



Social Security  
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité  
sociale du Canada

Citation: *D. M. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2016 SSTADEI 416

Tribunal File Number: AD-16-827

BETWEEN:

**D. M.**

Applicant

and

**Canada Employment Insurance Commission**

Respondent

---

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

---

Leave to Appeal Decision by: Mark Borer

Date of Decision: August 12, 2016

## **DECISION**

[1] Previously, 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 restated much of the evidence he had previously provided to the General Division, but did not reference any of the enumerated grounds of appeal.

[5] Because of the lack of any alleged General Division error and the fact that no ground of appeal had been set out, Tribunal staff contacted the Applicant by letter to 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 asserting that he had 1400 insurable hours of employment. He did not explain how this related to his appeal or in what manner it was alleged that the General Division member had erred.

[7] 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*.

[8] 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