

Case Screening Summary

Total cases screened: 67 | Passed pre-screen: 39 | Used in final output: 23

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Indian Act, RSC 1985, c I-5</i>	Indian Act, RSC 1985, c I-5	Yes	Section 81(1) grants band councils broad bylaw-making authority for a list of enumerated purposes, including health (s. 81(1)(a)), order (s. 81(1)(c)), zoning/business regulation (s. 81(1)(g)), and matters ancillary thereto (s. 81(1)(q)), subject to consistency with the Act and regulations. Section 85.1 provides a specific, dedicated power for band councils to prohibit the sale, barter, supply or manufacture of intoxicants on reserve, subject to elector assent by majority vote at a special meeting. Section 86 governs publication and coming into force of bylaws.	Yes
<i>Indian (Soldier Settlement) Act, RSC 1927, c 98</i>	Indian (Soldier Settlement) Act, RSC 1927, c 98	Yes	This is a historical statute dealing with soldier settlement on Indian lands — not relevant to the bylaw-making authority or intoxicants questions at issue.	No
<i>Shísháhl Nation Self-Government Act, SC 1986, c 27</i>	Shísháhl Nation Self-Government Act, SC 1986, c 27	Yes	This is a specific self-government act for the Shísháhl Nation in BC, not directly applicable to a Saskatchewan band council acting under the Indian Act. May be tangentially relevant to broader self-governance discussion but not central to the analysis.	No
<i>NIL/TU, O Child and Family Services Society v. B.C. Government and Service Employees' Union</i>	2010 SCC 45	No	This decision concerns the division of powers regarding labour relations for a child welfare agency and does not address the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, the regulation of intoxicants on reserve, or the application of the Charter to commercial activity. While it discusses the "core of Indianness" in a labour context, it does not provide the legal principles required to analyze the specific bylaw-making or alcohol-regulation questions posed in the research.	N/A
<i>Reference re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act</i>	2019 SKCA 40	No	This decision concerns the constitutionality of the federal Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act and the division of powers regarding environmental regulation; it does not address band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, alcohol regulation on reserves, or Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Gamblin v. Norway House Cree Nation Band</i>	2000 CanLII 16761 (FC)	Yes	This decision directly addresses the scope of band council authority under sections 81 and 85.1 of the Indian Act, specifically distinguishing between the legal enforceability of a Band Council Resolution (BCR) versus a formal by-law regarding the regulation of intoxicants and conduct on reserve land.	Yes

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Laforme v. Mississaugas of The New Credit First Nation Band Council</i>	2000 CanLII 15488 (FCA)	Yes	This decision directly addresses the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under section 85.1 of the Indian Act regarding the regulation of intoxicants on reserve, specifically analyzing the limitations on creating exceptions to such prohibitions.	Yes
<i>Chisasibi Band (Chisasibi Eeyouch) c. Napash</i>	2014 QCCQ 10367	Yes	This decision directly addresses the scope of band council bylaw-making authority regarding alcohol regulation and provides an extensive analysis of whether such bylaws are subject to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which is central to the researcher's inquiry.	No
<i>Hiawatha First Nation v. Cowie</i>	2023 ONCA 524	Yes	This decision directly addresses the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under s. 81 of the Indian Act, specifically distinguishing between the legal force of a formal by-law and a mere band council resolution (BCR) in the context of regulating business and land use on reserve.	Yes
<i>St. Mary's Indian Band v. Canada (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) (T.D.)</i>	1995 CanLII 3525 (FC)	Yes	This decision is relevant because it directly analyzes the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under s. 81 of the Indian Act, specifically addressing whether such authority can be used to regulate activities (there, gambling) that are otherwise governed by federal legislation (the Criminal Code). It also addresses the principles of federal paramountcy and the limits of band council jurisdiction in relation to broader federal legislative schemes.	No
<i>NIL/TU,O Child and Family Services Society v. BCGEU</i>	2007 BCSC 1080	Yes	This decision is relevant because it provides an in-depth analysis of the "functional test" and the "Indianness" doctrine under s. 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867, which are central to determining the scope of Indigenous governance and the applicability of provincial versus federal jurisdiction over entities operating on reserve land. It specifically addresses how courts distinguish between activities that are subject to provincial laws of general application and those that fall within the core of federal jurisdiction over "Indians."	No
<i>R. v. M. Keeper</i>	2014 ONSC 3537	Yes	The decision addresses the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under s. 81(1) of the Indian Act, specifically regarding the interplay between federal authority, band bylaws, and the applicability of provincial laws of general application on reserve land.	No
<i>NIL/TU,O Child and Family Services Society v. BCGEU</i>	2008 BCCA 333	No	This decision focuses on the constitutional division of powers regarding labour relations (specifically whether a child welfare society falls under federal or provincial jurisdiction) and does not address the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act or the regulation of intoxicants on reserve.	N/A

