

Citation: *A. M. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2015 SSTAD 341

Appeal No. AD-14-446

BETWEEN:

A. M.

Applicant

and

Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Respondent

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION
Appeal Division – Leave to Appeal Decision

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL MEMBER: Pierre Lafontaine

DATE OF DECISION: March 11, 2015

DECISION

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

INTRODUCTION

[2] On June 18, 2014, the General Division of the Tribunal determined that:

- A disentitlement was imposed in accordance with section 37 of the *Employment Insurance Act* (the “*Act*”) and Section 55 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations* (the “*Regulations*”) because he was absent from Canada;
- A disentitlement was imposed in accordance with section 18 of the *Act* because he has not proven that he was available for work;
- The imposition of a penalty was justified in accordance with section 38 of the *Act* for making a misrepresentation by knowingly providing false or misleading information to the Respondent.

[3] The Applicant requested leave to appeal to the Appeal Division on July 31, 2014.

ISSUES

[4] The Tribunal must decide if 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* (the “*DESD 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 *DESD 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] Subsection 58(1) of the *DESD Act* states that the only grounds of appeal are the following:

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

[8] In regards to the application for permission to appeal, the Applicant needs to satisfy the Tribunal that the reasons for appeal fall within any of the above mentioned grounds of appeal and that at least one of the reasons has a reasonable chance of success, before leave can be granted.

[9] In his application for permission to appeal, the Applicant essentially repeats his testimony given before the General Division. He is requesting that the Appeal Division give him the benefit of the doubt since he speaks the truth and that the present situation has caused him family and medical problems.

[10] The Applicant is basically asking this Tribunal to re-evaluate and reweigh the evidence that was put before the General Division which is the province of the trier of fact and not of an appeal court. It is not for the Member deciding whether to grant leave to appeal to reweigh the evidence or explore the merits of the decision of the General Division.

[11] While an applicant is not required to prove the grounds of appeal for the purposes of a leave application, at the very least, an applicant ought to set out some reasons which fall into the enumerated grounds of appeal. The Application is deficient in this regard and the Applicant has not satisfied the Tribunal that the appeal has a reasonable chance of success.

[12] If the Applicant wants to request a write-off of his debt, a formal request should be made directly to the Respondent so that a decision is rendered on that issue.

CONCLUSION

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

Pierre Lafontaine

Member, Appeal Division