

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

**BETWEEN**

RANDOL HARRIS

**APPELLANT**

**AND**

BC SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

**RESPONDENT**

**DECISION**

APPEARANCES:

For the BC Farm Industry Review Board:	Dennis Lapierre, Presiding Member
For the Appellant:	Randol Harris
For the Respondent:	Rylee Hunter, Counsel
Date of Hearing:	December 17, 2021
Location of Hearing:	Video conference

## **I. Introduction**

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 by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (the Society).
2. The Appellant, Randol Harris, resides in Abbotsford, British Columbia and does not have a permanent address.
3. On October 7, 2021, officers of the Society executed a warrant at the location where the Appellant was staying and seized a Husky-type dog, "Blue" (the dog), approximately 3 years of age, having been determined by the Society to be in distress.
4. The Appellant disputed the decision to seize the animal and, on November 5, 2021, Marcie Moriarty, Chief Prevention and Enforcement Officer for the Society issued her review decision, upholding the decision to seize the animal, and concluding that it was not in its best interest to be returned to the Appellant.
5. On November 9, 2021, the British Columbia Farm Industry Review Board (BCFIRB) received a brief e-mail from the Appellant requesting an appeal of the Society decision.
6. On November 15, 2021, BCFIRB sent the Appellant a letter acknowledging receipt of the Notice of Appeal and the subsequent receipt of the filing fee. The letter additionally outlined the authority of BCFIRB to deal with animal seizures, establish Rules of Practices and Procedures, schedule hearing dates, and dates by which it must have received all relevant information.
7. On December 17, 2021, a BCFIRB hearing panel (the Panel) held a hearing via teleconference. The hearing was recorded.
8. The Appellant was unrepresented and called three witnesses. Two other witnesses the Appellant wished to call could not be contacted. The Appellant did, however, submit 14 letters of support, of which two are from the uncontacted intended witnesses.
9. The Society was represented by counsel and called three witnesses: Special Provincial Constable (SPC) Vanessa Hommel who led the investigation and seizure, Animal Protection Officer (APO) Cassandra Meyers, and Dr. Rebecca Ledger, an animal behaviour and welfare scientist, called as an expert witness.

## **II. Decision Summary**

10. Section 20.6 of the *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act* (the Act) permits BCFIRB, on hearing an appeal in respect of an animal, to require the Society to return the animal to its owner with or without conditions or to permit the Society, in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the animal. Under the *PCAA*, appeals to BCFIRB are broad in nature, as set out in detail in *BC Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals v. British Columbia Farm Industry Review Board, 2013 BCSC 2331*.
11. For the reasons outlined below, this Panel has decided not to return the dog, “Blue”, which is the subject animal of this appeal to the Appellant and permits the Society, in its discretion to destroy, sell, or otherwise dispose of the dog remaining in its custody pursuant to s. 20.6 (b) of the *PCAA*. The Appellant is liable to the Society for costs in the amount of \$

## **III. Materials Admitted on this Appeal**

12. All affidavits and witness statements, emails, photographs, videos, records, and materials received by BCFIRB in advance of the hearing were entered as exhibits. The record is comprised of Exhibits 1-24 and is attached as Appendix A to this decision.

## **IV. History Leading to Seizure of Animal and the Day of Seizure**

13. Exhibits submitted by the Society include summary records of 23 telephoned complaints by members of the public, and Society follow-ups from August 2020 up to and including the date preceding the October 7, 2021 seizure. Many of the complaints (August 1, 8, 11, October 21, 22, and November 28, 2020, January 15, April 3, 7, and June 10, 2021) were reports of seeing a malnourished, underweight dog. Some (October 2, and December 23, 2020, January 23, August 4, 25, and October 6, 2021) included descriptions of a dog being physically abused, yelled at, punched in the face, and kicked. Most of the complaints were from anonymous callers but all described a Husky-type dog in the control of an apparently homeless man with a shopping cart, or carts, in and around the same area of Abbotsford with the dog sometimes being carried in, tied to, or apparently pulling the carts.

