

IN THE MATTER OF THE *PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT*,
R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 372
ON APPEAL FROM A REVIEW DECISION OF THE BC SOCIETY FOR THE
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS CONCERNING THE SEIZURE OF ONE
DOG

BETWEEN:

TIM COLE

APPELLANT

AND:

BRITISH COLUMBIA SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

RESPONDENT

DECISION

APPEARANCES:

For the British Columbia Farm Industry
Review Board:

Jane Pritchard, Presiding Member

For the Appellant:

Tim Cole

For the Respondent:

Andrea Greenwood, Counsel

Date of Hearing:

November 9, 2023

Location of Hearing:

Teleconference

A. Overview

1. This is an appeal pursuant to s. 20.3 of the *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 372* (the *PCAA*) related to the seizure of one dog, Oscar, from the Appellant, Tim Cole, at his residence located in Kamloops, BC (the Property).
2. The Appellant is appealing the October 6, 2023, review decision issued under s. 20.2(4)(b) of the *PCAA* by Shawn Eccles, Senior Director of Animal Protection Services, of the British Columbia Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (the Society).
3. Section 20.6 of the *PCAA* permits the British Columbia Farm Industry Review Board (BCFIRB), on hearing an appeal with respect to animals, to require the Society to return the animals to their owner with or without conditions or to permit the Society, in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the animals. The Appellant in this case is seeking the return of Oscar.
4. On November 9, 2023, a BCFIRB hearing panel (the Panel) held a hearing via Teleconference. The hearing was recorded.
5. The Appellant was not represented by counsel. The Appellant gave evidence on his own behalf and called two witnesses, E.M. and J.B.
6. The Society was represented by counsel and called two witnesses, Special Provincial Constable (SPC) Sarah Steeves and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM), Sarah Pihowich.

B. Decision Summary

7. This decision concerns the distress arising to Oscar as a result of certain incidents that occurred on September 19 and 20, 2023, at the Appellant's residence. The incidents involved the exposure of Oscar to life threatening drugs including fentanyl, methamphetamines, amphetamines, and benzodiazepines. At the time of seizure, Oscar exhibited signs of drug overdose and required hospitalization and significant treatment.
8. The Panel is satisfied that Oscar was in distress at the time of the seizure on September 20, 2023, as defined by Section 1(2) of the *PCAA*.
9. The Appellant has made significant changes in his life in the last 2 months and it is clear that he cares deeply about Oscar. However, the Appellant's failure to recognize or address Oscar's distress prior to the seizure, and the significant ongoing health issues identified by the veterinarians that attended to Oscar's care after the seizure, do not support a return of Oscar to the Appellant.
10. As a result, and as further explained below, the Panel orders pursuant to section 20.6 of the *PCAA* that the Society is permitted in its discretion to destroy, sell, or otherwise dispose of Oscar, with the obvious hope that Oscar will be adopted unless circumstances somehow preclude that possibility.

C. Preliminary Matters

11. At 4:19 pm on November 8, 2023, the Society emailed 3 documents to BCFIRB to be included as exhibits in the record of this appeal. These documents were labeled:
 - *Redemption Form for Oscar – May, 2019.pdf*,
 - *292562 Dispatch History.pdf*, and
 - *292562 IFD.pdf*.
12. At 4:54pm on November 8, 2023, the Society emailed one further document to be included in the record labeled: *Oscars MRs May 2019*.
13. The Panel allowed the parties to make submissions at the outset of the hearing as to whether the documents submitted late by the Society on November 8, 2023 (the “Late Documents”) should be included as part of the appeal record.
14. The Society explained that the Late Documents addressed the Appellant’s claim that he had been told by the Society that Oscar’s weight issue was related to a high metabolism and that Oscar needed a high protein diet. The Late Documents included the documentation from the Kamloops Shelter where Oscar was surrendered in May 2019 and a medical record from Central Animal Hospital in Kamloops recording Oscar’s wellness exam conducted at the time of the seizure.
15. The Society further explained that the Late Documents had only just become available as Oscar had previously been surrendered to the Kamloops Shelter under the Appellant’s girlfriend’s name and the Shelter records were not linked to Oscar’s protection files. As such, the Late Documents had not been available for inclusion in the Society’s initial disclosure.
16. The Appellant submitted that he had met the timelines initially set by the Panel for document disclosure and that the Respondent should be held to those same timelines. He confirmed that he had received all of the Late Documents.
17. The Panel accepted the Late Documents as exhibits for the hearing as they were relevant and potentially could provide valuable information with respect to the Appellant’s care for Oscar.

