



Jim Lepore

JIM LEPORE

is a partner at Lenczner Slaght.

"Jim is best-in-class for Canadian IP litigation." — *Chambers Canada*

Jim's focus is advocacy – with a particular interest in commercial and intellectual property litigation.

He is frequently retained in complex disputes involving companies in the technology, artificial intelligence, fintech, telecommunications and natural resource sectors. Drawing on his background in engineering, business, and law, he provides creative solutions to legal issues inside and outside of the courtroom.

Jim appears regularly before all levels of Ontario and federal courts on a wide variety of matters ranging from patent and software licensing disputes to corporate oppression, the defence of class actions, and product liability claims.

During law school, Jim was recognized for academic excellence, earning the J.S.D. Tory Writing Prize for excellence in writing and legal research, the WeirFoulds LLP Writing Prize in Intellectual Property, and the Intellectual Property Institute of Canada's national writing prize, along with several course and advocacy prizes.

Before law school, Jim studied mechanical engineering and management at McMaster University and graduated *summa cum laude*. His capstone research project was in the field of aero-acoustics, designing a low noise landing gear for a Bombardier private jet.

Education

University of Western Ontario (2017)
JD
McMaster University (2014) BEng
Mgt (Summa Cum Laude -
Thermofluids and Energy Systems)

Bar Admissions

Ontario (2018)

Practice Areas

Class Actions
Commercial Litigation
Competition and Antitrust
Defamation and Media
Employment
Injunctions
Insurance
Intellectual Property

Contact

T 416-865-2881
jlepore@litigate.com

RECOGNITION

- ▶ Chambers Canada (2025-2026)
Associates to Watch, Intellectual Property: Litigation (Nationwide – Canada)
- ▶ Best Lawyers in Canada (2025-2026)
Ones to Watch – Intellectual Property
- ▶ Canada's IP Writing Challenge (2016)
Intellectual Property Institute of Canada; IP Osgoode
- ▶ WeirFoulds LLP Writing Prize in Intellectual Property (2016)
University of Western Ontario, Faculty of Law
- ▶ J.S.D. Tory Writing Prize (2017)
University of Western Ontario, Faculty of Law

- First Year Appellate Competition (FYAC) (2015)
Winner
- Harold G. Fox Intellectual Property Moot (2016)
Honourable Mention - Best Oral Advocate
- Highest Standing in Process and Substance in IP Litigation (2016)
University of Western Ontario, Faculty of Law
- Legate & Associates Medical Malpractice Trial Advocacy Moot (2017)
Winner
- University of Western Ontario Law Alumni Association Scholarship (2014)
University of Western Ontario, Faculty of Law

SELECT CASES

- **Canadian News Media Companies v OpenAI (Jurisdiction Motion)** – Our expert litigators were successful in resisting OpenAI’s motion to stay or dismiss claims brought by Canada’s leading news media organizations, on the basis that the Ontario court lacked jurisdiction. The Court concluded that it has jurisdiction over the claims and that the claims against OpenAI Inc., OpenAI OpCo LLC, OpenAI LLC, OpenAI Holdings LLC, OAI Corporation, and OpenAI Global can proceed in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. Read the decision [here](#).
- **James Caruk v Amazon.com Inc et al** – Counsel to the Defendants, technology companies (Amazon, Apple, Fox/Tubi) and media production companies, in an action alleging, *inter alia*, copyright infringement, passing off and misappropriation of personality. This action was dismissed pre-discovery following service of the Defendants’ notice of motion to strike.
- **One York Street Inc v 2360083 Ontario Limited** – Counsel to Menkes Developments (One York Street) before the Ontario Court of Appeal in its first decision to substantively address how deemed waiver of solicitor-client privilege arises when a party places its state of mind at issue. The Ontario Court of Appeal allowed One York’s appeal and required production of the respondents’ solicitor’s file on the basis of a deemed waiver of solicitor-client privilege.
- **Solucore Inc v KJA Consultants Inc** – Counsel to Solucore, a leading Canadian engineering company, in a patent infringement action involving vertical transport (e.g., elevators, escalators and lifts).
- **Heidelberg Materials Canada Limited v Toronto Port Authority (PortsToronto)** – Counsel to the Respondent, Toronto Port Authority (PortsToronto), in an urgent application for judicial review of a decision of the Minister of Transport. We obtained a dismissal on all issues, including the dismissal of a motion to strike PortsToronto’s responding evidence.
- **Canadian News Media Companies v OpenAI** – Counsel to Canada’s leading news media organizations in their legal action against OpenAI for breach of copyright, breach of online terms of use, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment for scraping large swaths of content (millions of works) from Canadian media to help develop its products, such as ChatGPT.
- **Confidential Matter** – Copyright counsel to a major news media company in matter relating to unauthorized use of its content to train AI tools.
- **Maoz Betser-Zilevitch v Canadian Natural Resources Ltd** – Counsel to the plaintiff in a patent infringement action involving oil & gas technologies, related to modular well pads used in heavy oil extraction.
- **7912854 Canada Inc v Sunprotection Group Inc et al** – Counsel to