## **V. The Review Decision**

14. In her review decision dated November 5, 2021, Ms. Moriarty explained the oversight role of the Society’s Cruelty and Investigations Department to review the evidence and make a decision about whether the animal seized, Blue, should be returned applying the relevant statutory test as described in *Brown v BCSPCA*, [1999] B.C.J. No. 1464 (S.C.), where at paragraph 22, the judge stated:

The goal and purpose of the Act is explicit in its title. It would be unreasonable, in my view, to interpret the Act as plaintiff’s Counsel suggests. In the interest of

preventing a recurrence of the cause or causes leading to the animal being in distress in the first place, the court must be satisfied that if the animal is returned to its owner, it will remain in the good condition in which it was released into its owner's care.

15. After reviewing the material she relied upon in making her decision, Ms. Moriarty concluded the following:
  - SPC Vanessa Hommel, having been appointed under Section 9 of the *Police Act* was a duly authorized agent of the Society, thus meeting the provisions under s. 10 of the *PCAA*.
  - The Appellant is the person responsible for Blue, the dog seized.
  - SPC Hommel reasonably formed the opinion that the appropriate course of action was to seize the dog in order to relieve his distress under a duty to protect; and
  - The Notice of Disposition with respect to Blue was served in accordance with sections 18 and 19 of the *PCAA*.
  - That the seizure took place in accordance with the *PCAA* and that SPC Hommel acted in good faith acting on the warrants given the information she had before her.
16. In explaining her decision not to return the dog, Ms. Moriarty began by outlining the events leading up to the October 7, 2021 warrant execution which included the Society receiving a complaint on October 6, 2021, where a witness watched a Husky dog being kicked and physically abused. She noted that the Abbotsford RCMP were contacted and the attending officer, who identified the Appellant, subsequently forwarded two video clips and a statement he received from the witness documenting the alleged abuse to the Society.
17. Ms. Moriarty referred next to the details contained in the Information to Obtain a Search Warrant (ITO), in which SPC Hommel noted the Society had received over 20 complaints between December 2020 and September 2021 regarding the dog being physically abused by the Appellant, and which also included complaints from various members of the public about the dog's physical condition. She noted that, when Society officers were able to locate the Appellant, they issued Notices directing him to cease harsh or inhumane training or disciplining techniques. She further noted that Society officers had at times provided him dog food, flea treatment, and opportunities to have the dog neutered.
18. While noting the number of letters of support by members of the community for Mr. Harris, she also noted the number of complaints the Society had logged, and the occasions on which both Society members as well as members of the community had provided the Appellant resources and opportunities to ensure the well being of the dog. In her view, the officers had done their best to reach out to motivate him to change his handling of the dog. The video clips from October 6, 2021 suggest the dog has previously endured physical punishment resulting in its overly submissive and fearful, unreactive and unflinching behaviour

which she concluded were suggestive of physical, emotional, and psychological distress. On this basis, she determined it was not in the best interest of the dog to be returned to the Appellant.

## **VI. Key Findings of Fact and Evidence**

19. In an appeal under the *PCAA*, the Panel must determine whether the animal was in distress when seized and if it should be returned to the Appellant. Following is a summary of the relevant and material 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

20. The Appellant began by outlining his history with the dog. He got the dog as a six-month-old pup from people on Facebook whose landlord would not allow pets. He brought it to Abbotsford where he had a suite. Later he moved to a parking lot, where he has been kept moving by the police and bylaw officers. He has been helped by members of the community. All of his belongings are kept in shopping carts.
21. Referring to the day preceding the seizure, October 6, 2021, he explained that he had been drinking a bottle of Crown Royal that someone had given him and when he woke up his pants were on fire and lots of his stuff was gone. He blamed his dog for not guarding him. But, in response to all the people who had reported that he had punched and kicked his dog, he said they were "full of shit."
22. In cross-examination, the Appellant stated the dog was one and half years of age when seized and had been in his custody except for the occasion when the Appellant broke his ankle. He recalled being spoken to by SPC Blackwell about a public complaint (October 2, 2020) of the dog being punched in the face and denied doing that. When pointed to the various complaint dates and details logged by the SPCA, the Appellant denied a November 27, 2020 complaint of a limping dog pulling a shopping cart, though he recalled his dog limping but did not recall what caused the limp. He denied a December 23, 2020 anonymous complaint of him yelling at and kicking his dog. He denied a January 23, 2021 complaint of him yelling at his dog, pulling on his collar, and treating him harshly. He denied an August 25, 2021 complaint of an emaciated dog tied to five grocery buggies, being urged to "mush" by hitting it on the head with a closed fist three or four times, although he did admit urging his dog to "mush."
23. The Appellant was referred to the two video clips recorded and sent to the SPCA by RCMP Cst. Marchinkow from the October 6, 2021 complaint. He admitted that these were videos of him but stated that the dog never yelped. While at first, the Appellant denied hitting the dog, when shown the videos, his evidence was that he

had not hit the dog forcefully and had he twisted its limbs forcefully, as suggested in the video, the dog would have yelped.