D. Material Admitted on this Appeal

18. The Panel identified all the documents received by BCFIRB in advance of the hearing as exhibits. The record comprises Exhibits 1-18 and is attached as Appendix A to this decision.

E. Review Decision

19. On October 6, 2023, Mr. Eccles issued his review decision in which he outlined his reasons for not returning Oscar to the Appellant (the “Review Decision”). He reviewed:

- BC SPCA Notice 27141 – September 20, 2023
- File #369588 Inspection Follow-up Details (IFD) – September 20, 2023
- Information to Obtain Warrant (ITO) – September 20, 2023
- Notice of Disposition – September 20, 2023
- Veterinary Records and Drug Panel Tests of Oscar
- Veterinary Records for Oscar – September 26, 2023
- Current Status List of Oscar

20. Mr. Eccles was satisfied, based on the evidence, that SPC Steeves reasonably formed the opinion that Oscar was in distress, in accordance with the *PCAA*, and that her action to take custody of Oscar to relieve Oscar of distress was appropriate in the circumstances.

F. Key Facts and Evidence

21. In an appeal under the *PCAA*, the Panel must determine whether an animal was in distress when seized and if it should be returned to the appellant. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and evidence based on the parties' written submissions and evidence presented during the hearing. Although the Panel has fully considered all the facts and evidence in this appeal, the Panel refers only to the facts and evidence it considers necessary to explain its reasoning in this decision.

Appellant Testimony

22. The Appellant testified that in the early afternoon of September 19, 2023, two of the Appellant's friends visited the Appellant at the Property where the three men smoked narcotics (alleged to be fentanyl and methamphetamine). The Appellant stated that he no longer talks to these two friends and realizes they are a harmful influence and that he made a mistake letting them in. The Appellant testified that to the best of his recollection the narcotics were on the kitchen counter but were pocketed by the men soon after use.
23. The Appellant stated that his friends left after approximately 30 minutes and that he blacked out shortly after they left.
24. At some point later that day the Appellant awoke and saw Oscar on the floor beside him barely breathing. The Appellant realized that something was very wrong. He immediately called for help from his friend EM.
25. The Appellant indicated that most of the next 48 hours after contacting EM are unclear and that he has only disjointed memories of the subsequent events.
26. The Appellant stated that he remembered EM coming to his residence with Narcan and helping to administer it to Oscar.

27. The Appellant acknowledged that the RCMP, and paramedics arrived, that he was administered Narcan, that he put Oscar in the Society truck, and that he wrote down a veterinarian's phone number and the phone number for possible financial support (ASK Wellness). The Appellant stated that his memories are jumbled, and he was not in a clear state of mind prior to and at the time of the seizure.
28. With respect to his ability to care for Oscar if Oscar were returned to him, the Appellant stated that he is back on his medication, he has completely changed the way he is living, he is seeing his doctor regularly and he has been going to counselling.
29. The Appellant noted that he has moved his residence (trailer) from the Property to a farm outside of town, he has finished the renovations on it, and he has cleaned it top to bottom. The Appellant stated that he is working part time on a farm owned by family friends, and that he pays rent, and has a cell phone paid for by his aunt. He claimed to have cut ties with the friends that visited him with narcotics on September 19, 2023.
30. The Appellant stated that he has had Oscar for about 7 years, since he was about a year old, and that Oscar is the only thing that's kept him going since he lost his family. He stated that he has taken Oscar to the vet to find out why he is so skinny but never understood anything other than to feed him a quality high protein diet.
31. The Appellant testified that on September 19, 2023, when he woke up in the evening after blacking out and seeing Oscar on the floor and barely breathing, he immediately called EM for help before blacking out again.

Appellant Witnesses:

E.M.

32. E.M. testified that he received a call from the Appellant on the evening of September 19, 2023, to say that he thought that Oscar had gotten into something. The Appellant requested E.M. go to Shoppers Drug Mart to get some Narcan and to bring it to him. E.M. indicated that the Appellant was slurring his words but was understandable.
33. E.M. picked up one box of Narcan and arrived at the Property at around 9 or 10pm which was approximately 15 minutes after he left home.
34. When E.M. arrived and entered the residence, he saw the Appellant and Oscar on the couch. E.M. could see that Oscar was not moving, his tongue was hanging out of his mouth, and he didn't look good.
35. E.M. testified that the Appellant took the Narcan and poured 3 of the 4 vials from the box directly into Oscar's mouth. E.M. questioned whether it was supposed to be injected. The Appellant told him that he had given the Narcan orally before to a dog.

