

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  
FIVE CATS

**BETWEEN:**

MELISSA HOEKSTRA AND AMANDA SIMPSON

**APPELLANTS**

**AND:**

BRITISH COLUMBIA SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

**RESPONDENT**

**DECISION**

**APPEARANCES:**

For the British Columbia Farm Industry  
Review Board:

Dennis Lapierre, Presiding Member  
Neil Turner, Panel Member

For the Appellants:

Amanda Simpson

For the Respondent:

Christopher Rhone, Counsel

Date of Hearing:

October 5, 2022

Location of Hearing:

Teleconference

## **I. 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 five cats (the *Animals*) from the Appellants Melissa Hoekstra and Amanda Simpson at their campsite located in Cranbrook, BC (the *Property*).
2. The Appellants are appealing the September 1, 2022, review decision issued under s. 20.2(4)(b) of the *PCAA* by Marcie Moriarty, Chief Prevention and Enforcement Officer, of the British Columbia Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (the *Society*) in which she determined that the *Animals* would not be returned to the Appellants.
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 Appellants in this case are seeking the return of the *Animals*.
4. On October 5, 2022, a BCFIRB hearing panel (the *Panel*) held a hearing via teleconference. The hearing was recorded.
5. The Appellants were not represented by counsel. The Appellants called five witnesses: B.B., Melissa Hoekstra, T.E., T.L. and F.H.
6. The *Society* was represented by counsel and called four witnesses: Special Provincial Constable (SPC) Isabel Menzel, Dr. Eduard Partini, L.L. and G.G.

## **II. Decision Summary**

7. This appeal involves the seizure of the *Animals* from a tent situated at the Horseshoe Lake recreation area near Cranbrook, British Columbia, a campsite being occupied by the Appellants. For the reasons outlined in the following, the *Panel* has decided not to return the *Animals* to the Appellants and permits the *Society*, in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the *Animals*.

## **III. Preliminary Matters**

8. At the request of the *Society*, the *Panel* admitted veterinary records and an invoice relating to the examination of one of the *Animals* as late entry exhibits. The Appellants raised no objection to the additions.

#### **IV. Material Admitted on this Appeal**

9. The Panel identified all the documents received by BCFIRB in advance of the hearing as exhibits. The record comprises Exhibits 1-21 and is attached as Appendix A to this decision.

#### **V. History Leading to Seizure of Animals and the Day of Seizure**

10. On the morning of August 2, 2022, the Society received a complaint of several cats being kept for over 48 hours in a tent situated at the Horseshoe Lake campground without adequate food or water during a period of extreme (37-degree Celsius) summer heat. SPC Menzel visited the site that afternoon. Finding nobody home, she spoke to a person at a nearby campsite who verified the complaint. She then left a contact notice on the door of a travel trailer parked beside two tents, one of which contained at least one cat. The constable did notice food and water dishes in one of the tents.
11. On the morning of August 3, 2022, SPC Menzel heard from Melissa Hoekstra and, after outlining the complaint learned from her that the Animals were being left alone while she was at work, and that the Animals were able to stay cool by laying under the cots in the tent.
12. That afternoon SPC Menzel visited the site and spoke to Amanda Simpson and learned that she and Ms. Hoekstra were homeless and had been staying at the site since May 2022. Ms. Simpson did not allow SPC Menzel access to the tent to inspect the Animals, but SPC Menzel could see fresh food and water in the tent and saw three of the Animals, which were obese, but otherwise appeared to be healthy. She then took two temperature readings using an infrared thermometer of the inside of the tent, getting air temperature readings of 45 degrees Celsius above the cots and 43 degrees Celsius below the cots. She offered to provide compassionate care for the Animals. Ms. Simpson refused the offer.
13. SPC Menzel then issued a notice which gave Ms. Simpson and Ms. Hoekstra 5 days to make shelter improvements, and to provide the Animals opportunity for exercise and more space from each other.
14. On the morning of August 9, 2022, having not heard back from the Appellants, SPC Menzel visited the campsite, found nobody home, noted the outside temperature at 29 degrees, and saw that an extra tarp had been placed over one of the tents. Speaking then to other nearby campsite occupants, she heard their similar observations about the daytime temperatures, their concerns about the Animals being confined in the extreme heat, and the unsanitary conditions in which the Animals were being kept.
15. That afternoon, after reviewing her concerns with a veterinarian, SPC Menzel obtained and executed a warrant and seized the Animals.