leading window coverings designer and manufacturer, Altex, in a trademark infringement, passing off, false advertising, trade libel and unfair competition action in the Federal Court of Canada.

- **7912854 Canada Inc v Sunprotection Group Inc et al** – Counsel to leading window coverings designer and manufacturer, Altex, in a commercial action in the Superior Court of Canada, related to intentional interference with contractual relations, and misappropriation of confidential and proprietary information.
- **Puma SE v Caterpillar Inc** – Co-counsel to Puma in an application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada arising from Caterpillar's opposition to Puma's trademark application for PROCAT on the basis that it is confusing with Caterpillar's registered design trademark (CAT & Triangle Design).
- **Fraudulent and Deceptive Web Domains Dispute** – Counsel to an infrastructure company related to the takedown and transfer of a fraudulent web domains. Provided strategic advice on intellectual property portfolio and assertion of the same.
- **Songbird Life Science Inc v Hyris Limited** – Counsel to Hyris Limited, resisting an application before the Superior Court of Justice seeking injunctive relief. The application related to Canadian distribution of Hyris's proprietary, COVID-19-specific diagnostic technology, which permitted users to conduct accurate COVID-19 testing "on site", without the need for a medical laboratory.
- **Rovi Guides v Videotron** – Counsel to Rovi Guides (a subsidiary of Xperi Holding Corporation) in a patent infringement action involving four patents related to digital entertainment technologies.
- **Adeia Guides v BCE Inc, Ericsson et al** – Counsel to Adeia Guides, Inc. and Adeia Media Holdings LLC in a patent infringement action involving four patents related to digital entertainment technologies.
- **Strategic Advice** – Counsel to a FinTech company in potential patent infringement litigation.
- **Del Ridge Homes Inc v Ledgemark Homes Inc** – Counsel to a sustainable real estate developer, Del Ridge Homes Inc, in a trademark infringement, false advertising, and unfair competition action in the Federal Court of Canada.
- **Voith Group** – Counsel to Voith providing advice on patent matters relating to paper mill technology.
- **Product Liability** – Defence of a product liability action including allegation of negligent design and manufacture of a multi-million-dollar electric arc furnace.
- **Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp et al v JAMP Pharma Corporation** – Counsel to JAMP in a NOC action relating to JANUVIA (sitagliptin), a medication used to control high blood sugar in people with type 2 diabetes.
- **Pliteq Inc v Sof Surfaces Inc** – Counsel to the defendant (plaintiff by counterclaim), Sof Surfaces Inc., in a bet-the-company commercial and intellectual property litigation, involving claims of trademark infringement and unfair competition claims under the Trademark Act and Competition Act and common law.
- **Swist v MEG Energy Corp** – Counsel to the plaintiffs in a patent infringement action, involving a patent related to heavy oil extraction. *(Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)*
- **Wi-LAN Inc v LG Electronics and LG Electronics Canada** – Counsel to Wi-LAN Inc in a patent infringement action, involving a patent relating to telecommunication networks, handover of devices between base

stations in advanced telecommunication networks, and related technologies. This matter also involved allegations related to standards essential patent licensing obligations; determination of a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) royalty; and claims under the *Competition Act*. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)

