

# The Rise of AI-Hallucinated Case Law in Canadian Courts and Tribunals

2026 CanLII Docs 738

Tom Macintosh Zheng

2026-03-27

---

## About the author

Tom Macintosh Zheng is a former commercial litigator licensed in Ontario and England & Wales. He is the co-founder of Courtready.ca, which provides practical tools and legal education for Canadians navigating the justice system. Tom is the 2026 recipient of the Ontario Bar Association Foundation Award, which recognizes exceptional contributions to the improvement of the justice system through public legal education, innovative research, or other means. He can be reached at tom@courtready.ca.

The author gratefully acknowledges the Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII) for making Canadian court and tribunal decisions freely available to the public. This study would not have been possible without CanLII's commitment to open access to legal information.

## 1 Summary

---

Large language models generate text by predicting the most probable next word in a sequence.<sup>1</sup> When prompted for case law references, these tools may produce text that *resembles* a citation: a plausible party name, a realistic court abbreviation, and a convincing year. The result is a fictitious citation that is indistinguishable in form from a real one.

This study presents the findings of a systematic review of decisions published on CanLII from January 1, 2024, to March 26, 2026. The review identified 132 decisions issued by 44 different courts and tribunals in six provinces and the federal jurisdiction. In each decision, the court or adjudicator flagged a party submitting at least one fictitious citation (i.e., a case that does not exist) as real authority. In 96 of those 132 decisions, the court

---

<sup>1</sup> Law Society of Manitoba, *Generative Artificial Intelligence: Guidelines for Use in the Practice of Law* (April 2024) at 1, online (pdf): Law Society of Manitoba <https://educationcentre.lawsociety.mb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/04/Generative-Artificial-Intelligence-Guidelines-for-Use-in-the-Practice-of-Law.pdf>.

or tribunal found or presumed that artificial intelligence (“AI”) tools generated the fictitious citations. In the remaining 36 decisions, the adjudicator identified the citations as non-existent but made no definitive finding regarding the use of AI.

The figures reported in this study represent a conservative floor, not a ceiling. The methodology captures only those cases where an adjudicator detected and remarked upon a fictitious citation in a published decision. For every fictitious citation that a court catches, others may pass through undetected. Decisions that are not published on CanLII, or that do not use language captured by the search methodology, fall outside the scope of this review.

## **2 Methodology**

---

The author conducted manual, targeted keyword searches of decisions published on CanLII across all Canadian jurisdictions. The search terms were designed to capture judicial language indicating that a cited authority could not be verified, located, or identified as a real decision. A separate set of searches targeted decisions that explicitly discussed the use of artificial intelligence tools in legal proceedings.<sup>2</sup>

Each decision responsive to the search terms was reviewed individually and manually to confirm the presence of fictitious citations. Where a fictitious citation was confirmed, the following data were extracted directly from the decision: the fictitious citation, the decision in which it appeared, the court or tribunal, the date, and whether the adjudicator attributed the citation to the use of AI. The confirmed decisions and their extracted data are published in a live database, updated weekly.<sup>3</sup>

## **3 Findings by Jurisdiction**

---

The 132 decisions span six provinces and the federal jurisdiction. Ontario accounts for the largest number of decisions, followed by British Columbia, the federal jurisdiction,

---

<sup>2</sup> The author does not publish the exact search strings to preserve the integrity of the ongoing monitoring process.

<sup>3</sup> The live database is maintained at [courtreedy.ca/fictitious-citations-in-canadian-courts](https://courtreedy.ca/fictitious-citations-in-canadian-courts).

Quebec, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and New Brunswick. The following subsections present the findings for each jurisdiction, organized by volume.

The study also found 15 decisions where the court or the adjudicator warned a party about or noted potential or actual AI misuse, but the underlying issue does not involve fictitious citations.<sup>4</sup>