Dr. Rebecca Ledger

24. Having heard and reviewed Dr. Ledger's qualifications as an animal behaviour and welfare scientist, the Panel accepted her as an expert witness qualified to testify with respect to the psychological effects of abuse on animals.
25. Dr. Ledger reviewed the two videos, the Chilliwack Animal Hospital medical records, and toxicology results relating to the dog. She also visited the dog while it was in foster care.
26. Dr. Ledger testified that when she reviewed the videos, she observed a dog that was experiencing anxiety, fear, helplessness, physical discomfort, and pain during his interactions with the male (the Appellant).
27. In response to questions about how she assessed the dog's reactions to the way it was being handled in the videos, she first explained the methodology she uses to reach her conclusions. These include drawing inferences from the conditions in which the behaviour occurs, and the behavioural evidence presented. She stated that according to research dogs may display a complex range of emotions. She stated helplessness is a reaction a dog may learn to exhibit when escape seems futile, and a passive physical reaction is one it learns to employ when it seeks to avoid further confrontation. In her opinion, from her reviewing of the videos, there is no way the dog would have understood the reason for its punishment. It didn't appear to know why it was being punished. Thus, the reaction. The dog seemed to have become conditioned to being passive.
28. Testifying about her observations of the dog while it was in foster care, she noted it was a picky eater. The dog played normally with the other dog on the premises, was not aggressive and appeared relaxed. It remained relaxed when she tested it with surprise handling and sudden hand motions, which indicated to her that the dog was fine when in a non-threatening environment.
29. In response to the Appellant's questions about why the dog exhibited signs of affection towards him and did not yelp in pain, she explained that the affectionate behaviours are not unusual, even in harsh circumstances, and dogs can exhibit distress in other ways. The dog, she explained, was suffering in the videos; it was in a negative state of mind.
30. In her written report, Dr. Ledger describes in detail the interactions of the dog and the Appellant, and the behaviors of the dog in response, which she concluded indicate the dog is experiencing distress through the interactions. She then listed the dog's behaviours when in the presence of people who have not caused it distress. The interactions include the dog:

- Being yanked by the scruff of the neck
- Being dropped along the ground by the scruff of the neck
- Being struck on the head
- Being leaned on by the male
- Having his front paw and leg twisted by the male.

She described the behaviours the dog displayed as:

- Flinching
- Avoidance/retreating
- A stiff, tense body
- Covering
- Leaning away from the male
- Ears back
- Tucked tail
- Avoiding eye contact with the male

She described the behaviours the dog displayed when in the presence of people who have not cause the dog distress as:

- No avoidance/retreating
- Active approach to the people
- A relaxed body posture
- No flinching when touched
- Swift compliance with obedience commands
- Ears forward and relaxed
- Relaxed tail
- Relaxed eyes
- Relaxed facial expression

31. She concluded in her report:

Blue is likely to experience anxiety and fear while in the presence of this male beyond these interactions, because of the suffering experienced while with this individual. (Exhibit 5, Tab 28, p.209)

#### APO Cassandra Meyers

32. Cassandra Meyers testified that she is an Animal Protection Officer (APO) for the SPCA and that, while she does not yet have the authority of a Special Provincial Constable, she does respond to complaints, issue Notices and will seek alternative measures in response to complaints as an outreach aspect of her job.

33. She reviewed the occasions on which she dealt with the Appellant and the dog:

- August 1, 2020, in response to a public complaint, she attended and spoke with the Appellant, noted the dog was underweight and provided supplies to assist him: food and a dog harness. She issued no Notice.

