

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *Djuric v. Evans*,  
2026 BCSC 49

Date: 20260114  
Docket: E98315  
Registry: Nanaimo

2026 BCSC 49 (CanLI)

Between:

**Zeljko Djuric**

Claimant

And:

**Lori Christine Evans**

Respondent

Before: The Honourable Justice Young

## **Reasons for Judgment**

Counsel for the Claimant:

B. R. Vining

The Respondent Appearing in Person:

L. C. Evans

Place and Date of Hearing:

Nanaimo, B.C.  
December 15, 2025

Place and Date of Judgment:

Nanaimo, B.C.  
January 14, 2026

[1] On November 6, 2025, the respondent filed a notice of application seeking the following financial disclosure:

- a) full personal and corporate financial disclosure of the claimant including T1 general tax returns (2020–2025), all T-slips, CRA notices of assessment; corporate ledgers, partnership agreements, and all personal and business bank statements; all financial records for Asturia Aquaculture Inc., Asturia Crayfish Consulting Ltd. and Asturia Stone Masonry, and corporate assets.
- b) Disclosure of all business and corporate funding application submitted by or on behalf of Asturia Aquaculture Inc. or the claimant including the BC Fast Pilot Program Expression of Interest (April 18, 2023) and the ABAM Multi-Tier Federal Industrial Funding Application (“YOS” Project) with all supporting documentation, images and drone aerial video footage of the site and all Asturia Aquaculture Inc. facilities.
- c) Disclosure of all international property holdings, assets and income including but not limited to the Trebinje Estate and any Zabica properties in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- d) An order to vary or set aside the April 24, 2024 (filed May 16, 2024) consent order on the basis of material nondisclosure of corporate and international assets by the claimant during mediation and settlement drafting.
- e) Disclosure of all government or industry project funding, grants, or benefits received by the claimant or associated corporations (2020–2025) including CRA, WCB, BCF MA, IR AP, PI CFI, and Innovative BC programs.
- f) Ongoing financial disclosure by the claimant to be made annually by May 30 each year until further order of this Honourable Court.

- g) Income imputation of the claimant at \$72,800–\$99,840 per annum pending full and complete disclosure.
- h) Immediate production of complete business ledgers, invoices and reconciliations for all active companies under the claimant’s ownership or direction.
- i) An order declaring that the respondent Lori Christine Evans has fulfilled all disclosure of financial obligations under the *Family Law Act* and prior consent orders.
- j) An order authorizing the registry to refer any ongoing non-compliance by the claimant to a Judicial Case Manager for direction and potential sanctions under Rule 21-7 of the *Supreme Court Family Rules*.
- k) An order granting costs to the respondent for the claimant’s prolonged non-compliance and procedural obstruction as such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may deem just and appropriate in the circumstances.

[2] The parties were in a common-law relationship from December 20, 2012 to May 2023. They have one child, and they share parenting of that child on a week-on week-off basis.

[3] The respondent works at Vancouver Island University where she is a university professor teaching nursing. Her regular annual income from 2020–2022 was approximately \$100,000 a year. Her income reduced while she was on disability benefits totaling approximately \$70,000 per year.

[4] The claimant worked throughout the relationship as a stonemason and in a self-employed capacity in the industry of crayfish farming through a company called Asturia Aquaculture Inc. The claimant says that despite his best efforts the crayfish farming business was unsuccessful.

[5] On May 16, 2024, the parties entered into a final consent order settling issues including parenting and property division. An order was made with respect to spousal support and child support.

[6] Now, over a year later, the respondent says that the April 24, 2024 final agreement was based on incomplete financial disclosure from the claimant. The claimant did not provide full personal or corporate financial documents, nor did he disclose his international property interests despite those assets forming part of his financial holdings.

[7] The respondent submits that the claimant continues to operate his corporations while representing himself publicly as CEO of Asturia Aquaculture Inc. I note that in an email dated June 27, 2025, the claimant's partner Odd Grydeland holds himself out as president of Asturia Aquaculture Inc.

[8] The claimant has produced proof that other proprietorships, namely, Asturia Aquaculture Crayfish Consulting and Asturia Masonry, were dissolved January 1, 2024.

[9] The respondent submits that the claimant operates as an independently employed master stonemason. The claimant did have a job doing stone mason work for a landscaping company and was injured at work and has been receiving WCB wage loss benefits since May of 2023.

[10] The respondent submits that the claimant is an international crayfish aquaculture expert and that he maintains an online presence, partnerships and industry relationships under these titles.