- **Bayer Inc et al v JAMP Pharma Corporation** – Counsel to JAMP in a NOC action relating to XARELTO (rivaroxaban), a medication indicated for prophylaxis of deep vein thrombosis.
- **Wi-LAN Inc and Quarterhill Inc v Telus Communications Inc** – Counsel to Quarterhill Inc. and its subsidiary Wi-LAN Inc. in a patent infringement action, involving patents relating to telecommunication networks, bandwidth allocation in advanced telecommunication networks, and related technologies. This matter also engaged standards essential patent obligations and claims under the *Competition Act*. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)
- **Wi-LAN Inc and Quarterhill Inc v LG Electronics and LG Electronics Canada** – Counsel to Quarterhill Inc. and its subsidiary Wi-LAN Inc. in a patent infringement action, involving patents relating to telecommunication networks, bandwidth allocation in advanced telecommunication networks, and related technologies. This matter also engaged standards essential patent obligations and claims under the *Competition Act*. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)
- **Wi-LAN Inc and Quarterhill Inc v Rogers Communications Canada Inc** – Counsel to Quarterhill Inc. and its subsidiary Wi-LAN Inc. in a patent infringement action, involving patents relating to telecommunication networks, bandwidth allocation in advanced telecommunication networks, and related technologies. This matter also engaged standards essential patent obligations and claims under the *Competition Act*. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)
- **Sunovion Pharmaceuticals Canada Inc et al v JAMP Pharma Corporation** – Counsel to JAMP in a NOC action relating to LATUDA (lurasidone), an anti-psychotic medication used to treat bipolar depression and schizophrenia.
- **Dennis v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada** – Counsel to the Canadian Wheat Board in a proposed class proceeding in the Federal Court and the Manitoba Court of Queen’s Bench by former grain...
- **Integrated Intellectual Property Strategy** – Commissioned by Government of Canada (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada) to prepare a study and report on strategies to integrate and exploit intellectual property for idea-based enterprises. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)
- **Telecommunication Source Code Dispute** – Retained by a rights-holder in a breach of contract and infringement of intellectual property rights dispute related to Voice Over IP (VOIP) technologies. (Prior to joining Lenczner Slaght)

SELECT PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- **Waiving Solicitor-Client Privilege: Lessons from One York Street Inc v 2360083 Ontario Limited** – Jim Lepore was invited to share his expertise at the Canadian Defence Lawyers' 2026 Annual Litigation Conference. Jim will unpack *One York Street Inc v 2360083 Ontario Limited*, where the Ontario Court of Appeal made its first decision to substantively address deemed waiver of solicitor-client privilege by pleading a party's state of mind. Lenczner Slaght's Matthew Lerner and Jim Lepore succeeded with an appeal on behalf of their client, Menkes Developments (One York Street).
- **Lenczner Slaght Advocacy Competition in Legal Ethics and Professionalism 2026** – Kyle Magee, Risa Kirshblum, Jim Lepore, Sean Lewis, Brianna Miklaucic, and Natalie Workewych served as judges at Western Law's Annual Advocacy Competition in Legal Ethics and Professionalism.
- **2025 Snapshot: Through the Lens of Lenczner Slaght** – We've released our *2025 Snapshot*, highlighting the most significant developments, decisions, and trends in litigation from the past year across 21 practice areas. Reflect on 2025 and look ahead to 2026 through the lens of our expert litigators.
- **2023 Snapshot: Through the Lens of Lenczner Slaght** – Lenczner Slaght launches our *2023 Snapshot*, a look at the most significant developments, decisions, business takeaways, and trends in litigation from the last year, across 15 practice areas. Revisit 2023 and look ahead to 2024 through the lens of our expert litigators.
- **Lenczner Slaght Advocacy Competition in Legal Ethics and Professionalism 2023** – We were proud to continue our sponsorship of Western Law's Annual Legal Ethics and Professionalism Moot! Matthew B. Lerner, Sean Lewis, Sean Blakeley, Jim Lepore, and Allison Jandura participated as judges.
- **Non-Infringing Alternatives: Moving Beyond Condemnation to Arrive at Compensation** – Jim Lepore's article *Non-Infringing Alternatives: Moving Beyond Condemnation to Arrive at Compensation* appeared in Volume 33 of Canadian Intellectual Property Review.
- **Selecting and Protecting Inherently Strong Names** – Jim Lepore co-authored the article *Selecting and Protecting Inherently Strong Name* for the Hamilton Law Journal.
- **The Effect of Proximity of the Landing Gear Lights on its Turbulent Wake** – Jim Lepore co-authored the article *The Effect of Proximity of the Landing Gear Lights on its Turbulent Wake* that appeared in Volume 10 of the Journal of Turbulence.
- **Experimental Investigation of Landing Light Orientation on Landing Gear Noise** – Jim Lepore co-authored the article *Experimental Investigation of Landing Light Orientation on Landing Gear Noise* for the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Pressure Vessel and Piping Conference.
- **Stereoscopic PIV Study of a Simplified Landing Gear Model** – Jim Lepore co-authored the article *Stereoscopic PIV Study of a Simplified Landing Gear Model* for the 10th Pacific Symposium on Flow Visualization and Image Processing Conference.
- **Limitations of Only Using a NUANS Search** – Jim Lepore co-authored the article *Limitations of Only Using a NUANS Search* for the Hamilton Law Journal.

