

Municipal Licensing & Standards Animal Services Dangerous Dog Request for Appeal City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 349

I am requesting a hearing before the Dangerous Dog Review Tribunal to appeal the Dangerous Dog Order noted below.

This form must be submitted, along with the appeal fee of \$374.14 in person or by registered mail to the following address:

Toronto Animal Services Enforcement and Mobile Response Unit 399 The West Mall 3rd Floor, North Block Toronto, ON M9C 2Y2 Attention: Court & Records Clerk

E-mail address: tasemru@toronto.ca

The appeal fee must be submitted by Cash, Certified Cheque or Credit Card.

on	
Date dangerous	dog order was served
July 23	,2023
1	V
	and the second sec
1	
Telephone number	E-mail address
Date	
August	- 15, 2023
	Date dangerous July 23 Telephone number Date

This request for appeal form and the appeal fee must be received by the City <u>no later</u> than 30 days after the date the Dangerous Dog order was served on the dog owner.

Should you wish, you may include reasons for your appeal on the next page.

Provided the form and fee are properly submitted, you will receive further information on the date of your hearing from City Clerks. Please note that you will have disclosure obligations under the Dangerous Dog Tribunal's Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure can be found at the link below:

https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/bylaws/ToRs/Dangerous%20Dog%20Review%20Tribun al-Rules%20of%20Procedure-Revised%20Oct.%2018%202021.pdf

Reasons for appeal
Check all that apply.
U Wrong dog identified in order
I No dangerous act
First, not second or subsequent dangerous act
3 Dangerous act not severe - Vet's report unavailable
Dangerous act did not occur while the dog was subject to a muzzle or caution notice under a City Animal Control By-law or a control order under the Dog Owners' Liability Act
Dog was acting in self-defence
2 Other Significantly adjusted walking routine
please see attached Sheet
further reasons may be presented
training forth coming.

Toronto August 15, 2023

3

Order reference number A23-031187

*the extent of the alleged injuries to the other dog remain unknown to me at the time of filing (August 15, 2023). Freedom of Information Access Requests for all the necessary files were made by me August 11, 2023 at Toronto City Hall.

*Marietta Chilton did not see my dog bite the other dog nor did she see it bleeding.

*the dog subject to the order may have acted in self-defence and/or acted protectively towards Marietta Chilton (spouse).

*as noted in the letter at the request of Selena Lam, badge number 260, submitted by David Chilton because of Marietta Chilton's concussion and shock, her investigation lacks impartial independent verification and thus the other dog's owner may have to assume some culpability for the incident. For example, was the other owner walking her dog "defensively" i.e. paying full attention to what her dog was doing? Did she see my dog – which was unknown to her – with Marietta Chilton and steer her dog in a different direction? Was the other owner's dog on an extending leash and thus not quickly and easily controlled? Does the other owner's dog have a history of aggression?

*my dog was "in control of a person." My dog was on a leash despite the other dog owner's repeated and incorrect assertions that he was not. Marietta Chilton only lost control of my dog after he pulled her off her feet, causing her to fall and sustain a concussion and shock. At Doctor's notes available on request.

*did the other dog's owner report my dog while still agitated and angry? Such that she had to be led away by Const. Ziol, who was on paid duty at the site of the incident. For the record, I spoke to Const. Ziol after she telephoned me at home and reported that Marietta Chilton had fallen and appeared concussed. She stated that she did not see what happened but was alerted to the fact that something had occurred by the other dog owner's shouting.