



Social Security
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité
sociale du Canada

Citation: *R. P. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2016 SSTADEI 311

Tribunal File Number: AD-16-554

BETWEEN:

R. P.

Applicant

and

Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Respondent

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION
Appeal Division

DECISION BY: Mark Borer

DATE OF DECISION: June 14, 2016

DECISION

[1] On March 11, 2016, a member of the General Division dismissed the Applicant'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 her initial application, the Applicant re-stated arguments that she had previously made before the General Division and submitted that "some of the information [in the decision] is incorrect".

[5] Because of the lack of any stated ground of appeal, I directed Tribunal staff to contact the Applicant by letter and ask for further details. Specifically, the Tribunal letter asked that she provide full and detailed grounds of appeal as required by the Act, and provided her with examples of what constitutes grounds of appeal. The Tribunal letter also noted that if she did not do so, her application could be refused without further notice.

[6] The Applicant responded by once again repeating the evidence she provided to the General Division. She also explained that she took a leave of absence from her job to go

back to school so that she could better herself, and set out her belief that she should receive benefits.

[7] While it is clear that the Applicant disagrees with the General Division decision, I find that the Applicant's submissions do not identify a ground of appeal that has a reasonable chance of success. In essence, this application is a blanket objection to the member's decision and a request that I re-hear the case 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