## **VI. Review Decision**

16. On September 1, 2022, Ms. Moriarty issued her review decision in which she outlined her reasons for not returning the Animals to the Appellants (the “Review Decision”). She reviewed the Signed Warrant, Information to Obtain Warrant (ITO), BCSPCA Notice, Inspection Follow-up Details (IFD), Veterinary Records and various photographs and various email submissions from the Appellants. Ms. Moriarty was satisfied, based on the evidence, that the SPC reasonably formed the opinion that the Animals were in distress, as defined in section 1(2) of the PCAA, and her action to take custody of the Animals to relieve them of distress was appropriate. Ms. Moriarty further determined that it would not be in the Animals best interests to be returned to the Appellants.

## **VII. Key Facts and Evidence**

17. In an appeal under the *PCAA*, the Panel must determine whether the Animals were in distress when seized and if they should be returned to the Appellants. Below 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 Testimony

18. Ms. Simpson testified that the Animals were not in distress, that there was nothing wrong with them, and that they had not been left alone. She admitted, they were left alone for periods of time of approximately 6 or 8 hours at a time, but not for 48 hours.
19. Ms. Simpson agreed that some of the Animals were obese. She didn’t think any of the Animals had dental issues with the exception of one that had broken a tooth trying to escape from the cage the Society had put it into during the seizure. She didn’t think the tents were too hot because the campsite was situated near the mountains, unlike nearby Cranbrook where the temperatures were higher. She took issue with the temperature readings taken by SPC Menzel, stating they were taken of air temperatures closer to the top of the tent. She felt that the Animals were doing fine in the tent on August 3, but with respect to the 27-degree limit SPC Menzel had outlined, while she didn’t agree, she did put a silver-coloured tarp over the tent to try to accommodate the direction provided by SPC Menzel.
20. Concerning the Animals’ history, Ms. Simpson testified that they had been spayed and neutered and given shots in 2018 in Ontario and were last seen a year ago by a veterinarian in Caroline, Alberta. She stated that she had refused the compassionate care offered by SPC Menzel because she and Ms. Hoekstra were looking for a travel trailer to live in. She testified that she has harnesses for the

Animals and takes them outside for a walk every other day for an hour or so. She also stated that the Animals have room to withdraw from each other and that the concern raised by SPC Menzel with respect to providing the Animals with appropriate space wasn't a problem. She noted that the cats slept together.

Appellant Witnesses:

21. All of the Appellants' witnesses briefly answered the same following three questions asked by Ms. Simpson: Were the Animals ever neglected or showing signs of distress? Should the Animals be returned? Were the Animals cared for?

B.B.

22. B.B. testified that he is a resident of Cranbrook, owns a cat, and offered the opinion that cats tolerate a temperature of 45 degrees Celsius quite well. He noted that one of his cats has travelled in his truck with him in those temperatures and that the cat has reached 22 years of age. His evidence was that he doesn't live at the campsite but had been out to the Property a few times. He helped install the tarp that was put over the tent. In his opinion, the Animals were showing no signs of distress and looked well fed, happy, and looked after. He felt the Animals were not neglected and should be returned.

Melissa Hoekstra

23. The co-Appellant, Melissa Hoekstra, gave some history of the Animals. She noted that the Animals were born feral and sometimes she had to fight with them to take them to a veterinarian. She stated that they were well looked after, never neglected, and were never in distress. She stated that the Animals give her comfort and are under her blankets at night.
24. Ms. Hoekstra stated that the tents were not too hot and that she was in the tent dealing with a migraine headache for 2 weeks in August but was not there when SPC Menzel visited. Addressing photographs taken of the inside of the tents, one of which showed contents on the floor in disarray, Ms. Hoekstra stated that the photographed tent was for storage and that the cots were in the other tent.

