

!!!PLEASE NOTE the following case is entirely fictional and was generated using ChatGPT. All cases, legislation, and material are fictional and should not inform any future moot submissions unrelated to this Moot Camp!!!

SUPREME COURT OF THE MOOT CAMP

Citation: **R. v. Moonlight, 2026 SCMC 7**

Date: February 24, 2026

Present: Delle Donne C.J. and Ragan, Booboo-Phoenix, Wilson, Liu, Cox, Hodge, Ringer and Minanengiyeofori JJ.

Reasons for Judgment

The judgment of Delle Donne C.J. and Ragan, Wilson, Liu, Cox and Hodge JJ. was delivered by

Delle Donne C.J. —

I. Introduction

1. This appeal concerns Mr. Horatio Moonlight, an amateur astronomer and self-proclaimed “Lunar Rights Activist,” who was charged under the **Celestial Integrity and Public Order Act, 2025** (“CIPOA”). Section 5(1) of the Act provides:

“No person shall, without a federal permit, project, simulate, amplify, duplicate, or otherwise tamper with the apparent presence of a celestial body in Canadian airspace in a manner likely to cause public alarm.”

2. On the evening of October 31, 2025, Mr. Moonlight launched what he described as a “community-enhancing lunar enhancement initiative”: a 200-metre weather balloon fitted with high-intensity projection equipment designed to create the appearance of a second moon over downtown Ottawa.
3. The result was immediate and spectacular. Citizens reported “astronomical duplication.” Amateur werewolf enthusiasts gathered in Parliament Hill Park. Several motorists stopped abruptly to take photographs. A small but enthusiastic group began chanting,

“Two moons! Twice the tides!” The Royal Canadian Mounted Police intervened before any tidal consequences could materialize.

4. Mr. Moonlight was arrested and later convicted at trial. He now appeals to this Court, arguing that s. 5(1) of the CIPOA violates his rights under ss. 2(b), 7, and 1 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.
-

II. Facts

5. Mr. Moonlight, a retired dental hygienist with a longstanding interest in astronomy, had grown dissatisfied with what he termed “lunar monotony.” In a manifesto posted online entitled *One Sky Is Not Enough*, he argued that “the monopoly of the single moon suppresses imaginative possibility.”
 6. Without seeking a permit, he launched a helium balloon carrying a projection array capable of casting a high-definition lunar replica into low cloud cover. The projection was remarkably convincing. Several social media users speculated that the federal government had “finally done something cool.”
 7. Traffic disruptions followed. Emergency dispatch received 312 calls in 20 minutes, including one inquiry as to whether the ocean had “already started rising.” A local astronomy club declared an “existential emergency.”
 8. Mr. Moonlight was charged under s. 5(1) of the CIPOA. He admitted the actus reus but argued constitutional invalidity.
-

III. Issues

9. The appeal raises three issues:
 - (1) Does s. 5(1) of the CIPOA infringe s. 2(b) of the *Charter* (freedom of expression)?
 - (2) Does it infringe s. 7 (life, liberty, and security of the person)?
 - (3) If so, is any infringement justified under s. 1?
-

IV. Analysis

A. Section 2(b)

10. The projection of an artificial moon constitutes expressive activity. As this Court held in *R. v. Pyrotechnic Poetry*, 2018 SCC 42 (fictional), expression includes conduct that conveys or attempts to convey meaning, even if that meaning is “cosmic in ambition.”
11. Mr. Moonlight’s projection was intended to provoke reflection on conformity, celestial scarcity, and “the tyranny of singular satellites.” It therefore falls within the ambit of s. 2(b).
12. Section 5(1) restricts such expression by criminalizing unauthorized celestial simulation. The infringement is clear.

B. Section 7

13. Conviction under s. 5(1) carries a maximum penalty of two years’ imprisonment. Liberty is engaged.
14. Mr. Moonlight argues that the law is overbroad and vague. We disagree.
15. The objective of the CIPOA is to prevent public alarm and maintain public order in Canadian airspace. The duplication of celestial bodies—realistic or otherwise—poses obvious risks of panic, distraction, and spontaneous tide-related speculation.
16. The law is not vague. “Celestial body” and “simulate” are terms capable of judicial interpretation. Nor is it overbroad: it is confined to conduct likely to cause public alarm. A child’s glow-in-the-dark sticker would not suffice.
17. Accordingly, s. 7 is not infringed in a manner contrary to the principles of fundamental justice.

C. Section 1

18. Even if s. 2(b) is infringed, the limitation is justified.
19. The objective—preventing widespread panic and ensuring orderly skies—is pressing and substantial.
20. There is a rational connection between prohibiting unauthorized celestial duplication and preventing confusion. The evidence demonstrates that the second moon caused

genuine alarm.

21. The measure is minimally impairing. Permits may be obtained. The Act does not prohibit all expressive projections—only those likely to cause alarm.
22. The salutary effects outweigh the deleterious. While Mr. Moonlight’s artistic ambitions are admirable, the preservation of a single, reliable moon for navigational and emotional stability purposes is of significant public importance.

V. Conclusion

23. Section 5(1) of the CIPOA infringes s. 2(b) but is justified under s. 1. It does not violate s. 7.
24. The appeal is dismissed.

Delle Donne C.J.
Ragan, Wilson, Liu, Cox and Hodge JJ. concur.

Reasons for Judgment

The reasons of Ringer and Minanengiyeofori JJ. were delivered by

Ringer J. (dissenting) —

25. I respectfully dissent.
26. The majority understates the expressive significance of Mr. Moonlight’s act. The projection of a second moon was political, philosophical, and undeniably majestic.
27. Section 5(1) criminalizes expression based on its capacity to unsettle. In *R. v. Inflatable Parliament*, 2022 SCC 9 (fictional), this Court warned that “the state may not silence

spectacle merely because it startles.”

28. The evidence of “alarm” consisted largely of social media confusion and a temporary spike in tide-related Google searches. Public curiosity is not panic.

29. The permit regime vests sweeping discretion in the Minister of Atmospheric Affairs. No criteria constrain the decision. This chills unconventional expression.

30. I would find the infringement of s. 2(b) not justified under s. 1. The law is disproportionate. A warning label—“This is Not the Moon”—would have sufficed.

31. I would allow the appeal and enter an acquittal.

Ringer J.
Minanengiyeofori J. concurs.

Concurring Reasons

Booboo-Phoenix J. (concurring in the result)

32. I agree with the Chief Justice that the appeal must be dismissed. I write separately because the case is not truly about moons.

33. It is about expectations.

34. Humanity has, for millennia, relied upon the singular moon as a quiet companion. It governs tides, poetry, and certain hairstyles. To double it abruptly is to disturb not merely traffic, but destiny.

35. Section 2(b) protects expression. It does not guarantee astronomical surprise.

36. While I accept that Mr. Moonlight’s project was expressive, I would ground its limitation not in alarm but in metaphysical coherence. As this Court observed in *Cosmos v. Chaos*, 2011 SCC 88 (fictional), “The Charter does not compel the multiplication of moons.”

37. I would therefore dismiss the appeal on the basis that Canadians are constitutionally entitled to a sky of predictable quantity.

38. I add only this: should Parliament ever legislate a Third Moon Framework, different considerations may arise.

Booboo-Phoenix J.

This judgment is entirely fictional. Any resemblance to actual legislation, celestial duplication, or spontaneous tidal enthusiasm is purely coincidental.

!!!PLEASE NOTE the above case is entirely fictional and was generated using ChatGPT. All cases, legislation, and material are fictional and should not inform any future moot submissions unrelated to this Moot Camp!!!