### 3.1 Ontario

---

Ontario produced the highest number of decisions in the dataset, with 39 decisions across 12 courts and tribunals: the Superior Court of Justice,<sup>5</sup> the Commercial List,<sup>6</sup> the Court of Appeal,<sup>7</sup> the Court of Justice,<sup>8</sup> the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario,<sup>9</sup> the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Kapahi Real Estate Inc. v. Elite Real Estate Club of Toronto Inc.*, 2026 ONSC 1438 at [para 24](#); *Kennedy v. Condominium Authority of Ontario*, 2026 HRTO 299 at [para 21](#); *Zeng v Zuo*, 2026 BCSC 188 at [para 100](#); *RSR Road Surface Recycling v Bonnechere Excavating et al.*, 2026 ONSC 698 at [para 39](#); *Labourers' International Union of North America, Local 1059 v 519 London Excavating Inc.*, 2026 CanLII 8474 (ON LRB) at [para 13](#); *Waddell (Re)*, 2026 ONSC 387 at [para 68](#); *Riley Pollard v UNIFOR Local 324*, 2026 CanLII 1037 (ON LRB) at [para 12](#); *Chaudhary v. Genest*, 2025 HRTO 3121 at [para 26](#); *Nelligan O'Brien Payne v Amy French*, 2025 TMOB 261 at [para 25](#); *Ren v. Area 09*, 2025 BCPAAB 20253891 at [para 7](#); *Ren v. Area 09*, 2025 BCPAAB 20251941 at [para 6](#); *Re X Corp.*, 2025 BCCRT 1228 at [para 45](#); *Shakori v Tern*, 2025 ONLTB 31233 at [para 62](#); *Lozano González c. Roberge*, 2025 QCTAL 15786 at [para 7](#); *Tweten (Re)*, 2024 ABSRA 3193 at [para 30](#).

<sup>5</sup> *Re Nicholson*, 2025 ONSC 1069 at [para 145](#) [\*]; *Ko v. Li*, 2025 ONSC 2766 at [para 10](#); *Ko v. Li*, 2025 ONSC 2965 at [para 14](#); *Attorney General v. \$32,000 in Canadian Currency*, 2025 ONSC 3414 at [para 50](#) [\*]; *Halton (Regional Municipality) v. Rewa et al.*, 2025 ONSC 4503 at [para 46](#); *X.L. v. Z.L. et al*, 2025 ONSC 5880 at [para 91](#); *Ko v. Li*, 2025 ONSC 6785 at [para 7](#); *X.L. v. Z.L. et al*, 2026 ONSC 347 at [para 59](#); *Gu v Fogler Rubinoff*, 2026 ONSC 466 at [para 24](#); *Garrick v Halton Police Board*, 2026 ONSC 802 at [para 29](#);

<sup>6</sup> *The Vancor Group Inc. v. 2744364 Ontario Limited et al*, 2025 ONSC 5925 at [para 22](#); *Wang, Fengxi (Re)*, 2025 ONSC 6707 at [para 35](#); *Re Gary Man Kin Ng*, 2026 ONSC 1418 at [para 14](#).

<sup>7</sup> *Stile Carpentry Ltd. v. 2004424 Ontario Inc.*, 2025 ONCA 669 at [para 8](#) [\*].

<sup>8</sup> *R. v. Chand*, 2025 ONCJ 282 at [para 5](#) [\*].

<sup>9</sup> *Lakhanpal v. Avis Budget Group Inc.*, 2025 HRTO 1410 at [para 12](#) [\*]; *MacEachern-Flatt v. University Health Network*, 2025 HRTO 2125 at [para 18](#) [\*]; *Visca v. Halton District School Board*, 2025 HRTO 2547 at [para 9](#) [\*]; *O.K. v. Southern Ontario Secondary Schools Association*, 2025 HRTO 2715 at [para 34](#) [\*]; *Wang v. Mongeon*, 2025 HRTO 2859 at [para 11](#); *Walker v. Collingwood General and Marine Hospital*, 2025 HRTO 2874 at [para 54](#) [\*]; *Vance v. Ontario (Provincial Police)*, 2026 HRTO 273 at [para 13](#) [\*]; *Maruta v. Mahon*, 2026 HRTO 356 at [para 17](#); *Asey v. The Association of Justice Counsel*, 2026 HRTO 367 at [para 6](#).

Landlord and Tenant Board,<sup>10</sup> the Condominium Authority Tribunal,<sup>11</sup> the Labour Relations Board,<sup>12</sup> the License Appeal Tribunal,<sup>13</sup> the Law Society Tribunal,<sup>14</sup> the Capital Markets Tribunal,<sup>15</sup> and the Animal Care Review Board.<sup>16</sup>

## 3.2 British Columbia

---

British Columbia accounted for 35 decisions across nine courts and tribunals: the Civil Resolution Tribunal,<sup>17</sup> the Supreme Court,<sup>18</sup> the Court of Appeal,<sup>19</sup> the Human Rights

<sup>10</sup> *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited*, 2025 ONLTB 52666 at [para 15](#); *1000831699 Ontario Inc v Lodhi*, 2025 ONLTB 78871 at [para 13](#).