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Sga'nism Sim'augit (Chief Mountain) v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	2013 BCCA 49	Yes	The decision explicitly addresses the scope of band council (Nisga'a Government) bylaw-making authority, including specific references to their power to regulate the sale and consumption of alcohol (intoxicants) on reserve lands and how those powers interact with federal and provincial laws.	No
<i>Southeast Resource Development Council Corp. v. United Food and Workers Union, Local 832 et al</i>	2004 MBQB 35	No	This decision concerns the constitutional jurisdiction of provincial labour relations boards over a private corporation providing medical referral services, rather than the scope of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act or the regulation of intoxicants on reserve. It does not address the specific legal principles regarding alcohol bylaws, federal paramountcy in the context of Indigenous self-governance, or s. 2(b) Charter challenges to commercial restrictions.	N/A
<i>R. v. Creekside Hideaway Motel Ltd.</i>	2005 CanLII 57049 (MB PC)	No	While the decision discusses the constitutional validity of provincial legislation and mentions Indian Reserves in the context of a Charter s. 15 challenge, it does not address the specific legal principles of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, federal paramountcy in relation to such bylaws, or the impact of Indigenous self-governance jurisprudence.	N/A
<i>R. v. Francis</i>	1988 CanLII 31 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides the foundational Supreme Court of Canada analysis on the doctrine of federal paramountcy in the context of Indian reserves, specifically addressing how federal regulations and provincial laws of general application can coexist without creating an operational conflict. It directly addresses the legal principles of "occupying the field" and the application of provincial laws on reserve land, which are central to the researcher's inquiry regarding the validity of band council bylaws.	Yes
<i>R. v. Charlie</i>	1985 CanLII 768 (BC CA)	Yes	This decision is relevant because it directly addresses the doctrine of federal paramountcy in the context of potential conflict between federal regulations under the Indian Act and other legislative provisions on reserves, establishing the test for determining when federal legislation "occupies the field."	No
<i>R. v. Blackbird</i>	2005 CanLII 1624 (ON CA)	Yes	The decision directly addresses the federal paramountcy doctrine in the context of overlapping regulatory regimes (a band council by-law and federal legislation), specifically rejecting the "occupying the field" argument in favor of the "impossibility of dual compliance" test. It provides critical guidance on how band council by-laws under the Indian Act interact with federal statutes.	Yes
<i>S.B. v. Alberta (Vital Statistics, Director)</i>	1982 ABCA 312	No	While this decision discusses the doctrine of federal paramountcy and the division of powers, it concerns provincial adoption law and marriage capacity rather than the specific legal framework of the Indian Act, band council bylaws, or Indigenous self-governance.	N/A