- August 19, 2020, stemming from a complaint about a dog in a crate appearing uncomfortable, she noted that the dog looked better.
34. There were other occasions when, even off-duty, she visited with and monitored the Appellant and the dog, sometimes providing them food.
  35. On August 5, 2021, she investigated a complaint of a dog being physically abused, looking skinny and undernourished. It was being pushed to the ground and being yelled at. She found the Appellant and the dog at the location described and spoke to the Appellant about the complaint. He denied the abuse but admitted to yelling. She did not issue a Notice but advised the Appellant to cease his harsh treatment of the dog and research positive reinforcing training methods for the dog.
  36. On August 28, 2021, she followed up on an August 25, 2021 complaint of an emaciated looking dog tied to grocery buggies, being struck with a closed fist and being urged to “mush.” She issued a Notice to the Appellant to cease harsh practices.
  37. In response to questions regarding the October 6, 2021 complaint and her review of the videos, she testified that, in her view, the actions of the Appellant were acts of abuse.
  38. In response to the panel’s question, her evidence was that in assisting with the execution of the warrant, the Appellant seemed to be “under the influence.” He was incoherent and unsteady.
  39. When asked why she had not issued Notices or acted on previous complaints, she explained that as most of the complaints were made anonymously and without knowing the names of the complainants, she could not take further action. She further stated that on the occasions when she gave the Appellant food, there was always food there, but the dog seemed to be a picky eater and appeared to be fed a low-quality diet.
  40. She agreed with the Appellant that she was well acquainted with him.

SPC Vanessa Hommel

41. SPC Hommel applied for and executed the Warrant on October 7, 2021, seizing the dog from the Appellant. This was her only occasion where she had direct contact with the Appellant, although she had seen him from time to time on the street in Abbotsford. Upon executing the Warrant, the Appellant was sitting in a chair, seemed disoriented, smelled of alcohol, and did not want, at first, to look at the Warrant. He denied abusing the dog. She testified that the time spent to execute the Warrant, seize the dog and leave the Property took only about five minutes.



42. In reviewing the videos prior to applying for the Warrant, she testified that the dog seemed conditioned to be passive through the depicted interactions.

#### Appellant's Witness SB

43. SB has stayed in the Appellant's camp and had some knowledge of the Appellant and the dog. He had been homeless too for three years at one point. He had witnessed the dog being treated well and had never seen it mistreated. The dog seemed happy and content. He had known the dog for about six months and usually saw the Appellant two to three times per week. He said he knew the dog had problems with feeding and eating at times. He felt the dog was good for the Appellant's mental health.

In response to questions by counsel, he said he had seen the videos and was shocked. He had noticed that the dog was skinny, but it did not appear to be suffering.

44. He testified that he is retired now and likes to help get people off the street. In again referring to the video, he said again that he was shocked. He felt that the Appellant was not being himself and he felt the Appellant would benefit from counselling.

#### Appellant Witness GR

45. GR owns a business adjacent to where the Appellant is camped. Prior to knowing the Appellant, he had phoned the SPCA to complain about the Appellant's camp. He was concerned about the location of the camp and the presence of a homeless man nearby. He changed his mind after visiting and getting to know the Appellant. He didn't see a problem with the relationship between the Appellant and the dog and the dog never appeared to be in danger.
46. On cross examination, GR stated that his complaints were mostly about wanting the Appellant to move, to the point of even suggesting the dog was being abused and appeared neglected. This was until he took it upon himself to get to know the Appellant a bit better. In response to further questioning about details of his complaints, he stated he could not recall those instances accurately. He said the Appellant and the dog have lived next to his shop since summer; he sees them five or six days/week. The Appellant told him of an incident where the Appellant struck his dog.

#### Appellant Witness SJM

47. SJM is an outreach worker who has helped the Appellant and the dog several times. She felt that the Appellant cared for the dog and always had the dog's best interest at heart. She felt the dog was being cared for and seemed happy.

48. She provides the Appellant rides up to two times/week for appointments. She had never heard or seen the dog being abused except for in the video.

### **Appellant Character References**

49. The Appellant submitted 11 letters of support from persons in the community who have assisted him with buying food, dog treats and helping with vet bills. Many of the supporters felt this was a one-off situation, accidental and unintended, and suggested that the Appellant should be given a second chance. They describe the Appellant as a loving owner and the dog as an essential companion; they see a strong bond between them and believe they should stay together. The authors of these emails were not available for cross examination.

## **VII. Analysis and Decision**

50. Part 2.1 of the *PCAA* establishes the standards of care for animals and establishes a duty on those responsible for the 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.

