



COURT OF APPEAL OF YUKON

**Court of Appeal of Yukon
Practice Directive (Civil & Criminal)**

Title: Guidelines for Protecting Privacy Interests in Reasons for Judgment

Issued: 18 May 2017

Effective: 01 June 2017

**Cite as: *Guidelines for Protecting Privacy Interests in Reasons for Judgment*
(Civil & Criminal Practice Directive, 01 June 2017)**

1. The principle of open justice is a cornerstone of our judicial system. There are, however, times when the privacy interests of a litigant outweigh the public interest of open justice.
2. The need to protect the privacy of participants in the judicial system has led to statutory and common law restrictions on publication of certain facts or information. Where such restrictions apply, commercial case law reporters have traditionally assumed the task of editing reasons for decision before publication to ensure compliance with the law.
3. Publication of decisions by the courts over the internet has raised new privacy issues that must be addressed by the courts and the judges. Decisions involving family law matters are particularly sensitive. Courts in Canada have developed different solutions for protecting the privacy of the parties and others involved in such litigation. Some courts do not publish family law decisions at all; others publish only headnotes, using initials; while others publish the decisions with full names.
4. This Court will continue to use full names in family law judgments, except where otherwise precluded by law, with the recommendation that judges be encouraged to edit their decisions by including in the decision only personal information which is relevant to the decision being made. While the preparation of reasons for judgment is a discretionary matter and unique to each judge, some guidance can be provided to assist in the task. Four main objectives have been identified for each judge to consider when preparing reasons for judgment:
 - a) Full compliance with the law;
 - b) Openness of the judicial system;

- c) Privacy interests of the litigant;
 - d) Cogency of the reasons for judgment;
5. In addition to these principles, the following considerations may also be helpful in editing decisions for privacy concerns:
- a) The presence of personal data (e.g. address, account numbers) and personal acquaintances' information (e.g. personal data of parents, workplace, school) in a decision represents a high risk of violating privacy concerns;
 - b) With respect to cogency of the reasons for decision, specific factual information (names of communities, accused persons or persons acting in an official capacity) tends to have little or no legal relevance in and of itself, while general factual information (age, occupation, judicial district of residence) tends to be relevant;
 - c) The presence of general factual information in a decision tends to represent a low risk of identification of a person if personal data (e.g. name, address) and personal acquaintances have been removed.
 - d) As indicated, each judge is independent and has complete discretion in preparing their reasons for judgment. These items are presented for guidance purposes only.



The Honourable Chief Justice Bauman
for the Court of Appeal of Yukon

History:

This is a new practice directive.