36. E.M. noted that Oscar did not respond to the Narcan. E.M. was not familiar with the proper administration of Narcan so he called 911 but when the dispatcher realized that the Narcan was for a dog they wouldn't advise him. E.M. could not find the 4th vial and then left to get more Narcan.
37. When E.M. returned to the Property with 3 more boxes of Narcan, the Appellant was passed out on the floor and Oscar was still on the couch in the same condition. E.M. phoned 911 again and got instructions on giving the Narcan to the Appellant.
38. E.M. administered one Narcan dose to the Appellant and he responded immediately. E.M. administered one Narcan dose to Oscar and he responded by coming to and lifting his head, he could stand with help, but was still having a hard time getting around.
39. E.M. stated that the fire department arrived shortly after he had administered the Narcan to the Appellant and Oscar, followed by ambulance services and the police.
40. E.M. testified that he did not observe anything that he could identify as drugs or weapons in the residence while he was there. E.M. stated he could not take Oscar home with him as he lives in a senior's residence that does not allow dogs.
41. E.M. returned to the Property on September 20, 2023. The Society and the RCMP were both present. E.M. observed Oscar to be in better condition than the night before (he didn't look like he was dying). Oscar was up and walking around outside the residence but was still very wobbly. E.M. agreed that there was reason to be concerned at that time about Oscar's condition.
42. E.M. agreed that the Society had directed the Appellant to take Oscar to a veterinarian and stated that when he was asked by the Appellant if he could help him take Oscar to the vet, he said that he could help. E.M. stated that if Oscar was his dog, he would have taken him to the vet. E.M. noted that the Appellant said he had to find a veterinarian that would take Oscar as he owed money to some of the local veterinarians. E.M. agreed that the Society told the Appellant to get Oscar to the vet within 2 hours.
43. E.M. testified that he was asked by the RCMP to leave the Property and eventually he did.
44. With respect to the Appellant's ability to provide proper care for Oscar if Oscar were returned, E.M. stated that the Appellant is changing things in his life and is probably capable of looking after Oscar. E.M. also stated that he can help the Appellant with veterinary costs at times if he needs it.

J.B.

45. J.B. was not present at the Property on September 19 or 20, 2023 and therefore could not provide any evidence with respect to the incidents that led to the seizure of Oscar.
46. J.B. stated that he has known the Appellant his whole life and that he has never seen the Appellant harm an animal. He stated that he has driven the Appellant to the vet with a pet in the past and has helped the Appellant financially in the past. He stated that he would help the Appellant with anything he would ever ask him to help with and would never turn his back on the Appellant.
47. He stated that the Appellant loves his dog and is a good person that has gone through a lot of traumas in his life.
48. J.B. stated that the Appellant's support system included J.B., J.B.'s wife and J.B.'s mother.

Respondent Witnesses:

SPC Steeves

49. SPC Steeves first visited the Property on September 20, 2023, following up on an anonymous complaint concerning a dog in distress at that address. She confirmed that the Kamloops RCMP had previously attended at the Property on the evening of September 19, 2023, and she gathered a description of their encounter before proceeding to the Appellant's residence.
50. SPC Steeves arrived at the Property at 11:18 am accompanied by one RCMP officer. Shortly after their arrival, E.M. attended at the property. SPC Steeves spoke with the Appellant and indicated that the Society had received a call about a dog that had ingested drugs and that they were following up to see if the dog was okay. The Appellant said that the dog was fine, and opened the door so she could see Oscar inside.
51. SPC Steeves noted that Oscar was staggering and trying to hide. She asked for Oscar to be brought outside. At that point the RCMP officer went to speak to E.M.
52. SPC Steeves testified that when Oscar was brought outside, he was staggering, stumbling and falling over. SPC Steeves directed the Appellant to bring Oscar to a veterinarian immediately. The Appellant told her that he couldn't afford to take Oscar to a vet. SPC Steeves suggested to the Appellant that he could surrender Oscar to the Society so that she could take him to a vet for treatment. The Appellant declined and said that he would get Oscar to the veterinarian.
53. SPC Steeves advised the Appellant that he had 2 hours to take Oscar to get veterinarian care and that she would return with a search warrant to seize Oscar, if necessary, in order to make sure that he was provided with proper veterinary care. SPC Steeves issued a notice to the Appellant and called to confirm that the

Central Animal Hospital (CAH) was the clinic on call for the weekend. She ensured that the Appellant wrote the phone number down for CAH and suggested to the Appellant that ASK Wellness might help with the veterinarian costs.