T.E.

25. T.E., a resident of Dublin, Ontario testified that the Animals were all healthy, were not neglected, and were cared for. He stated that he has been buying the Animals' food and had paid the veterinary bills in Ontario for the Animals to be fixed. With respect to the Animals' weight, he stated that the Animals were also fat when he knew them in Ontario.

T.L.

26. T.L., a resident of Woodstock, Ontario testified that the Animals were being cared for, were showing no signs of distress and should be returned. Her evidence was that these were friendly feral cats and should only be with one person. She stated that she has not been to British Columbia and last saw the Animals about a year ago in Ontario.

F.H.

27. F.H. testified that she is a parks operator who looks after three parks in the East Kootenay region but does not look after the Horseshoe Lake campsite. She testified having had 3 interactions with the Appellants at all 3 of the park sites and had never seen signs of distress in the Animals. She noted that the Animals appeared spoiled and, in her view, should be returned. She stated that she had seen them once in harnesses.

Respondent Witnesses:

SPC Isabel Menzel

28. SPC Menzel reiterated much of what is outlined in the history of this decision. On August 2, 2022 she received a call from L.L. about the Animals being left alone inside a tent. As a result, she visited the Horseshoe Lake campsite and, finding nobody home, left a contact notice. She explained that she was quite concerned about the Animals because of the heat of that day. It was 37 degrees Celsius. The next morning (August 3) she spoke with Ms. Hoekstra and arranged to meet with her daughter, Amanda Simpson, that afternoon at the campsite. Ms. Hoekstra's response to SPC Menzel during this conversation was that the Animals were not in distress, that they were not dying and that they could stay under the cots to stay cool.
29. SPC Menzel testified that, having arrived at the site that afternoon, she saw three obese cats and took air temperature readings inside the tent that housed the Animals. She obtained a reading of 45 degrees Celsius above the sleeping cots and 43 degrees Celsius beneath the cots. She then issued a Notice to Ms. Simpson, giving her 5 days to rectify the situation. She instructed the Appellants to provide shelter for the Animals that ensured protection from heat, cold and dampness appropriate to the protective outer coat and condition of the animal. She further instructed the Appellants to provide opportunity for periodic exercise to maintain good health, including opportunity to be unfettered to a fixed area. Finally, she instructed the Appellants to provide the Animals placed in group housing the opportunity to withdraw from each other.
30. The Notice Comments included reference to the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association temperature tolerance ideal for cats, not to exceed 27 degrees.

SPC Menzel understood that the Animals had been confined for some time and needed the opportunity for exercise. She also noted that from what she saw, the Animals didn't have adequate space to withdraw from each other.

31. Returning late morning on August 9, SPC Menzel noted that the outside temperature was 29 degrees Celsius. She saw that the trailer had been moved and that a tarp had been put over the tent, but she was concerned that the cover wasn't adequate to address the concern with respect to the heat.
32. Arriving at 8:00 pm that day to execute the warrant, she noted that the temperature inside the tent was 27 degrees Celsius.
33. Responding to questioning by Ms. Simpson about the health and appearance of the Animals, SPC Menzel reiterated her view that 3 of the Animals looked obese. She stated that she hadn't inspected their mouths. She reiterated her view that the Animals' distress was not a result of having a lack of food but as a result of their living conditions.

L.L.

