

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF MANITOBA**

*Coram:* Mr. Justice Christopher J. Mainella  
Madam Justice Karen I. Simonsen  
Mr. Justice David J. Kroft

***Docket: AI24-30-10070***

***BETWEEN:***

***WINNIPEG REGIONAL HEALTH  
AUTHORITY***

*(Plaintiff/Defendant by Counterclaim)  
Respondent*

*- and -*

***SHANNON HANCOCK, formerly known as  
SHANNON LOECHNER***

*(Defendant/Plaintiff by Counterclaim)  
Applicant*

*- and -*

***Docket: AI24-30-10112***

***BETWEEN:***

***WINNIPEG REGIONAL HEALTH  
AUTHORITY***

*(Plaintiff) Respondent*

*- and -*

***SHANNON HANCOCK, formerly known as  
SHANNON LOECHNER***

*(Defendant) Appellant*

)  
)  
) ***S. Hancock***  
) *on their own behalf*  
)  
)  
) ***L. K. Troup***  
) *for the Respondent*  
)  
) ***D. A. Johnston***  
) *on a watching brief for the*  
) *Attorney General of*  
) *Manitoba*  
)  
)  
) ***Motion under section 31.1***  
) ***of The Court of Appeal Act,***  
) ***CCSM c C240***  
)  
) *Motion heard and*  
) *Decision pronounced:*  
) ***June 9, 2026***  
)  
)  
) *Written reasons:*  
) ***June 18, 2026***  
)  
)  
)

- and - )  
 )  
**Docket: AI24-30-10155** )  
**BETWEEN:** )  
 )  
**WINNIPEG REGIONAL HEALTH** )  
**AUTHORITY** )  
 )  
 (Respondent) Respondent )  
 )  
 - and - )  
 )  
**SHANNON HANCOCK, formerly known as** )  
**SHANNON LOECHNER** )  
 )  
 (Applicant/Appellant) Appellant )

**MAINELLA JA** (for the Court):

[1] After hearing from the parties, we announced that we were satisfied that a vexatious litigant order should be made against Shannon Hancock (the appellant) with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

[2] By way of background, on February 12, 2025, a judge of this Court, sitting in chambers, declared the appellant to be a vexatious litigant in this Court pursuant to section 31.1(1) of *The Court of Appeal Act*, CCSM c C240 [the Act] (see *College of Registered Nurses of Manitoba v Hancock*, 2025 MBCA 14). That order included a prohibition against the appellant continuing or instituting proceedings in relation to the College of Registered Nurses of Manitoba (the College) and the respondent absent first obtaining leave of a judge of this Court.

[3] The appellant appealed the vexatious litigant order; her appeal was allowed in part (see *College of Registered Nurses of Manitoba v Hancock*,

2026 MBCA 15 [*Hancock 2026*]). While the vexatious litigant order was upheld in relation to the College, it was set aside in relation to the respondent because of the concern that the appellant had not received adequate notice that the original vexatious litigant hearing would address her ability to continue or institute proceedings in relation to both the College and the respondent (see *ibid* at paras 67-72).

[4] Subsequently, notice was provided to the appellant that a panel of this Court would consider whether she should be declared a vexatious litigant in any or all of the existing appeals in relation to the respondent (File Nos. AI24-30-10070, AI24-30-10112 and AI24-30-10155) or any new appeals, applications or motions regarding the respondent (see *Hancock 2026*).

[5] A preliminary matter the appellant raised is that she asked that this panel recuse itself based on a claim of a reasonable apprehension of bias.

[6] We see no cogent evidence that displaces the strong presumption of judicial impartiality (see *Yukon Francophone School Board, Education Area #23 v Yukon (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 25 at para 25). The mere fact that the members of this panel have sat on other appeals involving the appellant and made decisions unfavorable to her does not give rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias (see *Bartel-Zobarich v Manitoba Association of Health Care Professionals (MAHCP-Bargaining Unit) et al*, 2023 MBCA 41 at para 12).