54. Later that day SPC Steeves called the Appellant to see if Oscar had been taken to CAH. The Appellant was slurring his words and was difficult to understand. He stated he had not taken Oscar to the clinic and was waiting to hear from ASK Wellness as he hadn't found financial assistance. SPC Steeves informed him the 2 hours contemplated in the notice had expired.
55. SPC Steeves obtained and executed a search warrant at 3:58 pm at the Property accompanied by two RCMP officers.
56. SPC Steeves testified that upon their arrival the Appellant became upset and claimed that E.M. could come and take Oscar and the Appellant to CAH. SPC Steeves explained that it had been over 4 hours since she had issued the 2-hour notice. She told the Appellant that she appreciated that the Appellant cared about Oscar but that it was not fair to Oscar to make him wait any longer for veterinary care.
57. The Appellant put Oscar in the Society vehicle. Oscar was still stumbling and seemed disoriented. The Appellant was also slurring his words and stumbling around.
58. SPC Steeves took Oscar directly to CAH where he was provided with immediate veterinary care.
59. SPC Steeves stated that Oscar is doing well in the shelter and is gaining weight. She noted that he was to have a check up on the day of the hearing to see how he was responding to treatment for his perianal fistulas, but that she had not received a report from that check up yet.

Dr. Sarah Pihowich

60. Dr. Sarah Pihowich is a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and practices in Kamloops, B.C. She has two and a half years of experience in small animal medicine and surgery at the Central Animal Hospital (CAH) in Kamloops. Dr. Pihowich has worked with the Society in multiple capacities including intake exams on seized and surrendered animals, postmortem procedures and testifying as an expert witness. The Panel accepted Dr. Pihowich as an expert qualified to give opinion evidence on matters of veterinary medicine. Dr. Pihowich did not personally perform the intake exam on Oscar but was present at the time of intake and oversaw Oscar's treatment and care at the CAH.
61. On arrival at CAH the initial exam of Oscar was performed by Dr. Caminos DVM, who noted that Oscar was restless and easily startled by noise and sound. Oscar was panting, howling, urinating and agitated to the point that several people were needed to restrain him for treatment. He had slow responsive pupils and was struggling to walk.

62. Oscar was put on fluids and given 0.2mg/kg dose of intravenous Naloxone due to the history of opioid exposure. He settled a little bit after treatment but was still vocalizing and stumbling.
63. A urine strip test taken from Oscar was positive for amphetamines, benzodiazepines, and methamphetamine. Treatment was given to counteract the effect of those drugs and Oscar was settled down by the next morning.
64. Having reviewed the case history and clinical notes, Dr. Pihowich noted as follows:
 - Opioids have a short effect, or a short half-life, which means that opioids are metabolized quickly in both humans and animals;
 - Based on the self-reporting by the Appellant Oscar was exposed to fentanyl in the afternoon/early evening of September 19, 2023;
 - Oscar showed a mild but still noticeable response to Narcan/Naloxone 24 hours later (which reverses the effects of opioids but not the other drugs that Oscar tested for);
 - Oscar's reaction to the Narcan/Naloxone was a strong indication that Oscar would have had to have ingested another dose of opioids 2 to 6 hours before coming to the clinic; otherwise the Naloxone would not have made a clinical difference in his behaviour.
 - Oscar would not have been showing such severe signs of intoxication if he had only ingested the drugs on September 19, 2023. If it had been only on that day most of the drugs would have been expelled and processed by Oscar's system and he likely wouldn't have needed treatment at the clinic on September 20, 2023.
65. Dr. Pihowich noted that Oscar was diagnosed with a perianal fistula which is an immune-mediated chronic condition. Many dogs respond to treatment but generally there is not a full cure. The condition can flare up again and again and can require long term monitored treatment with the appropriate medication.
66. Dr. Pihowich noted that the medication for a perianal fistula can be very expensive and that frequent appointments with the veterinarian are needed to try to catch any flare up before it becomes too painful. She noted that dogs with this condition need to be monitored closely by their owners so that the dogs are brought in as soon as any sign or a flare up is noticed. She stated, "If you don't get on top of this disease, it's going to get worse."