34. L.L. testified that she runs a voluntary rescue for dogs and cats. She stated that she had been contacted July 31, 2022 by someone at the Horseshoe Lake campground and had understood that the Animals had been left unattended for 48 hours. She went to the camp that day.
35. The Appellants showed up shortly after L.L. arrived, around 9:00 pm, at which time Ms. Hoekstra let her look inside the tent where the Animals were being kept. There was food and water inside the tent, but the food was dried out and the water was warm.
36. L.L. testified that she spoke to Ms. Hoekstra, informing her that it was too hot for the Animals to be kept inside and that the tent stunk. She stated that she kept in touch with the campsite neighbors who also hadn't seen the Animals outside and were similarly concerned about them. She described Horseshoe Lake as being an unsupervised campsite with open food and cans left on tables, and without garbage disposal. L.L. was concerned that food being left around would attract predators.
37. Responding to Ms. Simpson's questions regarding the health of the Animals, L.L. stated that the Animals were overheated and that they were being kept in a confined area, which exuded a stench which would also cause them to be in distress. She stated that she had no idea about the Animal's dental health but that the two that she had picked up were obese.

G.G.

38. G.G. is a retiree who had been camping and visiting at the campground since July 16. Her campsite was right across the roadway from the Appellants' campsite. The Appellants were already camped there when she arrived.
39. G.G. described the Appellants' camp as looking deserted, but when she went over for a look, saw two cats in one of the tents. Because it looked deserted and because the weather was hot, she contacted the RCMP, who referred her to the Forestry department.
40. G.G. was eventually put in contact with the rescue lady, L.L. to whom she reported her concerns. G.G. watched the interaction with L.L. and the Appellants. She stated that the following day the Appellants left and that she didn't see them again for 48 hours.
41. She testified seeing the appellants only infrequently. They came home at night once in a while. She stated she was relieved to learn the Animals had been seized. She added that she had never seen the Animals being taken for walks, that the Animals never left the tent, and that despite the tarp, the sun still struck the side of the tent in the afternoon.
42. Responding to Ms. Simpson's questions, G.G. stated she didn't consider offering to help. She noted that after having watched the confrontation that took place between L.L. and Ms. Hoekstra, she preferred to keep her distance.

Dr. Eduard Partini

43. The Panel qualified Dr. Partini as an expert witness in veterinary medicine. He operates the K.L.O. Veterinary Hospital in Kelowna, British Columbia and has been a veterinarian since 1999.
44. Dr. Partini's stated that that he examined four of the Animals (Minners, Munchkin, Oreo, and Tigger) seized by the Society and performed dental surgery on Minners.
45. Dr. Partini explained that Minners was suffering from an immune response to a lesion on a tooth. He had to extract seven of Minners' teeth. Munchkin exhibited a similar tooth lesion however it resisted being examined.
46. Tigger exhibited a grade 2 degree of dental disease (the grades ranging from 1-4). Its teeth needed cleaning and polishing. Dr. Partini described Tigger as being obese. He stated that 27 degrees Celsius was the ideal temperature in which to keep cats if they are not overweight.
47. Responding to questions from Ms. Simpson, Dr. Partini described some of the Animals as being morbidly overweight and showing signs of both tooth and joint



discomfort as a result of tooth issues and being overweight. He noted that Oreo was the heaviest cat he had ever seen in his practice as a veterinarian and that it weighed over 30 lbs.

48. In response to a Panel question about why a cat would become overweight, Dr. Partini explained that, like humans, a cat can develop behaviours such as overeating in order to cope with its circumstances. He further noted that obese cats will suffer from overheating more than a normal-weight cat.
49. With respect to a Panel question about whether the tooth issues the Animals were suffering would be obvious to a lay person he stated it should have been for one cat, Minners, as Minners had halitosis (bad breath) which should have informed the Appellants that something was wrong.

### **VIII. Analysis and Decision**

50. As outlined at the outset of this hearing, the Panel is tasked with addressing two primary issues:
  - Were the Animals in distress at the time of the seizure?
  - Is it in the best interest of the Animals for the Society to return them to the Appellant's care?
51. 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.

52. 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.

53. We have also proceeded on the basis that the Appellants have an onus to show, that the remedy they seek (return of the Animals) is justified. The first issue to consider is whether the Animals were in distress at the time of seizure. Depending on the answer to that question, the next issue is to decide whether to return the Animals or whether doing so would return the animals to a situation of distress.

