

CITATION: Judson Howie LLP et al v. Blackwell, 2025 ONSC 6689
COURT FILE NO.: CV-25-0028-00
DATE: 2025-11-28

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:)
)
JUDSON HOWIE LLP, DOUGLAS) *P. Howie*, for the Applicants
JUDSON, and PETER HOWIE)
)
)
Applicants)
)
- and -)
)
)
PETER SCOTT BLACKWELL) *Self-Represented*
)
)
)
Respondent)
)
)
) **HEARD:** November 20, 2025,
) at Thunder Bay, Ontario

2025 ONSC 6689 (CanLII)

Justice W.D. Newton R.S.J.

Reasons on Application

Overview

[1] This is an application brought by Judson Howie LLP, Douglas Judson, and Peter Howie (“Judson Howie”) for a permanent injunction requiring Peter Scott Blackwell (“Mr. Blackwell”)

to remove certain defamatory publications made “on-line” regarding the applicants and prohibiting Mr. Blackwell from publishing any further defamatory material about the applicants.

[2] This application was first heard on October 23, 2025, and adjourned at Mr. Blackwell’s request. I set a return date of November 20, 2025 before me and directed that Mr. Blackwell was to file responding material by November 13, 2025.

[3] On November 20, 2025, I made an order by endorsement granting the permanent injunction with reasons to follow.

[4] These are my reasons.

The Facts

[5] Judson Howie LLP is a law firm. Douglas Judson and Peter Howie are the named partners of the firm. This summary of facts is taken from the affidavit of one of the applicants, Douglas Judson.

The CATIE Lawsuit

[6] In 2024, Judson Howie was retained by the Canadian Aids Treatment Information Exchange (“CATIE”) and certain individuals who were either employees, or past or current board members of CATIE. These parties sought to (1) sue Mr. Blackwell for defamation damages; (2) seek a permanent injunction directing the removal of all defamatory material published “on-line” by Mr. Blackwell about CATIE and the individuals; and (3) prohibit any further defamatory publications.

[7] McVey J. of the Superior Court of Justice in Ottawa validated service of the statement of claim on Mr. Blackwell. After Mr. Blackwell was noted in default, the CATIE plaintiffs moved for default judgment and McVey J. awarded \$1.75 million in damages and granted the permanent injunction.¹ The reasons identified Douglas Judson and Peter Howie as counsel for the plaintiffs.

The Posts on *The Daily* and X

[8] After the reasons of McVey J were released, posts appeared on a website called *The Daily*. On August 23, 2025, an article entitled “Douglas Judson and Catie’s Shameful Crusade: Bullying Communities and Pushing Taxpayer Funded Filth” appeared on the website. It contained a photograph of Mr. Judson with the words “Things Doug Likes to Defend” and a headline from the National Post referring to “inappropriate sexual handouts to children”. The article also states that “critics assert” that Judson Howie “employed deceptive tactics” to secure the judgement against Mr. Blackwell and describes the conduct as “either gross incompetence or deliberate manipulation”.

[9] On August 28, 2025, another article appeared on *The Daily* with a picture of Mr. Judson and Mr. Howie with the headline: “Taxpayer Funder Filth: Nonprofits’ Perverted Material Plague Schools, Punish Whistleblower”. The article references the CATIE defamation judgment.

[10] Also, commencing August 21, 2025, a similar campaign was commenced on X (formerly *Twitter*) from an account called @VoteCanadaCom which is associated with *The Daily* website. An *Instagram* account with the same name is associated with Scottie Blackwell.

¹ *Canadian Aids Treatment Information Exchange et al. v. Blackwell*, 2025 ONSC 4678.

[11] Over one hundred posts have been made on X about Mr. Judson. The post on August 21, 2025, has an image of Mr. Judson and a heading of “Judson’s Fairy Tales” with images of two “drag” performers. Mr. Judson deposed that the imagery is “plainly intended to be homophobic”. Other posts associate Mr. Judson, Mr. Howie, and their firm, with images from cards depicting or suggesting sexual acts generated by the AIDS Committee of Toronto for harm reduction. Mr. Judson deposes that these posts are to cast the applicants as sexual deviants. Other posts assert that Mr. Judson sent someone to Mr. Blackwell’s workplace to assault him or that he has lied to the court.

[12] Many of the posts were directed to the Treasurer of the Law Society, Peter Wardle, and to Benchers (the governing body of the Law Society) of the Law Society.

[13] The applicants assert that Mr. Blackwell is the publisher of these posts. This is based on:

- a. Mr. Blackwell’s admission in an X post on the @VoteCanadaCom site on August 28, 2025 that he, “Peter Scott Blackwell” is the person bringing attention to these issues;
- b. the striking similarity between *The Daily* website and the X account
- c. the name associated with the *Instagram* account; and
- d. the fact that these posts began shortly after the release of the CATIE judgments.

First Appearance – October 23, 2025

[14] Prior to the hearing of the application on October 23, 2025, Mr. Blackwell filed with the Registrar a motion made without notice seeking orders:

- a. adjourning the motion or extending time for the respondent to file responding material;

-
- b. allowing the respondent additional time to obtain legal representation;
 - c. allowing the respondent to serve the applicants by email to Mr. Judson's email;
 - d. permitting service by email pursuant to r. 16.04(1)(b) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*; and
 - e. providing reasonable accommodation due the respondent's disabilities and address-to-justice barriers.