G. Analysis and Decision

67. Part 2.1 of the *PCAA* establishes the standards of care for animals and establishes a duty on those responsible for animals to ensure those standards are met:
 - 9.1 (1) A person responsible for an animal must care for the animal, including protecting the animal from circumstances that are likely to cause the animal to be in distress.

(2) A person responsible for an animal must not cause or permit the animal to be, or to continue to be, in distress.

11 If an authorized agent is of the opinion that an animal is in distress and the person responsible for the animal.

(a) does not promptly take steps that will relieve its distress, or

(b) cannot be found immediately and informed of the animal's distress, the authorized agent may, in accordance with sections 13 and 14, take any action that the authorized agent considers necessary to relieve the animal's distress, including, without limitation, taking custody of the animal and arranging for food, water, shelter, care and veterinary treatment for it.

68. The definition of "distress" provides:

1 (2) For the purposes of this Act, an animal is in distress if it is

(a) deprived of adequate food, water, shelter, ventilation, light, space, exercise, care or veterinary treatment,

(a.1) kept in conditions that are unsanitary,

(a.2) not protected from excessive heat or cold,

(b) injured, sick, in pain or suffering, or

(c) abused or neglected.

69. We have also proceeded on the basis that the Appellant has an onus to show, that the remedy the Appellant seeks (return of Oscar) is justified. The first issue to consider is whether Oscar was in distress at the time of the surrender. Depending on the answer to that question, the next issue is to decide whether to return Oscar or whether doing so would return Oscar to a situation of distress.

70. The Panel is satisfied that Oscar was in distress at the time of the seizure on September 20, 2023, as defined by Section 1(2) of the *PCAA*. This finding is supported by the evidence of the witnesses that observed his behaviour which demonstrated clear intoxication which could only be explained by his exposure to harmful narcotics. The finding is further supported by the veterinary evidence confirming excessive exposure to multiple harmful drugs which called for immediate treatment that was not forthcoming by the owner. In fact, the Appellant did not seriously contest that Oscar was in distress at any point during the appeal process.

71. Having found that Oscar was in distress at the time of the seizure, the Panel turns to the issue of whether Oscar can be safely returned to the Appellant. The Panel notes as follows:

- Oscar's diagnosis of perianal fistula will require a high level of veterinary attention with regular check-ups, treatments on an ongoing basis, and possible surgery later. That care will likely be expensive and time consuming and will require an owner capable of providing consistent and proactive care.
- The Appellant did not provide Oscar with the care and veterinary treatment he required during the life-threatening events described in this

decision despite having been given the time to do so, and the contact information for the emergency animal hospital on call, and assistance from the Society and his support system that would have been necessary for him to provide that care.

- Although he has testified that he is now able to provide better care for Oscar, that care would be dependent on the help of friends and family through the stronger support system he has put in place. He has not demonstrated that he personally could be relied upon in all circumstances to provide the care required for Oscar or to ask for help in a consistent, appropriate, and timely manner to care for Oscar.
- The distress that Oscar endured from the events described in this decision was severe and remained untreated over multiple days until the Society intervened long after it was apparent that Oscar was suffering. The Appellant's inability to acknowledge or properly deal with that suffering despite all the third-party assistance that was offered to him leaves the Panel with very little confidence with respect to his ability to care for Oscar in the future.

72. The Appellant cares deeply about Oscar, this was very clear. It is also clear that he was responsible for the exposure of Oscar to the drug overdose that led to Oscar being taken into the care of the Society. On the evening of September 19, 2023, when the Appellant recognized the danger Oscar was in, he did not think to get Oscar to the veterinarian to be treated but thought about trying to treat Oscar himself. It is also clear that he was familiar with giving Narcan to dogs as he immediately thought of this treatment and told E.M. that he had given it orally to dogs before. The only reason that the Appellant would have had to give Narcan to a dog previously would have been because of a previous overdose experience.
73. The following day when Oscar was still displaying behaviour consistent with drug intoxication, the Appellant still did not think to take Oscar to the veterinarian. Even when given an ultimatum by the Society to take Oscar to a veterinarian or risk losing him, the Appellant still did not find a way to act appropriately.
74. The Panel does not find that returning Oscar to the care of the Appellant would be in Oscar's best interest and further finds that such a return would put Oscar back into a situation that would cause Oscar distress and further suffering. As such, the Panel orders that Oscar will remain in the care of the Society as set out in further detail below.

