

Citation: F. V. v. Canada Employment Insurance Commission, 2017 SSTADEI 434

Tribunal File Number: AD-17-909

BETWEEN:

F. V.

Applicant

and

Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Respondent

SOCIAL SECURITY TRIBUNAL DECISION Appeal Division

Leave to Appeal Decision by: Pierre Lafontaine

Date of Decision: December 12, 2017



REASONS AND DECISION

DECISION

[1] The Social Security Tribunal of Canada (Tribunal) refuses leave to appeal to the Tribunal's Appeal Division.

INTRODUCTION

[2] On October 13, 2017, the Tribunal's General Division found that the Applicant's earnings had been allocated in accordance with sections 35 and 36 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations* (Regulations).

[3] The Applicant filed an application for leave to appeal to the Appeal Division on November 30, 2017, after receiving the General Division decision on October 30, 2017.

ISSUE

[4] The Tribunal must decide whether the appeal has a reasonable chance of success.

THE LAW

[5] According to subsections 56(1) and 58(3) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development* (DESD Act), "An appeal to the Appeal Division may only be brought if leave to appeal is granted" and "The Appeal Division must either grant or refuse leave to appeal."

[6] Subsection 58(2) of the DESD Act provides that "[1]eave to appeal is refused if the Appeal Division is satisfied that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success."

ANALYSIS

[7] According to subsection 58(1) of DESD Act, the only grounds of appeal are the following:

 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.

[8] An application for leave to appeal is a preliminary step to a hearing on the merits. It is an initial hurdle for the Applicant to meet, but it is lower than the one that must be met on the hearing of the appeal on the merits. At the leave to appeal stage, the Applicant does not have to prove his case.

[9] The Tribunal will grant leave to appeal if it is satisfied that at least one of the above grounds of appeal has a reasonable chance of success.

[10] This means that the Tribunal must be in a position to determine, in accordance with subsection 58(1) of the DESD Act, whether there is a question of law, fact, or jurisdiction, the answer to which may lead to the setting aside of the decision under review.

[11] Given the foregoing, does the Applicant's appeal have a reasonable chance of success?

[12] The Applicant submits that he was not able to get any "true" paperwork from his previous employer. He feels that there are errors in the employer's T4. He also does not believe the amount owing to the Respondent. The Applicant states that the Respondent told him different amounts and sent him different notices of debts. He submits that the start date of his employment is incorrect and that this seems to be the root of the problem. He also filed his taxes in 2010 with Softron and was honest and forthcoming.

[13] The Applicant further submits that there was an issue with the Canada Revenue Agency in filing his taxes and with the Family Responsibility Office. There were also mitigating circumstances that the General Division did not consider.

[14] The General Division found that the Applicant had provided no evidence establishing that the amounts of the weekly earnings provided by his employer and used by the Respondent were inaccurate or incorrect.

[15] Furthermore, it found that the Applicant's evidence did not demonstrate that the Respondent had committed an error in allocating the earnings or that it had allocated those earnings in such a way that was non-compliant with the Regulations.

[16] The Federal Court of Appeal found that the burden of proof for disputing the employer's pay information rests with the claimant, and that mere allegations intended to show doubt are insufficient—*Dery v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2008 FCA 291 (CanLII).

[17] It is therefore not sufficient for a claimant to merely cast doubt on the veracity of the employer's evidence. He or she must provide countering evidence before the General Division, which the Applicant has not done. In light of the evidence before it, the General Division could not simply arrive at a different conclusion from the one at which it did arrive.

[18] After reviewing the appeal docket, the General Division's decision and the arguments in support of the application for leave to appeal, the Tribunal finds that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success.

CONCLUSION

[19] The Tribunal refuses leave to appeal to the Tribunal's Appeal Division.

Pierre Lafontaine Member, Appeal Division