

## AMF INVESTIGATIONS: THE DUTY TO ANSWER AN INVESTIGATOR AND HIS JURISDICTION TO RULE ON OBJECTIONS (CONTINUED)

Dina Raphaël

With regard to our *In Fact and In Law Express* newsletter of July 2012, entitled “*AMF Investigations: The duty to answer an investigator and his jurisdiction to rule on objections*”, please be informed that, on December 20, 2012, the Supreme Court dismissed Fournier’s application for leave<sup>1</sup> to appeal a Court of Appeal decision<sup>2</sup>, which convicted Fournier of an offence under section 195(4) SA because of his refusal to testify whereas lower courts acquitted him.

The Court of Appeal judgment is now final.

---

<sup>1</sup> No 34979.

<sup>2</sup> 2012 QCCA 1179.

Subscription: You may subscribe, cancel your subscription or modify your profile by visiting Publications on our website at [lavery.ca](http://lavery.ca) or by contacting Carole Genest at 514 877-3071.

The content of this text provides our clients with general comments on recent legal developments. The text is not a legal opinion. Readers should not act solely on the basis of the information contained herein.

For more information, visit [lavery.ca](http://lavery.ca)  
© Lavery, de Billy 2013 All rights reserved