<sup>11</sup> *Dhuruvasangary v. Toronto Standard Condominium Corporation No. 1532*, 2025 ONCAT 115 at [para 17](#) [\*]; *Balogun v. Wentworth Standard Condominium Corporation No. 382*, 2025 ONCAT 207 at [para 3](#); *Vasina v. York Condominium Corporation No. 486*, 2026 ONCAT 3 at [para 6](#); *Pellegrino v. York Condominium Corporation No. 486*, 2026 ONCAT 5 at [para 20](#) [\*]; *Salah v. Peel Condominium Corporation No. 168*, 2026 ONCAT 53 at [para 7](#).

<sup>12</sup> *Noura Ahmed v Troy Powell*, 2025 CanLII 62624 (ON LRB) at [para 25](#) [\*]; *Alana Kotler v Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation*, 2025 CanLII 96840 (ON LRB) at [para 19](#).

<sup>13</sup> *Babbar v. Tarion Warranty Corporation*, 2025 CanLII 111710 (ON LAT) at [para 15](#) [\*]; *Larry and Kari Myers v. Tarion Warranty Corporation*, 2025 CanLII 86528 (ON LAT) at [para 7](#).

<sup>14</sup> *Mazaheri v Law Society of Ontario*, 2025 ONLSTH 186 at [para 9](#); *Mazaheri v Law Society of Ontario*, 2026 ONLSTH 33 at [para 61](#).

<sup>15</sup> *Internet Sciences Inc v CNSX Markets Inc*, 2025 ONCMT 17 at [para 7](#) [\*].

<sup>16</sup> *LaPointe v. Chief Animal Welfare Inspector*, 2025 ONACRB 159 at [para 32](#).

<sup>17</sup> *Geismayr v. The Owners, Strata Plan KAS 1970*, 2025 BCCRT 217 at [para 25](#); *A.Q. v. B.T.*, 2025 BCCRT 398 at [para 23](#); *SQBox Solutions Ltd. v. Oak*, 2025 BCCRT 408 at [para 11](#); *Simpson v. Hung Long Enterprises Inc.*, 2025 BCCRT 525 at [para 8](#); *AQ v. BW*, 2025 BCCRT 907 at [para 15](#); *Blaser v. Campbell*, 2025 BCCRT 962 at [para 16](#); *Hakemi v. ICBC*, 2025 BCCRT 1035 at [para 12](#); *Maxwell v. WestJet Airlines Ltd.*, 2025 BCCRT 1146 at [para 12](#); *Lockwood v. ICBC*, 2025 BCCRT 1227 at [para 53](#); *Obermann v. Spring Financial Inc.*, 2025 BCCRT 1669 at [para 9](#); *Heneghan v. The Owners, Strata Plan 187*, 2025 BCCRT 1681 at [para 32](#); *Obermann v. ICBC*, 2025 BCCRT 1759 at [para 8](#); *Greenwood v. The Owners, Strata Plan LMS4102*, 2026 BCCRT 6 at [para 10](#); *Howse v. Coulton*, 2026 BCCRT 153 at [para 13](#); *Rasko v. ICBC*, 2026 BCCRT 162 at [para 25](#) [\*]; *White v. The Owners, Strata Plan BCS3946*, 2026 BCCRT 339 at [para 9](#); *Siemens v. The Owners, Strata Plan EPS3699*, 2026 BCCRT 401 at [para 31](#).

<sup>18</sup> *Zhang v Chen*, 2024 BCSC 285 at [para 8](#); *Zahariev v Zaharieva*, 2025 BCSC 1057 at [para 14](#); *J.R.V. v N.L.V.*, 2025 BCSC 1137 at [para 51](#); *Moradi v British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)*, 2025 BCSC 1377 at [para 18](#); *Choi v. Slopinski*, 2025 BCSC 2226 at [para 38](#) [\*]; *Zou v Miracon Development Inc.*, 2026 BCSC 85 at [para 23](#); *Krivaia v Hungerford*, 2026 BCSC 408 at [para 81](#).