### **Distress**

54. The Appellants argue that the Animals were not in distress and should be returned to their care. The evidence, however, is that the Animals were confined for periods of time of up to 48 hours over several days in a tent during very hot weather while the Appellants were away.

55. Under such circumstances, the inside temperatures of the tent were as high as 45 degrees Celsius, a temperature well beyond the ideal temperature for cats. The high temperatures were recorded using an infra-red device by SPC Menzel. The periods of the Animals’ confinement were confirmed by other campsite residents with whom SPC Menzel spoke as well as by G.G. at the hearing of this Appeal.

56. At Ms. Simpson’s own admission, the Animals were left confined in a tent for 6-8 hours at a time while she and Ms. Hoekstra were at work. There is little evidence, beyond that from Ms. Simpson, who testified that she put the cats in harnesses every second day and took them for a walk, that the cats were being relieved of their daytime heat stress.

57. While the Appellant’s note that they placed a tarp over the tent to reduce the daytime temperatures, this was not sufficient in the view of SPC Menzel, to address the concern with respect to the Animals’ overheated living conditions. According to witness testimony, the afternoon sun still was directly striking one side of the tent such that the tent would have continued to overheat during the course of the day.

58. The evidence provided by Dr. Partini was that some of the Animals were morbidly obese, with one of them (Minners) suffering dental disease that required the extraction of 7 teeth. Two of the others similarly had dental issues.

59. With respect to the Animals' weight issues, Dr. Partini drew a comparison to humans who develop such conditions as a result of stress. He also outlined that the ideal temperature environment for cats as being 27 degrees which was much lower than the temperature measured inside the tent as noted above.
60. L.L. described the tent in which she saw five confined cats as exuding a stench significant enough that she considered it likely to cause the Animals to be in distress.
61. The witnesses that the Appellant's called in support of their case were largely unhelpful. Two of the witnesses attended the hearing by phone from Ontario and while they spoke favourably about what they knew of the Animals and the care the Animals were given, their views were based on past circumstances occurring elsewhere.
62. The Appellant's third witness, F.H., appeared to have interacted only briefly with the Appellants and could only offer that the Animals appeared to be healthy.
63. The Appellant's fourth witness, B.B., gave testimony that was more supportive and was based on his own experience with cats and his having visited the Appellants' campsite. However, his opinion on the temperatures that a cat can tolerate are well beyond of the limits defined by Dr. Partini and by the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association.
64. In conclusion, the Panel accepts the evidence of SPC Menzel, Dr. Partini, L.L. and G.G., and finds that the Animals were in distress at the time of seizure. While the testimony of G.G. was somewhat problematic in terms of the accuracy of her recollections about when and over what span of time she made her observations, the Panel nonetheless finds her testimony credible and supportive of the evidence of SPC Menzel and the others with whom SPC Menzel spoke.

## **XI. Return of the Animals**

65. In *Eliason v SPCA, 2004 BCSC 1773* Mr. Justice Groberman stated:

“The scheme of the Act clearly is designed to allow the Society to take steps to prevent suffering of animals, and also to allow owners of animals to retrieve them, or have the animals returned to them, if they are able to satisfy the Society that the animals will be taken care of.”
66. In *Brown v BCSPCA, [1999] B.C.J. No.1464 (S.C.)*, the court explained:

“The goal and purpose of the Act is explicit in its title. It would be unreasonable, in my view, to interpret the Act as the 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 to its owner's care”.