BLOG POSTS

- **Two Steps Forward: CIPO Resets on Non-Patentable Subject Matter**

On March 24, 2026, the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) released a new practice notice on patentable subject matter under the *Patent Act* (the March 2026 Practice Notice), together with updated examples illustrating its application. The March 2026 Practice Notice replaces the 2020 Practice Notice, which we have previously commented on at length.

- **Making a Splash in Patent Law: The Federal Court of Appeal Clarifies Overbreadth and Utility** – ProSlide Technology and WhiteWater West Industries are the two largest competitors in the global water slide market. That competitive pressure has, perhaps inevitably, spilled into the courtroom.
- **Password Reset Required! The Federal Court of Appeal Weighs in on TPMs** – Savvy content creators and copyright owners often use technological protection measures (TPMs) to restrict what users can do with their works (often digital materials). The prohibition against circumventing TPMs is rooted in sections 41 and 41.1 the *Copyright Act*, but the interpretation of those provisions and how they fit within the broader *Copyright Act* is the subject of ongoing debate.
- **Breaking New Ground: Ontario Court of Appeal Issues Landmark Ruling on Deemed Waiver of Privilege** – In *One York Street Inc v 2360083 Ontario Limited*, Lenczner Slaght's Matthew Lerner and Jim Lepore succeeded with an appeal on behalf of their client, Menkes Developments (One York Street) in the Ontario Court of Appeal's first decision to substantively address deemed waiver of solicitor-client privilege by pleading a party's state of mind. Waiver of privilege is often said to exist when a party "places its state of mind in issue," but before the Court of Appeal provided clarity, there was much confusion as to what it means for a party to place its state of mind in issue.
- **DABUS Down, Not Done: Thaler Appeals Canadian Ruling on AI Inventorship** – As we predicted in our earlier comment, Dr. Stephen Thaler – who created an AI system that allegedly conceived two disparate yet novel products – is not giving up his bid to have that system (DABUS) awarded a Canadian patent.
- **Calling the Bluff on "Actual Invention": More Guidance from the FC to CIPO on Patentable Subject-Matter** – *Dusome v Canada (Attorney General)* ("*Dusome*") is the latest successful appeal from a decision of the Commissioner of Patents refusing a patent application on the basis of non-patentable subject matter.
- **Canadian Courts Have Jurisdiction to Address Misappropriation by AI Companies** – In *Toronto Star Newspapers Limited v OpenAI Inc*, the Ontario Superior Court delivered a significant ruling on the jurisdiction of Ontario (and Canadian) courts to determine disputes relating to the misappropriation of content by artificial intelligence (AI) companies.
- **Robots Rejected: Canada Denies AI as Patent Inventor** – The wait is over – the Canadian Patent Appeal Board (the Board) has answered the question we've been tracking since 2022: can an artificial intelligence (AI) system be named as an inventor on a Canadian patent application? That answer, delivered in *Re Thaler, Stephen*, is no.
- **Close Only Counts in Horseshoes: Federal Court of Appeal Reins in the PMPRB** – The Federal Court of Appeal's decision in *Galderma Canada Inc v Canada (Attorney General)* ("*Galderma FCA*") arose from what seemed like a straightforward production order, but ended up providing clear guidance on the jurisdiction of Canada's Patent Medicine Prices Review Board (PMPRB). The key takeaway: the PMPRB's jurisdiction extends only to *patented* medicines, not *all* medicines.
- **AI Artistry on Trial: Can Machines Hold Copyright?** – The intersection of artificial intelligence and intellectual property law is once

again in the spotlight with the latest legal proceeding, *Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic v Ankit Sahni*.