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>R. v. Gloade</i>	1986 CanLII 6946 (NS CA)	Yes	The decision directly addresses the doctrine of federal paramountcy and the application of provincial laws of general application to Indians on reserves, specifically analyzing the interaction between provincial liquor legislation and the Indian Act. It provides a foundational analysis of how federal legislation (the Indian Act) interacts with other laws, which is central to the researcher's inquiry regarding the validity of band council bylaws versus federal provisions.	Yes
<i>Bell Canada v. Quebec (Commission de la Santé et de la Sécurité du Travail)</i>	1988 CanLII 81 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is a foundational authority on the doctrine of interjurisdictional immunity and the limits of provincial legislation (specifically labour and safety regulations) when applied to federal undertakings. It directly addresses the principles of federal paramountcy, the "double aspect" theory, and the constitutional test for determining when provincial laws are inapplicable to entities under exclusive federal jurisdiction.	No
<i>Simpson v. Ziprick</i>	1995 CanLII 1327 (BC SC)	Yes	The decision directly applies the doctrine of federal paramountcy and the interpretation of s. 88 of the Indian Act to determine whether provincial legislation (the Partition Act) is inoperative due to conflict with the federal Indian Act's provisions regarding the possession and management of reserve lands.	No
<i>Sechelt Indian Band v. British Columbia (Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act, Dispute Resolution Officer)</i>	2013 BCCA 262	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides an extensive analysis of the constitutional division of powers, the doctrine of interjurisdictional immunity, and federal paramountcy in the context of provincial legislation (the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act) applying to lands reserved for Indians under the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act. It directly addresses the legal principles of whether provincial laws of general application can regulate land use and tenancy on Indigenous lands, which is central to the researcher's inquiry regarding band council bylaws and federal paramountcy.	No
<i>Re Hopkins and Hopkins</i>	1980 CanLII 1678 (ON SC)	Yes	The decision directly applies the doctrine of federal paramountcy and the interpretation of s. 88 of the Indian Act to determine whether provincial legislation is inoperative due to conflict with federal law, which is central to the researcher's inquiry regarding band council bylaws and the Indian Act.	No
<i>Ford v. Quebec (Attorney General)</i>	1988 CanLII 19 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is a foundational authority on the scope of s. 2(b) Charter freedom of expression, specifically establishing that commercial expression is protected under the Charter and that freedom of expression includes the right to express oneself in the language of one's choice.	Yes

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Canada (Attorney General) v. JTI-Macdonald Corp.</i>	2007 SCC 30	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides a comprehensive analysis of s. 2(b) Charter freedom of expression challenges to commercial activity restrictions (tobacco advertising) and applies the Oakes test to determine if such restrictions are justified under s. 1. While it does not address Indigenous band council bylaws, it establishes the foundational constitutional framework for analyzing commercial speech restrictions that the researcher requires for their third research question.	Yes
<i>RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1995 CanLII 64 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is a foundational authority on s. 2(b) Charter challenges to commercial activity restrictions, establishing the framework for analyzing whether government-imposed bans on commercial expression (such as advertising) are justifiable under s. 1. While it does not address Indigenous law, it provides the essential legal principles required to analyze the researcher's third question regarding the prospect of success for a s. 2(b) challenge to a commercial restriction.	Yes
<i>Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)</i>	1989 CanLII 87 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is a foundational authority for s. 2(b) Charter challenges to commercial activity restrictions, establishing the analytical framework for determining whether commercial expression is protected and how such restrictions are evaluated under s. 1. It directly addresses the researcher's need for legal principles regarding commercial expression in a regulatory context.	Yes
<i>Reference re ss. 193 and 195.1(1)(C) of the criminal code (Man.)</i>	1990 CanLII 105 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides foundational Supreme Court analysis on whether commercial activity (specifically, communication for an economic purpose) falls within the scope of s. 2(b) Charter freedom of expression and whether such restrictions can be justified under s. 1. It directly addresses the legal principles concerning the regulation of commercial expression that the researcher is investigating.	Yes
<i>Canada (Attorney General) v. Bedford</i>	2013 SCC 72	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides a comprehensive analysis of s. 2(b) freedom of expression challenges in a regulatory context, specifically addressing whether criminal prohibitions on commercial activity (prostitution) infringe upon Charter rights. Furthermore, it establishes the modern framework for analyzing whether legislative restrictions on commercial activity are arbitrary, overbroad, or grossly disproportionate under s. 7 of the Charter.	No
<i>Montréal (City) v. 2952-1366 Québec Inc.</i>	2005 SCC 62	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides a leading Supreme Court of Canada analysis on the application of s. 2(b) of the Charter to commercial expression (specifically, the use of loudspeakers for advertising) and establishes the framework for determining whether such restrictions on public property are justifiable under s. 1. It also addresses the principles of municipal regulatory authority and the interpretation of by-laws in the context of nuisance control.	Yes