67. In seeking the return of the Animals, Ms. Simpson argued her belief that the Animals were being well cared for at the time of the seizure. However, her submissions centered on the importance of the Animals to her and not on any evidence that would demonstrate her ability to better care for them if they were returned. She noted that she misses the Animals and that she is attached to them. She offered nothing about meeting the Animals' needs or what changes she would make to improve their health or circumstances.
68. Ms. Simpson noted that the Animals were examined and apparently in good health when examined by a veterinarian in Caroline, Alberta a year prior to the seizure, however that information is of little evidentiary value to the Panel in this Appeal. It isn't sufficient for the Appellants to simply provide a telephone number of that veterinarian. The onus is on the Appellant to produce such evidence in the hearing and not for the Panel to investigate and find that evidence, if it exists, on their behalf.
69. While we appreciate the Appellants' emotional connections to the Animals, this Panel must make its decision based on the Animals' best interests. In the Panel's view, the needs of the Animals were not being met and they were suffering from inadequate care due to their overheated living conditions and their lack of veterinarian care, in particular with respect to their dental health. The Animals were in distress at the time of the seizure and there is no relevant evidence before the Panel that returning the Animals to the Appellants won't simply result in returning them to a situation of distress.

## **XI. Costs**

70. 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.

71. 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)".

72. The Society is seeking costs as follows:	
(a) Veterinary costs:	\$1,328.67
(b) SPCA time to attend seizure:	\$273.90
(c) Housing, feeding and caring for the Animal:	\$2,763.45
(d) Minners Dental Work:	<u>\$1057.98</u>
(e) Total:	\$5,858.64

73. 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 the Animal. The calculation of these estimates has been reviewed and supported in previous appeals. The Appellants made no submissions on cost.

**XI. Order**

74. The Panel orders that pursuant to Section 20.6 of the PCAA, that the Society is permitted in its discretion to destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of the Animals.

75. The Panel finds the Appellant is liable to the Society for costs of care of the Animals in the amount of \$5,857.98 this being part of the veterinary costs incurred by the Society as well as part of the costs associated with the seizure, housing, care and feeding of the Animals.

Dated at Victoria, British Columbia this 19<sup>th</sup> day of October 2022.

**BRITISH COLUMBIA FARM INDUSTRY REVIEW BOARD**

**Per:**




---

Dennis Lapierre, Presiding Member




---

Neil Turner, Member

## Appendix "A"

Exhibit #	Date (Received)	Received from	Document
Exhibit #1	September 1, 2022	BCSPCA	Hoekstra & Simpson Decision Letter - September 1, 2022
Exhibit #2	September 7, 2022	Appellants	Hoekstra & Simpson NOA
Exhibit #3	September 7, 2022	BCFIRB	Hoekstra & Simpson v BCSPCA P2211 - NOA Process letter
Exhibit #4	September 15, 2022	BCSPCA	LT appellants and BCFIRB encl doc disclosure
Exhibit #5	September 15, 2022	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Document Disclosure [Tab 1-Tab 23]
Exhibit #6	September 22, 2022	Appellants	Appellant Appeal Letter
Exhibit #7	September 22, 2022	Appellants	Appellant Photos
Exhibit #8	September 22, 2022	Appellants	Appellant Witness Contact Form
Exhibit #9	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	LT all encl submissions
Exhibit #10	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	Written Submissions of the BC SPCA (revised)
Exhibit #11	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	Affidavit 1 of Marcie Moriarty
Exhibit #12	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Witness Contact Forms
Exhibit #13	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	Tab 24-Tab 27

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Date (Received)</b>	<b>Received from</b>	<b>Document</b>
Exhibit #14	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	Updated BCSPCA Document Disclosure Index (Tab 1-Tab 27)
Exhibit #15	September 27, 2022	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Complete Document Disclosure (Tab 1-Tab 27)
Exhibit #16	September 29, 2022	BCSPCA	BCSPCA Expert Witness Contact Form
Exhibit #17	September 29, 2022	Appellants	Email – Appellant Witness Added
Exhibit #18	October 3, 2022	Appellants	Appellants’ Final Submissions - Our Evidence
Exhibit #19	October 3, 2022	Appellants	Email – Appellant Veterinarian History
Exhibit #20	October 5, 2022	BCSPCA	Veterinary Record for Minners
Exhibit #21	October 5, 2022	BCSPCA	Minners 55355 Dental Invoice