- **Password Protected! The Federal Court Revisits TPMs** – Savvy content creators and copyright owners often use technical protection measures (also known as “TPMs”) to restrict what users can do with their works (often digital materials). The prohibition against circumventing TPMs is rooted in sections 41 and 41.1 of the *Copyright Act*, but their fit within the broader *Copyright Act* is the subject of ongoing debate.
- **Digital Doppelgangers: Exploring the Implications of a Synthetic Voice That Might (or Might Not) Be Scarlett Johansson’s** – As widely reported by the likes of CBC, the Guardian, the Verge and CNBC, OpenAI has indicated they will “pause” the use of their AI-generated voice after users (and Scarlett Johansson herself) noted the striking similarity to Scarlett Johansson’s voice from the film “Her”. This connection may have been intentional, OpenAI’s CEO, Sam Altman, posted a one-word message – “her” – on his social media on the day the AI-generated voice was unveiled.
- **Innovation in Limbo: A Disappointing Turn in the Benjamin Moore Saga** – In our last comment on non-patentable subject matter, we provided our thoughts on the Federal Court of Appeal’s decision in *Canada (Attorney General) v Benjamin Moore & Co* (the “*Benjamin Moore Appeal*”). As a top line, this decision was a loss for Canadian innovation. As we discussed in detail, the Federal Court of Appeal missed an opportunity to clarify the law of patentable subject matter, adopt the IPIC framework endorsed by Associate Chief Justice Gagné, and signal to the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (“CIPO”) that its examination practices were out of step with the law. Instead, the Federal Court of Appeal further complicated an already complex area of the law, which will increase the costs of innovators to register their technologies in Canada.
- **Bars or Bytes? Exploring the Implications of a Track that Drake Might (or Might Not) Have Created** – Did Drake respond to an alleged feud with fellow artists, including Kendrick Lamar and Rick Ross? As reported by the LA Times, a track titled ‘Push Ups (Drop and Give Me 50)’ appeared online recently, taking aim at Lamar and several of his recent musical collaborators. However, this track remained unclaimed on any of Drake’s official platforms, causing some to question whether this track was fan-generated using artificial intelligence. This cynicism may be justified: Drake is reportedly no stranger to having to denounce fan-generated songs, and Lamar’s rumoured response was actually the work of artificial intelligence and another rapper.
- **AI in the Courtroom: The Quest for Legal Precedents** – The current landscape is inundated with narratives surrounding artificial intelligence and its intersection with the law. From the New York Time’s lawsuit launched against OpenAI in December 2023, to the BC lawyer reprimanded for citing fake AI-generated cases, to the lying Air Canada chatbot, the legal and mainstream media is full of stories of AI or people using AI running up against traditional legal doctrine and practice. Yet, amidst this surge of AI-related incidents, Canada finds itself grappling with more questions than answers.
- **Benjamin Moore: An Opportunity Missed** – It has been approximately six months since the Federal Court of Appeal’s decision in *Canada (Attorney General) v Benjamin Moore & Co* (the “*Benjamin Moore Appeal*”) was released, yet no practice direction has been issued from the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (“CIPO”) to address the decision, and there is no consistency in the way that computer-implemented inventions are being examined. As the patent bar awaits a decision on the leave application to the Supreme Court of Canada, we provide our

thoughts on the Federal Court of Appeal's decision, and the missed opportunity it was.

