



Citation: *SR v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2023 SST 467

Social Security Tribunal of Canada Appeal Division

Extension of Time and Leave to Appeal Decision

Applicant: S. R.

Respondent: Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Decision under appeal: General Division decision dated January 4, 2023
(GE-22-2326)

Tribunal member: Pierre Lafontaine

Decision date: April 20, 2023

File number: AD-23-206

Decision

[1] An extension of time to apply to the Appeal Division is granted. Leave (permission) to appeal is refused. The appeal will not proceed.

Overview

[2] The Applicant (Claimant) lost her job because she did not comply with the employer's COVID-19 vaccination policy (Policy). The employer did not grant her an exemption. The Claimant then applied for Employment Insurance (EI) regular benefits.

[3] The Respondent (Commission) determined that the Claimant lost her job because of misconduct, so it was not able to pay her benefits. After an unsuccessful reconsideration, the Claimant appealed to the General Division.

[4] The General Division found that the Claimant lost her job following her refusal to follow the employer's Policy. The employer did not grant her an exemption. It found that the Claimant knew that the employer was likely to dismiss her in these circumstances. The General Division concluded that the Claimant was dismissed from her job because of misconduct.

[5] The Claimant seeks leave to appeal of the General Division's decision to the Appeal Division. She submits that the General Division made errors of fact and law when it concluded that she had lost her job because of misconduct.

[6] I am granting the Claimant an extension of time to apply to the Appeal Division. However, I am refusing leave to appeal because the Claimant's appeal has no reasonable chance of success.

Issues

[7] The issues in this appeal are:

- a) Was the application to the Appeal Division late?
- b) If found late: Should I extend the time for filing the application?

- c) Has the Claimant raised some reviewable error of the General Division upon which the appeal might succeed?

Analysis

The application was not late

[8] On January 5, 2023, the General Division decision was communicated to the Claimant. On January 14, 2023, the Claimant wrote to the Tribunal to indicate that she wanted to request leave to appeal of the General Division decision.¹

[9] The application was not late.

The Claimant has not raised some reviewable error of the General Division upon which the appeal might succeed

[10] Section 58(1) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act* specifies the only grounds of appeal of a General Division decision. These reviewable errors are that:

1. The General Division hearing process was not fair in some way.
2. The General Division did not decide an issue that it should have decided. Or, it decided something it did not have the power to decide.
3. The General Division based its decision on an important error of fact.
4. The General Division made an error of law when making its decision.

[11] An application for leave to appeal is a preliminary step to a hearing on the merits. It is an initial hurdle for the Claimant 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 Claimant does not have to prove her case but must establish that the appeal has a

¹ See AD1B-2.

reasonable chance of success based on a reviewable error. In other words, that there is arguably some reviewable error upon which the appeal might succeed.

[12] Therefore, before I can grant leave to appeal, I need to be satisfied that the reasons for appeal fall within any of the above-mentioned grounds of appeal and that at least one of the reasons has a reasonable chance of success.

Does the Claimant raise some reviewable error of the General Division upon which the appeal might succeed?

[13] In support of her application for leave to appeal to the Appeal Division, the Claimant submits the following:

- a) Her employment contract did not include any vaccination requirements or dismissal if not vaccinated;
- b) The Commission has not shown that there was any breach of either an expressed or implied duty detailed in her employment contract that would support an obligation to get vaccinated against COVID-19;
- c) It is well founded and long recognized in Canadian common law that an individual has the right to bodily integrity as well as the right to accept or refuse any medical treatment. Exercising that right cannot be characterized as a wrongful act or undesirable conduct sufficient to conclude misconduct worthy of the punishment of disqualification from EI benefits;
- d) She was not defying her employer but simply protecting her health. She submits that she elected to wait until there was more definite information concerning the safety of the vaccine.

[14] The General Division had to decide whether the Claimant lost her job because of misconduct.

[15] The notion of misconduct does not imply that it is necessary that the breach of conduct be the result of wrongful intent; it is sufficient that the misconduct be conscious, deliberate, or intentional. In other words, in order to constitute misconduct, the act complained of must have been wilful or at least of such a careless or negligent nature that one could say the employee wilfully disregarded the effects their actions would have on their performance.

[16] The General Division's role is not to judge the severity of the employer's penalty or to determine whether the employer was guilty of misconduct by dismissing the Claimant in such a way that her dismissal was unjustified, but rather of deciding whether the Claimant was guilty of misconduct and whether this misconduct led to her dismissal.²

[17] The General Division determined that the Claimant was dismissed from her job because she refused to follow the employer's Policy that applied to all employees. She had been informed of the Policy and was given time to comply. She was not granted an exemption. The Claimant refused intentionally; this refusal was wilful. This was the direct cause of her dismissal. The General Division found that the Claimant knew that her refusal to comply with the Policy could lead to her dismissal.

