

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

CITATION: Louie v. Han, 2026 ONCA 404

DATE: 20260608

DOCKET: M57014 & COA-25-CV-1054

Huscroft, Dawe and Wilson JJ.A.

BETWEEN

Laetitia Louie

Applicant  
(Appellant/Moving Party)

and

Isaac Han a.k.a. Chung-Hing Isaac Han

Respondent  
(Respondent/Responding Party)

AND BETWEEN

Isaac Han

Applicant  
(Respondent/Responding Party)

and

Laetitia Louie

Respondent  
(Appellant/Moving Party)

Laetitia Louie, acting in person

Jamie Sanderson and Jason Allingham, for the respondent/responding party

Heard and rendered orally: June 4, 2026

On appeal from the judgment of Justice Loretta P. Merritt of the Superior Court of Justice, dated July 2, 2025.

### REASONS FOR DECISION

[1] The appellant has several applications for leave to appeal pending in the Divisional Court. Her intention was to obtain leave and then consolidate those appeals with the one matter that is properly before this court, pursuant to s. 6(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43.

[2] Justice Paciocco outlined the process involved in his motion decision of January 15, 2026: *Louie v. Han*, 2026 ONCA 25, at paras. 9-12. Despite this, the appellant has not obtained leave from the Divisional Court since that date. In the absence of appeals properly before that court there are no appeals to be consolidated with the matter properly before this court.

[3] The respondent says that the issue properly before this court – a purchase money resulting trust – has no bearing on the Divisional Court matters and can be resolved without prejudice to the appellant.

[4] We agree. Accordingly, the motion for directions is dismissed.

[5] The appellant appeals the decision of the application judge awarding the respondent a 50 percent beneficial interest in a townhouse that was purchased in June of 2010. She argues that the application judge erred in finding that the

respondent made the down payment and denies that he made any contributions towards the mortgage payments.

[6] We do not accept these submissions. The application judge correctly identified how a resulting trust arises and found on the evidence that it was the parties' intention from the outset that they would own the townhouse jointly. The application judge's conclusion that the \$68,000 down payment was paid by the respondent and her finding that he contributed at least 50 percent of the mortgage payments and the carrying costs of the townhouse is amply supported in the evidentiary record.

[7] Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

[8] Costs to the respondent are fixed in the sum of \$20,698.59, all inclusive, payable by the appellant.

"Grant Huscroft J.A."  
"J. Dawe J.A."  
"D.A. Wilson J.A."