- **Don't Make Me Say It a Fourth Time: Federal Court Weighs in (Again) on Patentable Subject Matter** – Associate Chief Justice Gagné's decision in *Benjamin Moore & Co v Attorney General of Canada*, 2022 FC 923 ("**Benjamin Moore**") marks the second time that the Federal Court has had to weigh in to tell the Commissioner that it was not applying the correct test for patentability of computer-implemented inventions. Unlike past decisions (discussed below), the Court in *Benjamin Moore*, provided instruction on how the Commissioner ought to assess patentability of such inventions. As a top line, these instructions appear to level the playing field – reducing the artificially high standard that computer-implemented inventions face during patent examination.
- **Don't Be the Author of Your Own Dismissal: Chief Justice Dismisses Dueling Motions for Summary Judgment in the Trademark Context** – Summary adjudication can be enticing. In the right circumstances, it saves the parties time and money. Unsurprisingly, there is a growing trend in Canadian intellectual property litigation to use summary adjudication that we have been actively monitoring (see, e.g., our comments here, here, here, here, here and here).
- **The Train Has Left the Station: The Federal Court of Appeal Confirms That Opposition Won't Derail a Summary Trial** – As part of our series on summary adjudication, we previously commented on the Federal Court's recent use of a summary trial to resolve a patent infringement dispute. The abbreviated procedure of a summary trial addresses many of the Federal Court's traditional concerns with summary judgment (e.g., lacking live evidence).
- **Don't Sit Back During Summary Judgment: Federal Court of Appeal Weighs in on Summary Judgment for Patent Infringement Actions** – The Federal Court of Appeal has historically held that summary judgment is usually not the preferred means of resolving patent infringement actions. These cases are inherently complex and technical, and usually involve expert evidence. In the Federal Court of Appeal's view, a trial judge who has had the opportunity to hear all of the evidence live is best suited to resolve these disputes (see *Suntec Environmental Inc v Trojan Technologies Inc*).
- **The Other Shoe Has Dropped: Summary Judgment in the Federal Court** – Patent infringement actions are inherently complex and technical. They often involve complex scientific inquiries and expert evidence. The Federal Court has historically held that summary judgment—which does not include live evidence—is generally not the preferred means of resolving patent infringement actions. Instead, such determinations are best left to a trial judge who has had the opportunity to hear all of the evidence live (e.g., *Suntec Environmental Inc v Trojan Technologies Inc*).
- **A Decade in the Making: Federal Court Weighs in on Non-patentable Subject Matter** – Many know Amazon as the world's largest online retailer, a mantle it carries, in part, because of just how easy it is to buy about anything. In fact, as many Canadians know, you can buy something on Amazon with as little as "1-Click".
- **The Times They Are a-Changin': Summary Judgment in the Federal Court** – Patent infringement actions are inherently complex and technical. They often involve complex scientific inquiries and expert evidence. The Federal Court has historically held that summary judgment—which does not include live evidence—is generally not the preferred means of resolving patent infringement actions. Instead, such determinations are best left to a trial judge who has had the opportunity to hear all of the evidence live (e.g. *Suntec Environmental Inc v Trojan Technologies Inc*

).

- **Board Man Doesn't Get Paid** – During last year's NBA Finals, Kawhi Leonard was taking on more than the Golden State Warriors. In the middle of the Finals, he filed a lawsuit against the company he formerly endorsed—Nike—in the Southern District of California (original complaint [here](#)). At issue was Leonard's "Klaw Logo," which he claimed to have conceived before his contract with Nike. An early sketch of the logo and the design Nike ultimately used are shown side-by-side [here](#).
- **Full Steam Ahead: Opposition Won't Derail a Patent Infringement Summary Trial** – In 2014, the Supreme Court of Canada recognized that the most painstaking procedure is not always the best procedure to resolve disputes – a culture shift was required to create timely and affordable access to the civil justice system (see *Hryniak*). This touchstone for access to justice is reflected in several courts' rules of procedure, including the Federal Court of Canada.

SELECT NEWS ARTICLES

- **Lenczner Slaght Welcomes New Partners: Jim Lepore & Sean Lewis** – Canada's leading litigation firm is proud to announce that two of our expert litigators, Jim Lepore and Sean Lewis, have been promoted to the partnership.
- **Chambers Canada Highlights Lenczner Slaght's Excellence in Advocacy** – Canada's leading litigation firm continues to be recognized in world-renowned directory, with new rankings highlighting its deep bench of expertise.
- **Lenczner Slaght Litigators Featured Among Best Lawyers in Canada** – The 2026 edition of *Best Lawyers in Canada* recognizes Lenczner Slaght with 180+ rankings, featuring 48 of our expert litigators across 27 practice areas.
- **Chambers Canada Recognizes Lenczner Slaght's Deep Bench of Expert Litigators** – Canada's leading litigation firm continues to advance their position in the latest edition of the world-renowned directory.
- **Lenczner Slaght Litigators Recognized as the Best Lawyers in Canada** – In the 2025 edition of *Best Lawyers in Canada*, Lenczner Slaght is proud to receive 168 total rankings, with 45 of our expert litigators recognized for their expertise across 25 practice areas.
- **Lenczner Slaght Welcomes Jim Lepore** – Canada's leading litigation firm adds another exceptional litigator to its expert Intellectual Property Group.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Canadian Bar Association
- Ontario Bar Association
Member-at-Large, Information Technology and Intellectual Property Executive (2024-2026)
- The Advocates' Society
Intellectual Property Focus Group (2026)
- Intellectual Property Institute of Canada
Internet & Technology Committee (2021-present)
- Toronto Intellectual Property Group