[18] The General Division concluded from the preponderant evidence that the Claimant's behavior constituted misconduct.

[19] It is well-established that a deliberate violation of the employer's policy is considered misconduct within the meaning of the *Employment Insurance Act* (EI Act).³ It is also considered misconduct within the meaning of the EI Act not to observe a policy duly approved by a government or an industry.⁴

[20] It is not really in dispute that an employer has an obligation to take all reasonable precautions to protect the health and safety of its employees in their workplace. In the present case, the employer followed the order of the Provincial Health Officer to implement its Policy to protect the health of all employees and patients during the pandemic.⁵ The Policy was in effect when the Claimant was dismissed.

² *Canada (Attorney General) v Marion*, 2002 FCA 185; *Fleming v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2006 FCA 16.

³ *Canada (Attorney General) v Bellavance*, 2005 FCA 87; *Canada (Attorney General) v Gagnon*, 2002 FCA 460.

⁴ CUB 71744, CUB 74884.

⁵ Pursuant to the *Public Health Act*, S.B.C. 2008.

[21] The question of whether the employer's Policy violated the Claimant's employment contract or whether the Policy violated her common law and constitutional rights, is a matter for another forum. This Tribunal is not the appropriate forum through which the Claimant can obtain the remedy that she is seeking.⁶

[22] The Federal Court has rendered a recent decision in *Cecchetto* regarding misconduct and a claimant's refusal to follow the employer's COVID-19 vaccination policy. The claimant put forward that it was not proven that the vaccine was safe and efficient. He felt discriminated against because of his personal medical choice. The claimant submitted that he has the right to control his own bodily integrity and that his rights were violated under Canadian and international law.⁷

[23] The Federal Court confirmed the Appeal Division's decision that, by law, this Tribunal is not permitted to address these questions. The Court agreed that by making a personal and deliberate choice not to follow the employer's vaccination policy, the Claimant had breached his duties owed to the employer and had lost his job because of misconduct under the EI Act.⁸ The Court stated that there exist other ways in which the Claimant's claims can properly advance under the legal system.

[24] In the previous *Paradis* case, the Claimant was refused EI benefits because of misconduct. He argued that there was no misconduct because the employer's policy violated his rights under the *Alberta Human Rights Act*. The Federal Court found it was a matter for another forum.

[25] The Federal Court stated that there are available remedies for a claimant to sanction the behaviour of an employer other than transferring the costs of that behaviour to the Employment Insurance Program.

⁶ In *Paradis v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2016 FC 1282, the Claimant argued that the employer's policy violated his rights under the *Alberta Human Rights Act*. The Court found it was a matter for another forum; See also *Mishibinijima v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2007 FCA 36, stating that the employer's duty to accommodate is irrelevant in deciding misconduct cases.

⁷ *Cecchetto v Canada (Attorney general)*, 2023 FC 102.

⁸ The Court refers to Bellavance, see note 3.

[26] In the *Mishibinijima* case, the Federal Court of Appeal stated that the employer's duty to accommodate is irrelevant in deciding EI misconduct cases.

[27] The preponderant evidence before the General Division shows that the Claimant made a **personal and deliberate choice** not to follow the employer's Policy in response to the exceptional circumstances created by the pandemic and this resulted in her losing her job.

[28] I see no reviewable error made by the General Division when it decided the issue of misconduct solely within the parameters set out by the Federal Court of Appeal, which has defined misconduct under the EI Act.⁹

[29] I am fully aware that the Claimant may seek relief before another forum, if a violation is established.¹⁰ This does not change the fact that under the EI Act, the Commission has proven on a balance of probabilities that the Claimant was dismissed because of misconduct.

[30] In her application for leave to appeal, the Claimant has not identified any reviewable errors such as jurisdiction or any failure by the General Division to observe a principle of natural justice. She has not identified errors in law nor identified any erroneous findings of fact, which the General Division may have made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before it, in coming to its decision.

[31] After reviewing the docket of appeal, the decision of the General Division and considering the arguments of the Claimant in support of her request for leave to appeal, I find that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success.

⁹ *Paradis v Canada (Attorney General)*; 2016 FC 1282; *Canada (Attorney General) v McNamara*, 2007 FCA 107; CUB 73739A, CUB 58491; CUB 49373.

¹⁰ I note that in a recent decision, the Superior Court of Quebec has ruled that provisions that imposed the vaccination, although they infringed the liberty and security of the person, did not violate section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights*. Even if section 7 of the Charter were to be found to have been violated, this violation would be justified as being a reasonable limit under section 1 of the Charter - *Syndicat des métallos, section locale 2008 c Procureur général du Canada*, 2022 QCCS 2455 (Only in French at the time of publishing).

Conclusion

[32] An extension of time is granted. Permission to appeal is refused. This means that the appeal will not proceed.

Pierre Lafontaine
Member, Appeal Division