavit or other evidence on the applicants a reasonable time before the application is to be heard or considered.

DATED this 29th day of October, 2026.

NAPOLI SHKOLNIK CANADA
Suite 400, 1000 – 7 Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2P 5L5

**Adam D. Bordignon**
Tel: (519) 984-6339

Lawyer for the Applicants