[11] The respondent also alleges the claimant holds undisclosed property interests in Bosnia and Herzegovina and possibly additional family holdings in Zabica.

[12] The respondent submits that the claimant has received or attempted to receive public funding through Astoria Aquaculture Inc. On April 18, 2023, the claimant and Asturia Aquaculture Inc. submitted an expression of interest for the

BC Fast Pilot Program for \$200,000 in funding with letters of support from Canadian aquaculture experts and agencies demonstrating active and ongoing corporate activities. The claimant does not deny this. The funding was received and was used in an attempt to develop the aquaculture business but for reasons described by his partner the business has failed.

[13] The claimant filed Form F8 financial statements on November 27, 2025; July 15, 2025; January 12, 2024; and July 20, 2023 attaching his personal income tax returns for 2022, 2023 and 2024. In his January 12, 2024 financial statement he attached income tax return summaries for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 all showing very modest personal income under minimum wage income level.

[14] He also attached a record of employment from Living Stone Interlocking Brick Inc. showing his employment earnings for 2023 totaling \$21,835.34.

[15] In 2023 the claimant swore an affidavit explaining his employment and self-employment history. He was born in Yugoslavia which is now Bosnia. He received a bachelor's degree in 1985. After graduating from university, he started his own business in aquaculture selling crayfish to local merchants in Dubrovnik, Croatia. He had a partner in the aquaculture business and continued to operate with a partner until 1991 when the war began in Yugoslavia.

[16] He landed in St. John's, Newfoundland in 1996 thinking he would start his crayfish business there. That is where he met Dr. Stephen Goddart who was an expert in crustaceans. He recommended that the claimant take his skills to the West Coast of Canada. He set up a crayfish aquaculture farm north of Duncan, British Columbia in 1997.

[17] The claimant deposes that in 2013 he met his partner Odd Grydeland and incorporated a company called Asturia Aquaculture Inc. 2014.

[18] In a previous Affidavit #4 filed January 12, 2024, the claimant describes the difficulty he and Mr. Grydeland had with the Malahat First Nation Band who closed

their property and denied the claimant and Mr. Grydeland further attendance to conduct a profitable business. The claimant deposes that he has not been making any money from that business. He has told the respondent this, but the respondent insists on receiving information about the company despite the fact that the company is not operating.

[19] The respondent alleges that Asturia Aquaculture Inc. was worth \$1 million and that the claimant had three licenses worth \$3 million. Mr. Grydeland deposes in his 2024 affidavit that none of this is true and that he and the claimant were simply out of luck as far as the Bamberton project with the Malahat First Nation was concerned. All of this information was provided to the respondent and her counsel prior to the final order being entered into on May 16, 2024.

[20] In the settlement agreement the parties agreed to impute income of \$32,000 based on minimum wage for the claimant.

[21] The claimant deposes that there are no corporate financial documents because the company had not filed corporate financial statements because the company made no income for a number of years. The respondent continues to demand corporate records even though she has been advised on numerous occasions that the three companies are not operating and have no income. The claimant's only source of income is WCB payments.

[22] The respondent submits that the claimant has not disclosed his international property interests. The claimant deposes he has no international property interests. The claimant's father died intestate in November 2000 and his sister has power of attorney over his father's affairs. Prior to his death his father made his sister and he promise that on his death his oldest son Dusan Djuric would receive his house. His sister has been working with the civil authorities in Trebinje to achieve this. In short, the claimant has no interest in his father's home and no other form of property.

[23] On January 12, 2024, Mr. Odd Grydeland swore an affidavit deposing that he had been involved with the business with the claimant. They incorporated Asturia

Aquaculture Inc. in September 2014. The claimant owns 70% of the shares and he owns 30% of the shares. The company was incorporated to generate crayfish production. They entered into a partnership agreement between Malahat First Nation and Malahat investment Corporation. He assisted in applying for funding through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and they were able to obtain three separate sets of funding estimated at approximately \$220,600. These monies were utilized for equipment to set up the facility and to pay administrative costs to Malahat Investment Corporation. He attached copies of the agreements they entered into. He attached a schedule of how those monies were used between 2015 and 2023.

[24] Mr. Grydeland deposed that he was informed by the claimant that the claimant had a business interest on Mount Sicker Road near Duncan however he did not own the land. The owner of the land decided he no longer wanted to have a crayfish operation on the property. That crayfish equipment was moved to the Bamberton property. Mr. Grydeland deposes that the license the claimant had for the Mount Sicker Road enterprise is useless to him as it is tied to property that he no longer has access to.