[7] When a contextual and fact-specific analysis is taken of this proceeding, the informed person, viewing the matter realistically and practically, and having thought the matter through, would not conclude that it

is more likely than not that each member of this panel would consciously or unconsciously decide this matter unfairly. Nothing raised by the appellant credibly raises concern as to the impartiality of any member of this panel.

[8] We are satisfied that an order pursuant to section 31.1(1) of the *Act* against the appellant is in the interests of justice, as nothing short of a vexatious litigant order restricting the appellant's access to the justice system will prevent her from conducting proceedings in a vexatious manner against the respondent. That conclusion was reached for the following reasons.

[9] The relevant legal principles in relation to vexatious litigant orders are set out in *College of Registered Nurses of Manitoba v Hancock*, 2023 MBCA 70, a case involving the appellant and a vexatious litigant order made against her in the Court of King's Bench that prohibited her from continuing or initiating proceedings in that Court against the College without prior leave of a judge.

[10] The record before this panel consists of well over 2,000 pages of materials. It provides clear insight into the conduct and attitude of the appellant in relation to litigation regarding the respondent.

[11] In this Court's view, when the record is considered objectively and in light of the entirety of these proceedings, there is overwhelming evidence of the "attempted abuse or significant misuse of the court process [by the appellant] which, if allowed to continue unabated, would bring the administration of justice into disrepute" (*ibid* at para 2). This Court would highlight the following cacophony of egregious conduct by the appellant in relation to litigation involving the respondent that confirms she has crossed

the line demarking a vexatious litigant from one who is merely aggressive (see *ibid* at para 69):

1. Serial uncivility by the appellant to opposing counsel, registry staff and members of this Court.
2. Complete disregard for court procedures or orders of this Court as to the proper manner of filing of materials.
3. Repeated communications on irrelevant matters, such as the authenticity of communications from the registry or the structure of this Court's email and data systems.
4. Scandalous and conspiratorial statements about members of the Bar and the judiciary not involved in any way in the appellant's litigation in relation to the respondent.
5. Open contempt for the authority of the registrar in carrying out her duties in ensuring the orderly perfecting and scheduling of appeals despite her authority under the *Act*.
6. Aggressive and domineering communications that often frivolously allege professional misconduct of civil servants, members of the Bar and judges. The materials before this Court contain numerous allegations by the appellant of professional misconduct that are patently absurd.
7. Repetition of substantive arguments on matters previously decided against the appellant.

[12] In summary, we are satisfied that this is one of the clearest cases where a vexatious litigant order is the most proportionate remedy to ensure the integrity of the administration of justice.

[13] In the result, the following vexatious litigant order is made, which will operate in addition to the related order upheld in *Hancock 2026*:

1. The appellant is declared a vexatious litigant in this Court.
2. The appellant is prohibited from continuing her appeals on File Nos. AI24-30-10070, AI24-30-10112 and AI24-30-10155, as well as from instituting any further proceedings against the respondent, which includes filing any applications or motions in connection with the respondent, without prior leave of a judge of this Court.
3. An application for leave to continue existing proceedings or instituting new proceedings in this Court by the appellant in relation to the respondent, or any other application under section 31.2 of the *Act* in relation to the respondent, must be in writing by the appellant, by sending a letter to the registrar, not exceeding three pages, setting out her position and argument on the application. The registry is to provide a copy of any such letter to counsel for the respondent for comment, if required. An application for leave to proceed may be determined by a judge of this Court based on those written submissions without an oral hearing.

4. This Court's registry is authorized to reject any correspondence or document that is attempted to be filed in contravention of this order or that is deemed not compliant with the *Act*; the MB, *Court of Appeal Rules (Civil)*, Man Reg 555/88R; or any order of this Court.

[14] A copy of these reasons and the vexatious litigant order is to be provided by the registry to the parties, at their last-known address, electronically or by regular mail.

[15] There will be no award as to costs as this order arises out of this Court's own motion.

Mainella JA

---

Simonsen JA

---

Kroft JA

---