



Social Security  
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité  
sociale du Canada

Citation: *C. L. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2016 SSTADEI 316

Tribunal File Number: AD-16-433

BETWEEN:

**C. L.**

Applicant

and

**Canada Employment Insurance Commission**

Respondent

---

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

---

DECISION BY: Mark Borer

DATE OF DECISION: June 16, 2016

## **DECISION**

[1] On February 12, 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 his initial application the Applicant re-stated arguments that he had previously made before the General Division and submitted that "I feel the wrong decision was made".

[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 the Applicant provide full and detailed grounds of appeal as required by the Act, and provided examples of what constitutes grounds of appeal. The Tribunal letter also noted that if this was not done, the application could be refused without further notice.

[6] The Applicant responded by repeating some of the evidence he provided to the General Division. He also explained that his appeal had a reasonable chance of success

because “another person should be able to see this” and agree that he was entitled to 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-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