

# COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

CITATION: Watt v. Health Professions Appeal and Review Board, 2026 ONCA  
355

DATE: 20260514

DOCKET: COA-26-OM-0112

Roberts, Monahan and Wilson JJ.A.

BETWEEN

Dr. Andrew JL Watt

Applicant (Moving Party)

and

Health Professions Appeal and Review Board

Respondent (Responding Party)

Andrew Watt, acting in person

David P. Jacobs and Steven G. Bosnick, for the responding party

Heard: in writing

Determination pursuant to r. 2.1 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, with respect to a motion for leave to appeal the order of Justice Shaun O'Brien of the Divisional Court dated February 2, 2026.

## REASONS FOR DECISION

[1] The applicant seeks leave to appeal (the "Motion for Leave") an order of O'Brien J. of the Divisional Court denying him permission to proceed with an application for judicial review (the "Application for Judicial Review"). O'Brien J. also

denied the applicant permission to bring a motion (the “Motion”) seeking an appointment with the Chief Justice of Ontario to discuss, amongst other things, consolidating various claims and proceedings he is attempting to pursue before various courts and tribunals.

[2] The applicant was required to seek leave to proceed with these matters pursuant to the order of Corbett J. in *Watt v. Health Professions Appeal and Review Board*, 2024 ONSC 5980, requiring that the applicant receive written permission of a judge to commence or continue legal proceedings in the Superior Court of Justice (including the Divisional Court and the Small Claims Court). Corbett J. issued that order on the basis that the applicant had engaged in a series of proceedings that did not appear to be grounded in objective reality and were on their face frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process.

[3] O’Brien J. denied the applicant permission to proceed with the Application for Judicial Review and the Motion for several reasons, including that the applicant’s claims were nonsensical and had no foundation in any evidence or in law.

[4] The Motion for Leave appears on its face to be frivolous and vexatious. It makes bald allegations of alleged wrongdoing by O’Brien J. or other judges who may have adjudicated or otherwise been involved in prior proceedings brought by the applicant. The applicant further alleges “gross negligence” in the execution of

the Divisional Court's duty to administer justice in Ontario with regard to his litigation. He seeks an order from the Chief Justice of Ontario that the RCMP White Collar Crimes unit investigate the Health Professions Appeal and Review Board and the College of Physicians and Surgeons with regard to healthcare fraud and regulatory fraud and lay criminal charges where appropriate.

[5] Accordingly, this court gave notice to the applicant that it was considering making an order staying or dismissing the Motion for Leave as frivolous or vexatious or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court pursuant to r. 2.1 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194. The court also imposed a stay under s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 pending the determination of the r. 2.1 review.

[6] The Applicant responded by directing the Registrar of the court not to proceed with the r. 2.1 process until the court had responded to his prior request for the appointment of an appeal management judge in respect of his Motion for Leave.

[7] In response to this submission, the Applicant was advised that, because the Court had initiated a stay under s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act* pending determination of the r. 2.1 review, his request for case management would not be considered until a determination had been made on that review.

[8] Having considered the Motion for Leave, as well as the underlying litigation to which it relates, it is obvious that the proceeding is on its face frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process. The Applicant makes bare, unsupported allegations of criminal wrongdoing involving judges and administrative tribunals. He also seeks orders or declarations from the Chief Justice that have no legal or evidentiary basis. He seemingly wishes to relitigate matters that have been the subject of various court orders, which he has unsuccessfully appealed.

[9] Therefore, in accordance with r. 2.1.02, we dismiss the Motion for Leave on the basis that the proceeding is frivolous, vexatious and an abuse of process of the court. We also dismiss the applicant's request for case management, and make an order under r. 2.1.02(3) prohibiting the applicant from making any further motions in this proceeding without leave of a justice of this court.

"L.B. Roberts J.A."  
"P.J. Monahan J.A."  
"D.A. Wilson J.A."