



Social Security  
Tribunal of Canada

Tribunal de la sécurité  
sociale du Canada

Citation: *S. C. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2017 SSTADEI 117

Tribunal File Number: AD-16-1177

BETWEEN:

**S. C.**

Applicant

and

**Canada Employment Insurance Commission**

Respondent

---

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

---

Leave to Appeal Decision by: Mark Borer

Date of Decision: March 25, 2017

## REASONS AND DECISION

[1] Previously, a member of the General Division dismissed the Applicant's appeal. In due course, the Applicant filed an application requesting leave to appeal to the Appeal Division.

[2] The Applicant's application to the Appeal Division was filed late. The Applicant offered no explanation for this, and he clearly did not prioritize the filing of this appeal. That being said, given my disposition of this application, I do not see any prejudice to the Commission resulting from an extension of time being granted. Therefore, I am prepared to conclude that it is in the interests of justice to allow further time within which this application can be made.

[3] Subsection 58(1) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act* (DESDA) 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.

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

[5] In his initial application, the Applicant made statements regarding his self-employment and alleged that the General Division member erred in fact. In response to a request from Tribunal staff for additional details, the Applicant repeated some of the evidence and submissions he had already made to the General Division member regarding his self-employment business, but did not elaborate on what errors he felt had been made.

[6] Because these initial submissions did not set out a ground of appeal which had a reasonable chance of success, I asked Tribunal staff to contact the Applicant by letter to seek further details. Specifically, the Tribunal letter asked that the Applicant provide full and detailed grounds of appeal as required by the DESDA, 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.

[7] The Applicant did not respond.

[8] I note that on the face of the record the General Division member did consider the Applicant's evidence and submissions, even if she did not ultimately accept them.

[9] The Applicant is dissatisfied with the General Division member's decision. But in essence, he would like me to re-weigh the evidence and come to a different conclusion than that already reached by the General Division member.

[10] This I cannot do.

[11] The role of the Appeal Division is to determine if a reviewable error set out in ss. 58(1) of the DESDA 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*.

[12] It is not sufficient for an applicant to ask the Appeal Division for a different outcome than that already rendered. In order to have a reasonable chance of success, an applicant must explain in some detail how, in their view, at least one reviewable error set out in the DESDA has been made. Because the Applicant did not, even after he was twice prompted to do so by the Tribunal, I find that the Applicant's application for leave to appeal does not have a reasonable chance of success and must be refused.

*Mark Borer*

Member, Appeal Division