Hederal Court of Canada Trial Division



Section de première instance de la Cour fédérale du Canada

Date: 19991125

Docket: T-398-99

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, THIS 25TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1999

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE TEITELBAUM

IN THE MATTER OF Sections 18, 18.1 and 18.2 of the *Federal Court Act*, R.S.C. 1985, Chapter F-7.

AND IN THE MATTER OF the *Food and Drugs Act*, R.S.C. 1985, Chapter F-27 and Division 8 of the Regulations thereunder.

AND IN THE MATTER OF Section 55.2(4) of the Patent Act and the Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations, SOR/93/133.

BETWEEN:

MERCK & CO., INC. and MERCK FROSST CANADA & CO.

Applicants

- and -

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA THE MINISTER OF HEALTH and NU-PHARM INC.

Respondents

REASONS FOR ORDER AND ORDER

[1] The oral application for an interim order to stay the decision of McGillis, J. of November 23rd, 1999 is denied.

(a) a serious issue (a) irreparable harm and (b) that the balance of convenience lies in favour of the applicant [3] I have no evidence before me, other than statements of counsel for the applicant, of the irreparable harm that the applicant will suffer. [4] What was said to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation. [5] The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. [6] At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.	[4]	it is trite law	it is true law that, as in an application for an injunction, the applicant must show.		
(b) that the balance of convenience lies in favour of the applicant [3] I have no evidence before me, other than statements of counsel for the applicant, of the irreparable harm that the applicant will suffer. [4] What was said to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation. [5] The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. [6] At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.		(a)	a serious issue		
I have no evidence before me, other than statements of counsel for the applicant, of the irreparable harm that the applicant will suffer. What was said to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation. The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.		(a)	irreparable harm and		
[4] What was said to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation. [5] The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. [6] At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.		(b)	that the balance of convenience lies in favour of the applicant		
What was said to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation. The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.					
[5] The hearing for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999. [6] At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.	irrepa	rable harm tha	t the applicant will suffer.		
[6] At that time the parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.	[4]	What was sai	d to me by counsel for the applicant, is, at this point, purely speculation.		
	[5]	The hearing t	for a stay application is set down for December 2, 1999.		
J.F.C.C.	[6]	At that time t	he parties will be in a better position to submit written evidence.		
J.F.C.C.					
			J.F.C.C.		