51. The first issue the Panel must consider is whether the Animal was in distress at the time of seizure. Depending on the answer to that question, the next issue is to decide whether it is in the best interests of the animal to be returned or whether doing so would return it to a situation of distress. The Panel has also proceeded on the basis that the Appellant has an onus to show, that the remedy sought (return of the Animal) is justified.

52. Section 1 (2) provides that 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.

## **VIII. Was the Animal in Distress?**

53. The Panel's analysis relies substantially on the evidence of the expert witness, Dr. Ledger, whose opinion, based on her review of the videos, clinical records and her own observations was that the dog demonstrated anxiety, fear, helplessness, physical discomfort, and pain. Dr. Ledger describes the dog having a learned response to harsh treatment and it experiences anxiety and fear while in the presence of the Appellant.
54. Dr. Ledger's conclusions about the ongoing nature of the harsh treatment are corroborated by the numerous complaints, over a period of a year or more, of a dog being physically abused and mistreated. These complaints were subsequently investigated by SPCA officers and despite the fact that many, if not most, were anonymously lodged, they describe the behaviours of a man and a dog fitting the description of the Appellant and the dog in question.
55. The evidence of Dr. Ledger is that the dog was in distress at the time of seizure. It was suffering at the hands of the Appellant in the videos and its apparent passive and helpless reaction was indicative of the type of reaction that a dog can learn to display over time when escape seems hopeless. The earlier complaints of anonymous witnesses reporting the dog being abused supports her opinion and assessment of this being likely behaviour learned from prior instances of harsh, if not abusive, treatment and not a one-off occurrence.
56. APO Meyers responded to some of the complaints and, upon speaking to the Appellant about the incidents, heard some measure of admission about the complained-about events but any mistreatment was denied. This adds a further measure of support that the reported events had occurred, at least to some degree, as described.
57. The Panel heard testimony from three witnesses testifying on the Appellant's behalf, one of whom felt the dog was good for the Appellant's mental health and had never seen the dog mistreated, but who also expressed shock at what they had seen in the video clips. Another didn't see a problem with the relationship between the dog and the Appellant. The dog never appeared to be in danger, he stated. The third witness, describing herself as a support worker, felt the dog was being cared for and seemed happy.

58. These views were shared by the authors of the 11 e-mails and letters of support from people sympathetic to the Appellant's circumstances and who wish to be helpful. None of these individuals witnessed the dog being abused. None can speak to the video from October 6, 2021, nor to any of the previously logged specific complaints of abuse. While these individuals provide supportive character references, with no witness able to speak to the specific events of October 6, 2021, the Panel finds that this is not a one-off situation and the supportive letters are unhelpful insofar as the decision I must make with respect to the best interests of the animal.
59. The Panel accepts the opinion evidence of the expert witness, supported by that of APO Meyers and SPC Hommel, that, as a result of prolonged mistreatment, the dog has become conditioned to be passive as depicted in the video interactions. On this basis, I find the animal was in distress at the time of seizure and was in pain and suffering, and as such, the seizure was justified.

## **IX. Return of the Animal**

60. Section 20.6 of the *PCAA* states:

20.6 On hearing an appeal in respect of an animal, the board may do one or more of the following:

- (a) Require the Society to return the animal to its owner or to the person from whom custody was taken, with or without conditions respecting
  - (i) The food, water, shelter, care or veterinary treatment to be provided to that animal, and
  - (ii) Any matter that the board considers necessary to maintain the well-being of that animal;
- (b) Permit the Society, in the Society's discretion, to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the animal;
- (c) 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).

61. Having heard and considered all the evidence, including the testimony of the Appellant and his supportive witnesses, this panel accepts that the Appellant feels a strong emotional, close bond with his dog. Nevertheless, this panel must make its decision based not on the emotional connections he has with the dog but on what is in the dog's best interest. This part of the decision has to do entirely with determining whether returning the dog to the Appellant would likely result in it being returned to a situation of distress.
62. The accumulation of public complaints and the harsh physical treatments observed and described supports the conclusions of Dr. Ledger that the kind of distress exhibited by the dog in the video clips was a learned defensive response to the suffering it had endured at the hands of the Appellant. These are responses learned over time.