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>R. v. Van der Peet</i>	1996 CanLII 216 (SCC)	No	While this decision addresses the definition of Aboriginal rights under s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, it does not analyze s. 2(b) Charter freedom of expression challenges to commercial activity, nor does it address the specific legal framework of band council bylaw-making authority or federal paramountcy.	N/A
<i>McKinney v. University of Guelph</i>	1990 CanLII 60 (SCC)	No	This decision concerns the application of the Charter to universities and mandatory retirement policies; it does not address the specific legal principles of band council bylaw-making authority, federal paramountcy in the context of Indigenous self-governance, or s. 2(b) challenges to commercial activity restrictions.	N/A
<i>George v. Heiltsuk First Nation</i>	2022 FC 1786	Yes	The decision directly addresses the intersection of Indigenous legal traditions (?vi??ás) and Canadian administrative law, specifically discussing how courts must delineate jurisdictional boundaries in a manner that respects Indigenous self-governance and inherent law-making powers. It provides a framework for how courts assess whether a band council's actions constitute an exercise of state authority versus an exercise of inherent Indigenous jurisdiction.	Yes
<i>Dickson v. Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation</i>	2024 SCC 10	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides the Supreme Court of Canada's most recent and authoritative framework for how Indigenous self-governance rights (under s. 25 of the Charter) interact with individual Charter rights, specifically addressing the "shield" versus "interpretive prism" debate and the conditions under which collective Indigenous rights take precedence over individual Charter claims.	Yes
<i>Houle v. Swan River First Nation</i>	2025 FC 267	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it applies the Supreme Court of Canada's recent framework from <i>Dickson v Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation</i> (2024 SCC 10) to determine how Indigenous self-governance rights interact with Charter challenges (specifically s. 15) and the scope of band council authority. It directly addresses the researcher's core interest in how recent jurisprudence on Indigenous self-governance affects the traditional constitutional analysis of band-imposed restrictions.	Yes
<i>Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc. v. Drew</i>	2001 SKQB 25	Yes	The decision addresses the intersection of provincial regulatory authority and Indigenous self-governance claims in the context of on-reserve economic activity, which is central to the researcher's inquiry regarding how self-governance rights interact with traditional constitutional and jurisdictional analysis.	No
<i>George v Bella Bella Community School Society</i>	2023 BCSC 1767	No	This decision concerns a tort claim regarding the termination of an employment contract and defamation; it does not address the scope of band council bylaw-making authority, federal paramountcy, or Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Renvoi à la Cour d'appel du Québec relatif à la Loi concernant les enfants, les jeunes et les familles des Premières Nations, des Inuits et des Métis</i>	2022 QCCA 185	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it provides a detailed analysis of the constitutional status of Indigenous self-governance rights under s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, and explicitly addresses how these rights interact with the traditional division of powers and the doctrine of federal paramountcy. It specifically examines whether Parliament can unilaterally legislate to grant Aboriginal laws primacy over provincial laws, which is central to the researcher's inquiry regarding the limits of band council bylaw authority.	Yes
<i>Kwanlin Dün First Nation v. Edzerza</i>	2006 FC 1147	No	This decision concerns the internal administrative jurisdiction of a First Nation's election appeals board under its own constitution and does not address the constitutional principles of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, federal paramountcy, or Charter challenges to commercial regulations.	N/A
<i>R. v. Pamajewon</i>	1994 CanLII 2716 (ON CA)	Yes	This decision is highly relevant as it directly addresses the legal principles of Indigenous self-governance and its interaction with federal legislative authority (the Criminal Code), specifically rejecting the argument that inherent self-governance rights create concurrent jurisdiction that can override federal law. It provides the foundational judicial reasoning on how courts analyze claims of "concurrent governance" versus federal paramountcy in the context of band-regulated economic activity.	No
<i>R. v. Pamajewon</i>	1996 CanLII 161 (SCC)	Yes	This decision is a foundational case regarding the scope of Indigenous self-governance under s. 35(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982, specifically addressing whether band council authority to regulate activities (like gambling) constitutes an inherent aboriginal right that can supersede federal law. It directly addresses the legal principles of how self-governance claims are characterized and measured against federal regulatory authority.	Yes
<i>Membertou Band v. Paul</i>	2021 NSSC 286	Yes	The decision explicitly addresses the shift from Indian Act authority to inherent self-governance under the First Nations Land Management Act, providing judicial support for the principle that Indigenous self-governance rights can supersede traditional Indian Act regulatory frameworks.	No
<i>R. v. Van der Peet</i>	1996 CanLII 216 (SCC)	Yes	SCC established the test for Aboriginal rights under s. 35(1): an activity must be an element of a practice, custom or tradition integral to the distinctive culture of the Aboriginal group prior to European contact. Rights must be characterized specifically, not broadly. The test is applied from the perspective of the Aboriginal peoples but within the Canadian legal framework. Ambiguities resolved in favour of Aboriginal peoples. Directly governs any s. 35 self-governance argument raised to defend the alcohol bylaw — the band would need to show alcohol regulation was integral to their distinctive culture prior to contact.	Yes