<sup>19</sup> *Musselman v. Vanderstelt*, 2025 BCCA 289 at [para 7](#); *Wu v. Murray*, 2025 BCCA 365 at [para 11](#); *Chan v. British Columbia (Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal)*, 2025 BCCA 452 at [para 39](#).

Tribunal,<sup>20</sup> the Property Assessment Appeal Board,<sup>21</sup> the Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal,<sup>22</sup> the Health Professions Review Board,<sup>23</sup> the Employment Standards Tribunal,<sup>24</sup> and the Labour Relations Board.<sup>25</sup>

### 3.3 Federal

---

The federal jurisdiction accounted for 24 decisions across seven courts and tribunals: the Federal Court,<sup>26</sup> the Trademarks Opposition Board,<sup>27</sup> the Social Security Tribunal,<sup>28</sup> the Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board,<sup>29</sup> the Canada Industrial

---

<sup>20</sup> *Duarte v. City of Richmond*, 2024 BCHRT 347 at [para 52](#); *RR v. Fraser Health Authority and others (No.3)*, 2025 BCHRT 287 at [para 219](#).

<sup>21</sup> *Backhaus v. Area 01*, 2025 BCPAAB 20251734 at [para 10](#).

<sup>22</sup> *A2402099 (Re)*, 2025 CanLII 82587 (BC WCAT) at [para 45](#); *A2501051 (Re)*, 2025 CanLII 97422 (BC WCAT) at [para 5](#).

<sup>23</sup> *Applicant v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia (No. 2)*, 2026 BCHPRB 25 at [footnote 1](#) [\*].

<sup>24</sup> *BC Taco Restaurant Group Ltd.*, 2025 BCEST 134 at [para 21](#).

<sup>25</sup> *Vicki Boomer*, 2025 BCLRB 250 at [para 52](#).

<sup>26</sup> *Hussein v. Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)*, 2025 FC 1060 at [para 35](#); *Hussein v. Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)*, 2025 FC 1138 at [para 15](#); *Lloyd's Register Canada Ltd. v. Choi*, 2025 FC 1233 at [para 2](#); *Yuehong v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 1837 at [para 93](#) [\*]; *Roy v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2026 FC 28 at [para 27](#); *Arora v. Canadian National Railway*, 2026 FC 82 at [para 26](#); *Seidu v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2026 FC 185 at [para 27](#); *Deblois c. Canada (Procureur général)*, 2026 CF 218 at [para 35](#) [\*]; *Gray v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2026 FC 306 at [para 11](#); *National Indigenous Fisheries Institute v. Canada (Fisheries and Oceans)*, 2026 FC 382 at [para 48](#).

<sup>27</sup> *Industria de Diseno Textil, S.A. v Sara Ghassai*, 2024 TMOB 150 at [para 5](#) [\*]; *Monster Energy Company v Pacific Smoke International Inc.*, 2024 TMOB 211 at [para 16](#); *14095863 Canada Inc. v Abercrombie & Fitch Trading Co.*, 2026 TMOB 28 at [para 12](#); *14095863 Canada Inc. v Abercrombie & Fitch Trading Co.*, 2026 TMOB 29 at [para 11](#) [\*]; *Paul Greco v Abercrombie & Fitch Trading Co.*, 2026 TMOB 30 at [para 14](#) [\*].

<sup>28</sup> *XH v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2025 SST 1097 at [para 9](#) [\*]; *PL v Minister of Employment and Social Development*, 2025 SST 1237 at [para 9](#); *JF v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2025 SST 1390 at [para 14](#) [\*].

<sup>29</sup> *Salem v. Deputy Head (Department of Health)*, 2025 FPSSLREB 122 at [para 59](#); *Hogan v. Treasury Board (Department of Employment and Social Development)*, 2025 FPSSLREB 127 at [para 23](#); *Delisle v. Canadian Association of Professional Employees*, 2025 FPSSLREB 131 at [para 30](#).

Relations Board,<sup>30</sup> the Canadian International Trade Tribunal,<sup>31</sup> and the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada.<sup>32</sup>

### 3.4 Quebec

---

Quebec produced 18 decisions across eight courts and tribunals: the Superior Court,<sup>33</sup> the Court of Appeal,<sup>34</sup> the Court of Quebec,<sup>35</sup> the Tribunal administratif du logement,<sup>36</sup> the Tribunal administratif du travail,<sup>37</sup> the Tribunal administratif,<sup>38</sup> the Régie du bâtiment,<sup>39</sup> and labour arbitration awards.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> *Choi v Lloyd's Register Canada Limited*, 2024 CIRB 1146 at [para 76](#).

