

[TRANSLATION]

Citation: *L. C. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2014 SSTAD 393

Appeal No. AD-13-69

BETWEEN:

L. C.

Applicant

and

Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Respondent

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION
Appeal Division – Application for Leave to Appeal

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL MEMBER: Pierre Lafontaine

DATE OF DECISION: December 23, 2014

DECISION

[1] The Tribunal refuses leave to appeal to the Appeal Division of the Social Security Tribunal.

INTRODUCTION

[2] On April 19, 2013, a Board of Referees found that:

- Imposing a disentitlement under paragraph 18(a) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (the Act) was justified because the Applicant failed to show that he was available for work;
- Imposing a disentitlement under section 9 and subsections 11(1) and 11(4) of the Act was justified because the Applicant failed to show that he was unemployed;
- Imposing a penalty under section 38 of the Act was justified;
- Issuing a notice of violation under section 7.1 of the Act was justified.

[3] On May 23, 2013, the Applicant filed an application for leave to appeal with the Appeal Division.

ISSUE

[4] The Tribunal must decide whether the appeal has a reasonable chance of success.

THE LAW

[5] According to subsections 56(1) and 58(3) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act*, “an appeal to the Appeal Division may only be brought if leave to appeal is granted” and “the Appeal Division must either grant or refuse leave to appeal.”

[6] Subsection 58(2) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act* provides that “leave to appeal is refused if the Appeal Division is satisfied that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success.”

ANALYSIS

[7] In accordance with subsection 58(1) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act*, the only grounds of appeal are that:

- (a) the Board of Referees failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;
- (b) the Board of Referees erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or
- (c) the Board of Referees based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before it.

[8] A leave to appeal proceeding is a preliminary step to a hearing on the merits. It is a first hurdle for the Applicant to meet, but it is lower than the one that must be met on the hearing of the appeal on the merits. At the leave stage, the Applicant does not have to prove the case.

[9] The Tribunal will grant leave to appeal if the Applicant shows that one of the above-mentioned grounds of appeal has a reasonable chance of success.

[10] This means that the Tribunal must be in a position to determine, in accordance with subsection 58(1) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act*, whether there is a question of law, fact or jurisdiction whose response might justify setting aside the decision under review.

[11] Given the foregoing, does the Applicant's appeal have a reasonable chance of success?

[12] The facts identified and the documents submitted by the Applicant in support of the application for leave to appeal do not add anything significant to what was already given to the Board of Referees, and essentially uphold the Board's decision on the issues.

[13] Since the Applicant did not raise any question of law, fact or jurisdiction whose response might justify setting aside the decision under review, the appeal has no reasonable chance of success.

CONCLUSION

[14] Leave to appeal is refused.

Pierre Lafontaine

Member, Appeal Division