3€

the time of the seizure of the horses, that I

Proceedings

Again, while it is highly suspicious as to how those TV crews happened to arrive there, the S.P.C.A. officers denied that they tipped them off. There is no evidence that they did, and it is possible that the TV crew comes upon this scene in a number of ways, including listening to radio transmissions, things of that nature. Maybe they do have somebody that works in the office, maybe they get a tip somewhere. There are all sorts of reasons how that may occur. It might have been the person who made the complaint originally who decided that the television cameras should be there. And as I say, it is suspicious. I have my suspicious, but there is no proof of that and I am not going to take the extra step of finding that the TV cameras were

opposed to enter a stay of proceedings.
So, having now dismissed the abuse of process argument, that leaves us with, it seems to me, a decision on the merits, based on the evidence that is left.

there at the invitation of the S.P.C.A. and I

therefore carnot find that necessary bad faith.

That is why I have decided to exclude evidence as

(SUBMISSIONS BY COUNSEL)

THE COURT: Okay. Well, all of the evidence of any veterinarian inspection after the seizure is out. I will not consider that. All the photographs of the horses taken after, being fed, etcetera, I am not going to consider those photographs. I have seen them, but I have to disabuse my mind of them and not consider them. And any evidence of the S.P.C.A. officers about the condition of the horses after the seizure, everything that happens after the seizure is out.

(SUBMISSIONS BY COUNSEL)

THE COURT: Well, I think they entered the property before they got the search warrant, as I recall. They entered the property, which I believe they have the right to do where they find the animal in distress, without a search warrant. They