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>R. v. Sparrow</i>	1990 CanLII 104 (SCC)	Yes	SCC established the foundational framework for s. 35(1) analysis. Federal legislative powers under s. 91(24) continue but must be reconciled with s. 35(1): the Crown must justify any government regulation that infringes upon or denies aboriginal rights. The two-part justification test requires: (1) a valid legislative objective (conservation, resource management, or other compelling and substantial objective); and (2) consistency with the Crown's fiduciary duty to aboriginal peoples, including minimum infringement and consultation. Extinguishment requires clear and plain intention — regulation alone does not extinguish. Relevant to the memo as background framework for any s. 35 self-governance argument raised to defend the alcohol bylaw against Indian Act challenge, and for understanding that the Crown must justify any infringement of existing aboriginal rights.	Yes
<i>Canadian Western Bank v. Alberta</i>	2007 SCC 22	Yes	SCC set out the modern framework for division of powers analysis: (1) pith and substance; (2) interjurisdictional immunity (limited application, reserved for precedent-established situations, requires "impairment" not mere "affects"); (3) federal paramountcy (operational conflict — impossibility of dual compliance OR frustration of federal purpose). Court strongly restricted interjurisdictional immunity doctrine. Paramountcy test: onus on party relying on it to show either (a) impossible to comply with both laws, or (b) application of provincial law frustrates purpose of federal law. Mere duplication/overlap does not trigger paramountcy. Foundational for the paramountcy analysis as applied to the band council alcohol bylaw.	Yes
<i>Osoyoos Indian Band v. Oliver (Town)</i>	2001 SCC 85	Yes	SCC held that the Band's s. 83(1)(a) taxation bylaw applied to canal lands on reserve because the Order in Council only transferred an easement, not a fee simple. Court confirmed that Indian Act provisions dealing with band land interests should be interpreted broadly in favour of the band. At para 74-75, Court confirmed that s. 81 bylaw authority is not unfettered — bylaws must be consistent with the Act, and bylaws that conflict with a prior exercise of s. 35 expropriation power would be prohibited by s. 81. Court confirmed the liberal interpretive principle: provisions aimed at maintaining Indian rights to be interpreted broadly, provisions limiting those rights to be interpreted narrowly. Useful for the memo primarily on interpretive principles for s. 81 bylaw authority.	Yes

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. v. Saskatchewan</i>	2005 SCC 13	Yes	SCC held that Saskatchewan's tobacco display ban was NOT rendered inoperative by the federal Tobacco Act's permission to display tobacco products. Two-part paramourcy test confirmed: (1) impossibility of dual compliance; and (2) frustration of federal legislative purpose. Court held that Parliament's mere permission (not granting a positive entitlement) does not prevent a province (or by analogy a band) from imposing a stricter standard. Criminal law prohibitions do not create freestanding rights limiting stricter legislation. Critically for the memo: a band council alcohol bylaw that is stricter than the Indian Act's regime does not conflict with the Indian Act merely because the Act permits alcohol in some circumstances — Parliament's non-prohibition is not a positive entitlement to sell alcohol on reserve.	Yes
<i>Quebec (Attorney General) v. Kanyinda</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a Charter challenge regarding subsidized childcare eligibility for refugee claimants in Quebec and does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or federal paramourcy in the context of reserve land alcohol regulation.	N/A
<i>Taylor v. Newfoundland and Labrador</i>	(no citation)	No	The decision concerns provincial travel restrictions under s. 6 of the Charter during the COVID-19 pandemic and does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or the doctrine of federal paramourcy in the context of Indigenous self-governance.	N/A
<i>Kahnawà:ke Gaming Commission c. Magic Palace</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns the procedural scope of the Superior Court of Quebec's power of judicial review over private entities under the Code of Civil Procedure and does not address the substantive legal issues of Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, federal paramourcy, or Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Gitxaala v. British Columbia (Chief Gold Commissioner)</i>	(no citation)	No	While the decision discusses the interpretation of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act and UNDRIP, it concerns a provincial mineral tenure regime and does not address the specific research questions regarding band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, federal paramourcy, or s. 2(b) Charter challenges to alcohol regulation on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Alliance du personnel professionnel et technique de la santé et des services sociaux c. Brière</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a labour law dispute regarding the interpretation of ministerial decrees and the Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms in the context of healthcare employment; it does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, federal paramourcy, or s. 2(b) Charter rights.	N/A