<sup>31</sup> *Enviro Plus Duct Cleaning*, 2025 CanLII 59520 (CA CITT) at [para 29](#).

<sup>32</sup> *Monfared v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 CanLII 133075 (CA IRB) at [para 25](#).

<sup>33</sup> *Blinds to Go Inc. c. Blachley*, 2025 QCCS 3190 at [para 57](#); *Bourse de Immobilier Multilogements inc. c. Lanthier*, 2025 QCCS 4135 at [para 10](#); *Droit de la famille - 251792*, 2025 QCCS 4505 at [para 30](#); *Entreprises Bertrand Roberge ltée c. Giroux*, 2025 QCCS 4157 (“Giroux”) at [footnote 252](#) [\*]. However, it is unclear whether the court, in fact, caught the fictitious citations in *Giroux*; *Kalala c. Coopérative d’habitation La Fraternité Micheloise*, 2025 QCCS 4866 at [para 26](#); *Alamleh c. R.*, 2026 QCCS 416 at [para 8](#); *Droit de la famille — 26184*, 2026 QCCS 666 at [para 36](#); *Specter Aviation Limited c. Laprade*, 2025 QCCS 3521 at [para 53](#).

<sup>34</sup> *Azar c. Université de Montréal*, 2025 QCCA 1442 at [para 7](#).

<sup>35</sup> *Lessard c. Longuépée*, 2025 QCCQ 8285 at [para 38](#); *Makongo v. Montpetit*, 2026 QCCQ 746 at [para 41](#).

<sup>36</sup> *Rajabi v. Lassalle*, 2024 QCTAL 35477 at [para 18](#) [\*]; *Thabize c. Immobilière montréalaise IMR inc.*, 2026 QCTAL 7284 at [para 20](#).

<sup>37</sup> *St-Roch c. Andritz Hydro Canada inc.*, 2025 QCTAT 5136 at [para 46](#) [\*]; *Bégin-Létourneau c. Syndicat des spécialistes et professionnels d’Hydro-Québec, section locale 4250, SCFP-FTQ*, 2025 QCTAT 5208 at [para 20](#).

<sup>38</sup> *Dulac c. Ville de Gatineau*, 2025 CanLII 113234 (QC TAQ) at [para 52](#) [\*].

<sup>39</sup> *Régie du bâtiment du Québec c. 9308-2469 Québec inc. (Éco résidentiel)*, 2025 QCRBQ 86 at [para 162](#).

<sup>40</sup> *Syndicat des travailleuses et travailleurs de L’Autre Maison – CSN c Centre L’Autre Maison inc.*, 2025 CanLII 120680 (QC SAT) at [para 125](#).

### 3.5 Alberta

---

Alberta accounted for 11 decisions across five courts and tribunals: the Court of Appeal,<sup>41</sup> the Court of King's Bench,<sup>42</sup> SafeRoads Alberta,<sup>43</sup> the Calgary Assessment Review Board,<sup>44</sup> and the Human Rights Tribunal.<sup>45</sup>

### 3.6 Saskatchewan

---

Saskatchewan produced four decisions across two courts: the Court of King's Bench<sup>46</sup> and the Court of Appeal.<sup>47</sup>

### 3.7 New Brunswick

---

New Brunswick produced one decision from the Court of King's Bench.<sup>48</sup>

## 4 Self-Represented Litigants vs. Represented Parties

---

Of the 132 decisions in the dataset, 108 (82%) involved self-represented litigants who submitted filings containing fictitious citations. The remaining 24 decisions involved represented parties or parties whose representation status could not be determined from the decision.

The concentration among self-represented litigants is consistent with the expectation that individuals without legal training are (i) more likely to rely on AI tools for legal

---

<sup>41</sup> *Reddy v Saroya*, 2025 ABCA 322 at [para 73](#); *DJ v SN*, 2025 ABCA 383 at [para 24](#); *Reddy v Saroya*, 2026 ABCA 20 at [para 1](#); *HDO v MDF*, 2026 ABCA 45 at [para 19](#); *Iyer v Nazir*, 2026 ABCA 92 at [para 19](#).