63. The Appellant did not demonstrate any insight into how his conduct harmed his dog. In his testimony in this hearing, he minimized his conduct even when officers expressly required him to cease harsh treatment and research positive reinforcing training methods. He describes those who made anonymous complaints as being “full of shit” even though upon investigation, concerns were identified by the officers. Further, the Appellant tried to explain away and minimize his conduct on the video by stating that, because his dog was not yelping, it had not been hit forcefully.
64. I have concluded above that this is not a one-time incident. The history of complaints over a lengthy period suggests not only that physical abuse had previously occurred, but that it is very unlikely that the Appellant could or would change his behaviour. Further, I also note Dr, Ledger’s evidence of the marked difference in the dog’s behaviour while in foster care. Unlike the behaviour observed while in the Appellant’s presence, the dog was calm and relaxed in its interactions and did not flinch or demonstrate fear or anxiety.
65. To return the dog to the Appellant, in the absence of any recognition of the past harm he has caused and a viable plan to employ appropriate training techniques, would inevitably expose the dog to more of the same sort of suffering and distress.

**X. Order**

66. For the reasons outlined above, the Panel has decided to not return the dog to the Appellant and permits the Society, in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the dog.

**XI. Costs**

67. The Society incurred costs with respect to the seizure of the dog and is entitled to seek an Order relating to costs, whether or not the dog is returned to the Appellant. The Society's claim for costs of \$1,163.33, can be broken down as follows:
- a) Veterinary costs: \$297.68
  - b) SPCA time attending to seizure: \$136.95
  - c) Housing, feed and care for the dog: \$728.70
68. The Panel finds that the costs incurred by the Society are reasonable and the Appellant is liable for costs to the Society in the amount of \$1,163.33 as outlined above.

Dated at Victoria, British Columbia this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2021

**BRITISH COLUMBIA FARM INDUSTRY REVIEW BOARD**

**Per:**



---

Dennis Lapierre, Presiding Member

**APPENDIX "A" – Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Date (Received)</b>	<b>Received from</b>	<b>Document</b>
Exhibit 01	Nov 5, 2021	BCSPCA	BCSPCA no return decision – Harris Nov 5, 2021
Exhibit 02	Nov 9, 2021	Appellant	Harris Notice of Appeal (NOA)
Exhibit 03	Nov 15, 2021	BCFIRB	Harris v BCSPCA NOA Process Letter
Exhibit 04	Nov 24, 2021	BCSPCA	LT Appellant and FIRB serving document disclosure
Exhibit 05	Nov 24, 2021	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Document Disclosure – Tab 1-23
Exhibit 06	Nov 24, 2021	BCSPCA	Tab 10 – Comp Videos
Exhibit 07	Nov 24, 2021	BCSPCA	Tab 11 – Voicemail Message
Exhibit 08	Nov 24, 2021	BCSPCA	Tab 14 – Voicemail Message
Exhibit 09	Dec 3, 2021	BCFIRB	Email from BCFIRB stating appellant initial submissions not received
Exhibit 10	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	LT Appellant and BCFIRB encl submissions
Exhibit 11	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Submissions
Exhibit 12	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	Affidavit 1 of Shawn Eccles
Exhibit 13	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	Witness Contact Form
Exhibit 14	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	Expert Witness Contact Form
Exhibit 15	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	Updated BCSPCA Document Disclosure Index – Tab 1-24
Exhibit 16	Dec 3, 2021	BCSPCA	Tab 24
Exhibit 17	Dec 6, 2021	Appellant	Witness Contact Form 1 of 2

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Date (Received)</b>	<b>Received from</b>	<b>Document</b>
Exhibit 18	Dec 6, 2021	Appellant	Witness Contact form 2 of 2
Exhibit 19	Dec 7, 2021	BCFIRB	Harris v BCSPCA NOA Process letter – revised
Exhibit 20	Dec 8, 2021	BCFIRB	Email from BCFIRB confirming appellant Final Submission not received
Exhibit 21	Dec 9, 2021	BCSPCA	Blue IDEXX FDXGP (2) 19 Nov 21
Exhibit 22	Dec 13, 2021	Appellant	Email containing photos of Husky Owner's facebook group
Exhibit 23	Dec 13, 2021	Appellant	Photos of Husky breed information
Exhibit 24	Dec 13, 2021	Appellant	Email with request for veterinary care