[15] In his affidavit, Mr. Blackwell admits that he was served with the application on October 3, 2025, but did not realize until later that this was a new application. He believed the material he received was related to the CATIE lawsuit and judgment. Due to this misunderstanding, his inability to retain counsel, and what he described as his “developmental learning disabilities and neurodivergence”, Mr. Blackwell sought more time to file responding material and to obtain a lawyer.

[16] Notwithstanding that Mr. Blackwell's motion and affidavit was not served on the applicants, I directed the Registrar to accept this material. Over the objections of the applicants, I granted an adjournment to November 20, 2025, and directed that Mr. Blackwell was to serve any responding material by November 13, 2025. The adjournment was granted on the interim, without prejudice, term that Mr. Blackwell shall immediately cease any further defamatory or harassing publishing, whether online or otherwise, about or depicting the applicants until further order of this court.

This Appearance - November 20, 2025

[17] On November 13 and 14, 2025 Mr. Blackwell delivered:

- a. an incomplete Fee Waiver Request to Court;

-
- b. a Notice of Appearance in this Application;
 - c. an affidavit of Peter Scott Blackwell under oath in this Application;
 - d. a Notice of Motion to set aside the CATIE judgment from the Superior Court of Justice in Ottawa;
 - e. an affidavit of Peter Scott Blackwell in support of the motion to set aside the CATIE judgment;
 - f. an affidavit from Joan Teresa Askew in this application and in support of the motion to set aside the CATIE judgment; and
 - g. an affidavit of service with respect to the above noted material.

[18] Notwithstanding that the Fee Waiver documentation was incomplete, I directed the Registrar to accept the documents so this matter could be dealt with on November 20, 2025.

[19] In his affidavits, Mr. Blackwell set out his developmental and learning disabilities and his financial circumstances.

[20] He stated:

5. My original posts online were a reaction to learning that the 'Sex from A-to-Z' cards, created by Caitie and Intended for harm-reduction education, were distributed in a way that resulted in the cards ending up in the hands of minors. I was shocked and upset when I learned this, and my reaction was rooted in concern about inappropriate material being accessed by children. I did not intend to harass anyone, and I did not understand the legal implications of expressing my concerns online. [Emphasis added.]

[21] Similarly, in his oral submissions to me, Mr. Blackwell did not dispute that he made the impugned postings about the applicants.

[22] While he deposed that he would abide by the terms of the injunction, he asked that the “contempt application” be adjourned until his motion to set aside the default judgment was heard.

[23] Ms. Askew’s affidavit sets out her understanding of Mr. Blackwell’s circumstances.

[24] The material filed by, or behalf of Mr. Blackwell, demonstrates an understanding of the legal process, the issues, and the ability to put his position before the court.

Positions of the Parties

[25] The applicants seek to have their application for injunctive relief heard. The applicants submit that the postings are defamatory and in reprisal to the applicants acting for CATIE.

[26] Mr. Blackwell asks that this application be adjourned until his application to set aside the CATIE judgment is heard. Mr. Blackwell understood that his motion to set aside the default judgment must be brought and heard in Ottawa which is where the judgment originated.

[27] I note that Mr. Blackwell appeared with a support person, Ms. Duggan, without objection from the applicants.

Analysis and Disposition

[28] I accept that Mr. Blackwell thought this was a motion for contempt, but he now understands that this an application seeking the removal of posts concerning the applicants and a prohibition against any such further postings.

[29] After hearing submissions from both parties, I directed that the proposed draft order granting the injunctive relief was to issue, subject to an amendment clarifying that all posts were to be removed before November 25, 2025, deleting the reference to a “Reply Record” which I did not accept, and fixing costs against Mr. Blackwell at a very modest amount of \$500.

[30] I am satisfied that the posts were defamatory in the sense that the postings would tend to lower the applicants' reputation in the eyes of a reasonable person, that the posts were about the applicants, were published by Mr. Blackwell, and were in reprisal to the applicant's acting for CATIE.²

[31] The attacks upon the applicants are both personal and professional, and not directly related to Mr. Blackwell's attempt to have the CATIE judgment set aside. This motion should not be adjourned to await the outcome of that motion.

[32] A permanent injunction is appropriate in these circumstances given what I would characterize as the relentless attacks upon the applicants who are lawyers, and whose reputations were attacked because they represented a client.

“Original signed by”
The Hon. Mr. Justice W.D. Newton, R.S.J.

Released: November 28, 2025

² Following the elements of defamation outlined in *Grant v. Torstar Corp.*, 2009 SCC 61, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 640, at para. 28.

CITATION: Judson Howie LLP et al v. Blackwell, 2025 ONSC 6689
COURT FILE NO.: CV-25-0028-00
DATE: 2025-11-28

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

B E T W E E N:

Judson Howie LLP et al

Applicant

- and -

Peter Scott Blackwell

Respondent

REASONS ON APPLICATION

Newton J.

Released: November 28, 2025