



Social Security  
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité  
sociale du Canada

Citation: *V. A. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission and InnSys Incorporated*,  
2016 SSTADEI 301

Tribunal File Number: AD-16-606

BETWEEN:

**V. A.**

Applicant

and

**Canada Employment Insurance Commission and InnSys Incorporated**

Respondents

---

**SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION**  
**Appeal Division**

---

DECISION BY: Mark Borer

DATE OF DECISION: June 13, 2016

## **DECISION**

[1] On February 29, 2016, a member of the General Division allowed the Employer's appeal from the previous determination of the Commission. In due course, the Applicant filed an application requesting leave to appeal to the Appeal Division.

[2] Subsection 58(1) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act* states that the only grounds of appeal are that:

(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.

[3] The *Act* also states that leave to appeal is to be refused if the appeal has "no reasonable chance of success".

[4] In his initial application the Applicant re-stated many of the arguments he had previously made before the General Division member. Although he referenced the grounds of appeal, he did not explain how the member made any material error. He also appeared to confuse submissions made by the Employer with factual findings made by the member.

[5] Noting that the Applicant's appeal was not complete because the grounds of appeal were not sufficiently detailed, I directed Tribunal staff to contact the Applicant by letter and ask for further details. Specifically, the Tribunal letter asked that he provide full and detailed grounds of appeal as required by the *Act*, and gave him examples of what constitutes grounds of appeal. The Tribunal letter also noted that if he did not do so, his application could be refused without further notice.

[6] The Applicant did not respond.

[7] I find that the Applicant's submissions are essentially a blanket objection to the member's decision and a request that I re-weigh the evidence and come to a different conclusion.

[8] This I cannot do.

[9] The role of the Appeal Division is to determine if a reviewable error set out in ss. 58(1) of the *Act* has been made by the General Division and if so to provide a remedy for that error. In the absence of such a reviewable error, the law does not permit the Appeal Division to intervene. It is not our role to re-hear the case *de novo*.

[10] In order to have a reasonable chance of success, the Applicant must explain in some detail how in their view at least one reviewable error set out in the *Act* has been made. Having failed to do so, this application for leave to appeal does not have a reasonable chance of success and must be refused.

*Mark Borer*  
Member, Appeal Division