[25] The claimant and Mr. Grydeland planned on harvesting crayfish from the lake on the top of the Malahat where the claimant has successfully harvested crayfish before. The crayfish would then be put in the tanks on the Bamberton property in preparation for marketing. Unfortunately, they discovered small mouth bass have been put in the lake and they apparently ate all the crayfish.

[26] In November 2021 Malahat Investment Corporation advised that they wanted \$3,500 a month rent from Asturia Aquaculture Inc. to use the Malahat land. They could not afford to make these payments and had trouble with people coming onto the facility and causing harm to their water supply.

[27] Mr. Grydeland deposes that there is now no ability to draw any income from the facility as the Malahat First Nation and Malahat Investment Corp. have control over the land where the facilities are located.

[28] Mr. Grydeland acknowledges that the claimant does have three licenses. One license was at the Mount Sicker Road property where the claimant has no access, and the others are for the facility at Bamberton property which are worthless because they are not welcome on the property. Mr. Grydeland deposes that Asturia Aquaculture Inc. is not worth anything now other than the value of the pick-up truck he bought for the company and that the claimant is now driving.

[29] On June 27, 2025, Mr. Grydeland responded to a request from the claimant's counsel for further financial disclosure. In that email he said due to minimal financial activity and having no taxable income or resources the last financial statement (drafts) for Asturia Aquaculture Inc. were produced for the 2014/2015 tax year. He notified CRA of the reasons for not submitting T2 returns on December 13, 2019. Nil remittances have been submitted as required.

[30] After reading the correspondence between the respondent and claimant's counsel attached to Affidavit #2 of the claimant, I get the distinct impression that this application for further disclosure is fuelled by the claimant's request for confirmation of the respondent's income now that she has returned to full-time work at VIU. Her increase in income will result in an increase in the spousal support payable by her to the claimant. She has resisted disclosure of her income after repeated requests. On the day this application was heard she filed a financial statement which did not attach any paystubs showing what her current income is.

[31] Rather than providing her own financial disclosure the respondent has chosen to apply for historical financial disclosure from the claimant despite the evidence provided by the claimant that the financial disclosure she requests does not exist.

[32] I am not satisfied on the evidence before me that the financial disclosure demanded by the claimant exists. It is apparent that the claimant and Mr. Grydeland have not given up on Asturia Aquaculture Inc. and still hold themselves out to be CEO and president of that company. I assume they are intending to pursue future ventures if possible. If Asturia Aquaculture Inc. does generate income the claimant will have to disclose this income.

[33] It is reasonable to request the claimant to produce proof of any job-search activity he is engaged in now that his WCB benefits are about to end. If he does obtain employment, he will of course have to disclose that change of circumstance. The consent order of May 16, 2025, requires both parties to keep each other updated as to any change in income so that support can be recalculated.

**Orders**

[34] I dismiss the application sought in the respondent's November 6, 2025, notice of application at paras. 1 and 2 as I do not find a material non-disclosure of corporate and international assets by the claimant.

[35] For the same reason, I dismiss the application at para. 4 of the respondent's notice of application seeking to set aside the April 24, 2024 consent order which was filed May 16, 2024.

[36] I dismiss the application at para. 5 for disclosure of all government or industry project funding grants or benefits. This has been disclosed and I am not aware of any new grants or project funding.

[37] The ongoing financial disclosure from the claimant asked for at para. 6 of the respondent's notice of application is unnecessary as this term is already contained in para. 26 of the consent order of April 24, 2024, so this application is dismissed.

[38] I decline to impute \$72,800.02–\$99,840 per annum to the claimant pending complete disclosure as sought by the respondent at para. 7. Disclosure has been provided and there is no credible evidence that this high an income should be imputed at this time.

[39] I dismiss the order sought by the respondent at para. 8 of her notice of application. The demand is far too broad and vague to respond to. The claimant is not entitled to historic business ledgers and invoices and reconciliations which have nothing to do with the claimant's current income.

[40] I dismiss the order sought by the respondent at para. 9 of her notice of application. The respondent has not fulfilled disclosure of financial obligations under the *Family Law Act* and in fact she has withheld relevant information about what her current income is. I order the respondent to produce pay stubs for the last three months showing her year-to-date income within seven days of the release of this order.

[41] Para. 10 is dismissed as it is nonsensical.

[42] I order the claimant to provide proof of his efforts to find employment in the past three months.

[43] I award costs against the respondent for bringing this unnecessary application. Costs are fixed at \$2,500 payable forthwith.

“B. M. Young, J.”  
The Honourable Justice Young