In this paper, recent boundary cases are considered—but especially as related to Ontario. The choice of jurisdiction is a consequence of the original audience for whom the paper was prepared: real estate lawyers in Ontario. While the activity of case law review and discussion may be seen as an ad hoc and fact—specific exercise, most lawyers in practice choose to remain aware of recent cases in order to stay abreast of new trends. Law schools still use the case law method for teaching—as well as to identify current reported cases as harbingers of potential new trends. Likewise, legislators monitor what emerges from our courts—if only to make sure that there is not a need for remedial legislation in order to possibly “correct” policy implications of a decision or a series of decisions which signal a new trend. Despite its jurisdictional limitations and the review of only most recent cases, this paper is both an example and a reminder that the jurisprudence of boundary law and the work of geomatics professionals continues to evolve.

Understandably, this is a topic which has the potential to create a sequel to a book, but has been kept to this length. The point, of course, is that the emphasis had to be on “new” cases. This was understood to mean cases decided in the last year. In the pages which follow there will be indicators of trends that are novel and suggestions that boundary law (as well as property law) is a constantly evolving body of jurisprudence. Furthermore, rather than being either boring or soporific, the topic can be more feisty than litigants in a family dispute. It can also engage complex mathematics and science that will make our heads spin. Boundary and property law decisions in 2013 have addressed disputes between urban neighbours, between rural neighbours and between residents and their municipalities. The issues have been wide-ranging and have included:

- challenges which emerge from the reliance on reference plans and registered instruments for boundaries of waterfront properties;
- navigability of small waterways and the creation of strips of Crown land;
- boundary and adverse possession problems concerning roadways and public spaces;
- the continuing evolution of the significance of mutual mistake in adverse possession; and
- the interpretation of the court’s power to rectify under the Land Titles Act.
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