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>Ruck v. City of Mississauga</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a municipal by-law regulating residential property standards and does not address Indigenous band council authority, the Indian Act, or the doctrine of federal paramountcy in the context of Indigenous self-governance. While it discusses s. 2(b) of the Charter, it does so in the context of private residential landscaping rather than commercial activity on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Kishawi v Vancouver Island University</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a judicial review of student disciplinary proceedings at a university and does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, federal paramountcy, or s. 2(b) Charter challenges in the context of reserve land. It provides no jurisprudence relevant to the research question.	N/A
<i>Steveston Harbour Authority v. Ridge Fishing Ltd.</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a commercial dispute over harbour moorage and trespass between a private harbour authority and private corporate defendants; it does not address the Indian Act, band council bylaw-making authority, federal paramountcy, or s. 2(b) Charter rights. While the defendants identify as Indigenous-owned businesses, the court's analysis is limited to contract law, proprietary estoppel, and administrative fairness in a commercial context.	N/A
<i>Murray-Hall v. Quebec (Attorney General)</i>	(no citation)	No	While the decision addresses the division of powers and federal paramountcy in the context of cannabis regulation, it does not address the specific research question regarding Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, nor does it analyze the application of s. 2(b) Charter rights to commercial activity on reserve land. The decision focuses exclusively on the constitutional validity of provincial legislation versus federal criminal law in the context of a state-run monopoly.	N/A
<i>References re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act</i>	(no citation)	No	While the decision discusses the division of powers and the national concern doctrine, it does not address the specific issues of band council bylaw-making authority under the Indian Act, federal paramountcy in the context of Indigenous governance, or s. 2(b) Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>WestJet v. Gauthier</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a class action regarding airfare pricing for passengers with disabilities and the doctrine of federal paramountcy in the context of transportation regulations; it does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or s. 2(b) Charter rights.	N/A
<i>Union des consommateurs c. Air Canada</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns consumer protection law and federal paramountcy in the context of airline ticket pricing and the Quebec Consumer Protection Act; it does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or s. 2(b) Charter rights.	N/A

Case Name	Citation	Passed Pre-Screen	Reasoning	Used in Final Output
<i>R v Bernier</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns the prosecution of individuals for violating COVID-19 public health orders and does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, federal paramountcy, or s. 2(b) Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Further Detention of Things Seized</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns the procedural requirements for the detention of seized property under the Criminal Code and does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Ville de Montréal c. Consultants AECOM inc.</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns the doctrine of federal paramountcy in the context of Quebec provincial legislation (Loi 26) and the federal Competition Act; it does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, or s. 2(b) Charter rights in the context of reserve land.	N/A
<i>Ville de Sainte-Julie c. Pépin</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision concerns a municipal zoning dispute regarding landfill remediation and the interpretation of provincial environmental legislation (Loi sur la qualité de l'environnement). It does not address Indigenous band council bylaw-making authority, the Indian Act, federal paramountcy in an Indigenous context, or Charter challenges to commercial restrictions on reserve land.	N/A
<i>Hiawatha First Nation v. Cowie</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision is a costs endorsement that focuses on procedural history and the allocation of legal fees; it does not substantively analyze the scope of band council bylaw-making authority, federal paramountcy, or s. 2(b) Charter rights.	N/A
<i>1401380 Ontario Ltd. v. Wasaya Airways LP, 1401380 Ontario Ltd. v. Remotes One Remote Communities</i>	(no citation)	No	This decision focuses on a private commercial dispute regarding breach of contract and inducing breach of contract between an air charter operator and a utility company. While the case involves Band Council Resolutions (BCRs) and mentions Indigenous self-governance, the court explicitly states that the decision is limited to contractual obligations and does not address the constitutional or administrative law issues (such as federal paramountcy or s. 2(b) Charter rights) central to the research question.	N/A