<sup>42</sup> *NCR v KKB*, 2025 ABKB 417 at [para 110](#); *Barrette v Wevers*, 2025 ABKB 583 at [para 10](#) [\*]; *QM v RM*, 2026 ABKB 185 at [para 70](#).

<sup>43</sup> *Dudak (Re)*, 2026 ABSRA 54 at [para 31](#) [\*].

<sup>44</sup> *CARB 188903M-2024 (Re)*, 2024 ABCGYARB 2188903 (CanLII) at [para 1](#) [\*].

<sup>45</sup> *Davidson v PCL Constructors Inc.*, 2026 AHRC 15 at [para 17](#) [\*].

<sup>46</sup> *Yashcheshen v Saskatchewan Government Insurance*, 2025 SKKB 127 at [para 26](#); *T.B. v K.M.*, 2025 SKKB 176 at [para 19](#); *J.V.E.C. v S.M.D.*, 2025 SKKB 203 at [para 37](#) [\*].

<sup>47</sup> *Bahrani v Peters*, 2026 SKCA 2 at [para 89](#) [\*].

<sup>48</sup> *R v Wallace*, 2025 NBKB 268 at [para 66](#) [\*].

research, and (ii) less likely to recognize a hallucinated citation. However, for many self-represented Canadians, generative AI may be their only realistic and cost-effective means of conducting legal research.

The presence of represented parties (namely, 24 decisions) in the dataset complicates any suggestion that this issue is confined to self-represented litigants. The finding that legal professionals are not immune to this problem underscores the systemic nature of the risk.

## **5 Trend and Analysis**

---

The data reveal a sharp acceleration over the study period. In 2024, the author identified seven decisions containing fictitious citations. In 2025, that figure rose to 86 decisions. In the first quarter of 2026 alone, 39 decisions have already been identified. The trajectory suggests that the rate of fictitious citations entering Canadian courts continues to increase.

Of the 132 decisions, 96 (73%) involve cases where the court or tribunal found or presumed that AI tools generated the fictitious citations. In the remaining 36 decisions, the adjudicator identified the citations as non-existent but did not make a finding about the source. These 36 decisions are marked with an asterisk [\*] throughout this study. The distinction is important: the absence of an AI finding does not mean AI was not involved; it means only that the adjudicator did not address the question.

The geographic spread of the findings is notable. The issue is not concentrated in a single province or court system. Fictitious citations have appeared across 44 courts and tribunals in six provinces and the federal jurisdiction. They affect courts at every level, from small claims and administrative tribunals to provincial courts of appeal. The breadth of the problem suggests that any court or tribunal that receives written submissions is susceptible.

As long as litigants and legal professionals use generative AI tools to conduct legal research, fictitious citations will continue to enter the system. The burden of detecting them currently falls on adjudicators and court staff. This diverts time and resources from the substantive work of adjudication and contributes to the delays that already strain

Canadian courts and tribunals.<sup>49</sup> A more sustainable approach would equip parties with the means to quickly and accurately verify their own citations before filing, so that fictitious authorities are caught at the source rather than at the bench.

## 6 Conclusion

---

This study set out to identify every published decision on CanLII, since January 1, 2024, in which a Canadian court or tribunal flagged a party for submitting a fictitious citation as real authority. It found 132 such decisions, spanning 44 courts and tribunals across six provinces and the federal jurisdiction. The rate of decisions containing fictitious citations has accelerated sharply, from seven in 2024 to 86 in 2025 and 39 in the first quarter of 2026. Self-represented litigants account for 82% of the affected decisions, but represented parties are not immune.

The figures in this study represent a conservative floor. For every fictitious citation that an adjudicator detects, others may go unnoticed. The author maintains a live, searchable database of all identified decisions at [courtready.ca/fictitious-citations-in-canadian-courts](https://courtready.ca/fictitious-citations-in-canadian-courts), which is updated on a rolling basis as new decisions are published on CanLII.

---

<sup>49</sup> For example, between November 1, 2025, and February 28, 2026, the average wait time for an Associate Judge motion at the Superior Court of Justice in Toronto ranged from 170 to 253 days, depending on the length or format of the motion. Tom Macintosh Zheng, *Toronto Superior Court Hearing Availability and Scheduling Trends* (1 March 2026), online (pdf): Courtready.ca <https://courtready.ca/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/2026-03-01-Courtready-Presentation-re.-Toronto-Court-Delays.pdf>.