

CITATION: Latif v. Kwinter, 2025 ONSC 7019
DIVISIONAL COURT FILE NO.: 662/25 ML
DATE: 20251217

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
DIVISIONAL COURT**

RE: NEMATULLAH LATIF, Moving Party

AND:

ALFRED M. KWINTER ET AL, Responding Parties

BEFORE: D.L. Corbett, Faieta and LeMay JJ.

COUNSEL: *Nematullah Latif*, Self-Represented

Jame Pedro, for the Responding Parties

HEARD: In-writing

ENDORSEMENT

[1] At the direction of the panel, the Registrar asked the Moving Party to ensure his materials were in Case Centre, since none of his materials had been uploaded when the panel initially sought to review this motion. The Moving Party wrote to the court expressing concern about this request, since his materials had already been provided to the court, and this had been confirmed in an endorsement from a case management judge.

[2] It is a normal and ordinary part of court operations that materials may not reach the panel hearing a matter, and it is for the panel to address this when it arises. The panel may request assistance from the parties to ensure that the panel has all the necessary materials before rendering its decision, and it is expected that parties will cooperate with any such request made by the panel. In this instance, once the court heard back from the Moving Party, staff was directed to make the motion materials available in Case Centre, following which the panel reviewed the motion materials before rendering this decision.

[3] The Moving Party asks this court to “set aside” the decision of Papageorgiou J. dated July 22, 2025 (unreported).

[4] Papageorgiou J.’s decision is interlocutory (declining to schedule appeals of interlocutory decisions of Associate Justices). There is no appeal from this interlocutory decision without leave from this court. Rather than dismissing the motion as misconceived, we have treated it as a motion for leave to appeal.

[5] Leave to appeal the decision of Papageorgiou J. dated July 22, 2025 (unreported), is denied, without costs. We note, for the benefit of the Moving Party, that this court does not provide reasons for its decisions denying or granting leave to appeal.

[6] The Moving Party also asks this court for leave to appeal four decisions of Associate Justices. Those proposed appeals were in the jurisdiction of a single judge of the Superior Court of Justice, and not the Divisional Court, and they were disposed of by Papageorgiou J. in her decision. There are no further appeal proceedings available in respect to those decisions.

“D.L. Corbett J.”

“Faieta J.”

“LeMay J.”

Released: December 17, 2025