H. Costs

75. Section 20 of the *PCAA* states:

20 (1) The owner of an animal taken into custody or destroyed under this Act is liable to the society for the reasonable costs incurred by the society under this Act with respect to the animal.

(2) The society may require the owner to pay all or part of the costs, with or without conditions, for which he or she is liable under subsection (1) before returning the animal.

(3) Subject to subsection (4), the society may retain the proceeds of a sale or other disposition of an animal under section 17 or 18.

(4) If the proceeds of a sale or other disposition exceed the costs referred to in subsection (1), the owner of the animal may, within 6 months of the date the animal was taken into custody, claim the balance from the society.

(5) Payment of costs under subsection (2) of this section does not prevent an appeal under section 20.3.

76. Section 20.6(c) of the *PCAA* provides that on hearing an appeal the board may “confirm or vary the amount of costs for which the owner is liable under section 20 (1) or that the owner must pay under section 20 (2)”.

77. The Society is seeking costs as follows:

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| (a) Veterinary costs: | \$1244.82 |
| (b) SPCA time attending to seizure: | \$109.56 |
| (c) Housing, feeding and caring for Oscar: | <u>\$1,127.75</u> |
| (d) Total: | \$2,481.83 |

78. On the matter of costs, the Society’s submissions provide detailed cost accounting, including invoices for veterinary care and detailed estimates on the daily operating costs associated with the care of Oscar. The calculation of these estimates has been reviewed and supported in previous appeals.

79. The Appellant acknowledged that the Society had incurred costs because of the seizure and did not contest the evidence presented by the Society regarding costs.

I. Order

80. After careful consideration of the written and oral evidence presented in this hearing, the Panel makes the following determination of the issues and attendant orders.
81. The Panel finds that Oscar was in distress at the time of the seizure and that it is in the interests of Oscar to remain in the care of the Society.
82. The Panel orders pursuant to section 20.6 of the *PCAA* that the Society is permitted in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of Oscar, with the obvious hope that Oscar will be adopted unless circumstances somehow preclude that possibility.
83. The Panel further orders, pursuant to s. 20.6(c) of the *PCAA*, that the Appellant is liable to the Society for the amount of \$2,481.83 as the reasonable costs incurred by the Society with respect to caring for Oscar.

Dated at Victoria, British Columbia this 23rd day of November 2023.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FARM INDUSTRY REVIEW BOARD

Per:



Jane Pritchard, Presiding Member

Appendix "A"

| Exhibit # | Date (Received) | Received from | Document |
|------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---|
| Exhibit #1 | October 6, 2023 | BCSPCA | Cole Decision Letter – October 6, 2023 |
| Exhibit #2 | October 12, 2023 | Appellant | Cole Notice of Appeal |
| Exhibit #3 | October 13, 2023 | BCFIRB | NOA Process Letter |
| Exhibit #4 | October 23, 2023 | BCSPCA | BC SPCA Document Disclosure Tabs 1-18_Redacted |
| Exhibit #5 | October 31, 2023 | Appellant | Appellant Initial Submission |
| Exhibit #6 | Nov 1, 2023 | Appellant | Oscar Cole |
| Exhibit #7 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | BCSPCA Submissions - Cole |
| Exhibit #8 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | Affidavit #1 of Shawn Eccles |
| Exhibit #9 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | Statement from RCMP Cst CANUEL |
| Exhibit #10 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | Oscar SPCA Seizure Report 2023 |
| Exhibit #11 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | PCAA Witness Contact Form - SPC Sarah Steeves |
| Exhibit #12 | Nov 3, 2023 | BCSPCA | PCCA Expert Witness Handout and Form - DVM Sarah Pihowich |
| Exhibit #13 | Nov 6, 2023 | Appellant | Appellant Final Submissions |
| Exhibit #14 | Nov 7, 2023 | Appellant | Appellant Witnesses |
| Exhibit #15 | Nov 18, 2023 | BCSPCA | Late Submissions: 292562 Dispatch History |
| Exhibit #16 | Nov 18, 2023 | BCSPCA | Late Submissions: 292562 IFD |
| Exhibit #17 | Nov 18, 2023 | BCSPCA | Late Submissions: Oscar MRs May 2019 |
| Exhibit #18 | Nov 18, 2023 | BCSPCA | Late Submissions: Redemption Form for Oscar - May 8, 2019 |