



Social Security
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité
sociale du Canada

Citation: *G. S. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2016 SSTADEI 17

Appeal No. AD-15-928

BETWEEN:

G. S.

Appellant

and

Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Respondent

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION
Appeal Division – Appeal

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL MEMBER: Mark BORER

DATE OF DECISION: January 13, 2016

DECISION: Appeal dismissed

Canada

DECISION

[1] The appeal is dismissed.

INTRODUCTION

[2] On July 13, 2015, a General Division member determined that the appeal of the Appellant from the previous determination of the Commission should be dismissed. The Appellant appealed that decision to the Appeal Division and leave to appeal was granted.

[3] This appeal was decided on the record.

ANALYSIS

[4] In granting leave to appeal, I noted at paragraphs 4 to 6 that:

In his application for leave to appeal, the Applicant states that the General Division member erred because he relied upon evidence that was mistranslated during the hearing by the interpreter.

I find that this application raises appeal grounds that have a reasonable chance of success. For that reason, this application for leave to appeal must be granted.

I note, however, that I will require actual evidence to substantiate this claim, including details of what parts of the interpretation were mistranslated, what the correct translation is, and in what way the alleged mistranslation was material to the outcome.

[5] This was the sole ground upon which leave to appeal was granted.

[6] To date, contrary to my expectations as expressed in my leave to appeal decision, the Appellant has made no further submissions regarding his allegations, or indeed any further submissions of any kind.

[7] Because of this, I find that the Appellant has failed in his duty to substantiate his allegations of an error on the part of the interpreter.

[8] Regardless, I have reviewed the General Division decision. I find that it correctly stated the law, made findings of fact supported by the evidence, applied the law in a reasonable manner to those facts, and came to conclusions that were entirely reasonable.

[9] There is no reason for the Appeal Division to intervene.

CONCLUSION

[10] For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Mark Borer

Member, Appeal Division