

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:)
)
Bridgepoint Financial Services Limited) *S. Libin*, for the Applicant
Partnership 1)
)
)
Applicant)
)
- and -)
)
)
Rudolf Steinberg) *Self-Represented*
)
)
)
Respondent)
)
)
)
HEARD: In writing
)

Mr. Justice S.J. Wojciechowski

Request for Adjournment of Application Hearing

[1] On Friday, November 28, 2025, an email was sent at 11:07 a.m. from Jakob Steinberg on behalf of the respondent, Rudolf Steinberg (“the Respondent”), requesting the adjournment of an application scheduled to be heard on Thursday, December 4, 2025 and Friday, December 5, 2025.

[2] Jakob Steinberg’s initial email was sent to the Registrar, stating that the basis for the adjournment request was that the Respondent had not yet received his complete client file from

his former counsel, and that without this file the Respondent was unable to prepare responding materials for use in the application.

[3] In addition, Jakob Steinberg maintained that the applicant, BridgePoint Financial Services Limited Partnership I (“BridgePoint”) had only recently served its factum, and the Respondent needed time to respond.

[4] In responding to this request, I made sure that all parties – including those who had been granted standing - received a copy of Jakob Steinberg’s email, and requested Jakob Steinberg provide a detailed explanation for the request for adjournment, including details of attempts to obtain the documents which were required for the application. In addition, by copy to all counsel, I requested the positions of all parties to the adjournment request.

[5] After receiving submissions from all parties, I determined that the application would proceed as scheduled, and that the request for an adjournment would not be granted, with reasons to follow.

[6] These are those reasons.

[7] The background to this matter includes a 2011 motor vehicle accident in which the Respondent was injured, and a settlement of his accident benefits claim in March 2022.

[8] In the process of advancing the motor vehicle litigation, the Respondent obtained a litigation loan from BridgePoint. In attempting to recover payment of that litigation loan, BridgePoint commenced an application dated December 17, 2024 against the Respondent. The application and supporting affidavits were served upon the Respondent on December 16, 2024.

[9] This matter was extensively case managed throughout 2024 and early 2025 by both Justice Warkentin and myself. In February 2025 I directed the Respondent to file responding materials by March 7, 2025, and a Factum by May 9, 2025. At the case management hearing when these timelines were established, legal counsel appeared in order to assist the Respondent, and while not yet retained to fully represent the Respondent, clearly the Respondent was provided with legal assistance with this matter at that time. To date, no materials have been filed by the Respondent.

[10] Other parties sought to participate in the application, and in response to a motion brought January 9, 2025, Mark Stoiko, Masgras Law and Pamela Adderley were granted standing.

[11] BridgePoint served its factum on April 25, 2025. Mark Stoiko and Masgras Law served their factums on May 16, 2025. Pamela Adderley served her factum on May 22, 2025.

[12] In scheduling the date for the application hearing to proceed, the Respondent originally requested an accommodation such that the hearing of the application only proceed in the afternoon. The Respondent indicated that due to injuries sustained in the motor vehicle accident, mornings were not good for him, and if forced to participate in a full day hearing, he would not have the stamina to do so. As such, the hearing for the application was originally scheduled to proceed during the afternoons of June 4 and 6, 2025.

[13] Issues arose from parties other than the Respondent with respect to the application such that it did not proceed on June 4 and 6, 2025. In making efforts to secure alternate dates, the parties worked together to find dates in October 2025. However, the Respondent advised the court that he was unavailable to attend in October 2025, and sought dates in December 2025.

[14] The application dates were accordingly scheduled for hearing during the afternoons of December 4 and 5, 2025.

[15] On November 27, 2025, BridgePoint did serve and file a revised factum in support of its position. However, this revised factum only provided revisions to counsel names and references to Case Center citations. The factum served in November 2025 was essentially the same factum as was served upon the Respondent in April 2025.

[16] Within this background, in response to my request for detailed submissions supporting the adjournment request, Jakob Steinberg made additional submissions including the following:

- a. The Respondent is catastrophically impaired, cognitively and physically, and cannot independently read, process or understand legal materials;
- b. He does not have legal representation;
- c. He does not have his original client file relating to his tort and AB claim arising from his 2011 motor vehicle accident;
- d. Jakob Steinberg only became involved in on November 27 in an effort to assist the Respondent with this matter;
- e. BridgePoint's factum was updated, and thus is new, which does not provide the Respondent with enough time to process and understand; and
- f. It would be unfair to the Respondent if this matter proceeds since he cannot meaningfully prepare for the hearing.

[17] In reviewing the submissions of Jakob Steinberg, I finally note his candid admission that he only advanced a formal request for a copy of the Respondent's legal file on November 27, 2025.

[18] This matter has been ongoing for several years, and specifically with respect to the pending application of BridgePoint since December 2024. At no time during this period of time did the

Respondent indicate that he required accommodations other than a later-in-the-day start time. To suggest at this point in time an adjournment is required to accommodate a request for documents which was made on November 27, 2025 – less than a week ago – is unreasonable. This would be prejudicial to the other parties involved in this litigation who are all prepared to proceed. The Respondent participated in the process of setting up the dates of December 4 and 5, 2025 – on at least two separate occasions – and there was no suggestion made to me that he was unable to participate in this litigation process once morning attendances were not scheduled.

[19] Finally, the Respondent did have the assistance of legal counsel in February 2025, who did not take any issue with the original June 2025 dates which were set to hear the application. And in the process of rescheduling the June 2025 dates to December 2025, the Respondent was able to voice his unavailability in October 2025 and instead request – and obtain – the dates of December 4, and 5, 2025 to address BridgePoint’s application.

[20] There is nothing new in the recent version of the factum filed by BridgePoint other than the inclusion of additional references making the factum easier to access, and therefore there cannot be any prejudice to the Respondent in proceeding with a hearing based upon a document he has possessed since April 2024.

[21] The application of BridgePoint will proceed as scheduled on Thursday, December 4, 2025 commencing at 1:00 p.m., and on Friday, December 5, 2025 commencing at 2:00 p.m..

“Original signed by”
The Hon. Justice S.J. Wojciechowski

Released: December 2, 2025

CITATION: Bridgepoint Financial Services Limited v. Steinberg, 2025 ONSC 6756
COURT FILE NO.: CV-24-0476-00
DATE: 2025-12-02

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

B E T W E E N:

Bridgepoint Financial Services Limited
Partnership 1

Applicant

- and -

Rudolf Steinberg

Respondent

**REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT OF
APPLICATION HEARING**

Wojciechowski J.

Released: December 2, 2025