



Citation: *GK v Canada Employment Insurance Commission*, 2026 SST 240

**Social Security Tribunal of Canada
Appeal Division**

Leave to Appeal Decision

Applicant: G. K.

Respondent: Canada Employment Insurance Commission

Decision under appeal: General Division decision dated March 19, 2026
(GE-26-619)

Tribunal member: Glenn Betteridge

Decision date: March 25, 2026

File number: AD-26-255

Decision

[1] Leave (permission) to appeal is denied.

[2] This means G. K.'s appeal won't go forward.

Overview

[3] G. K. is the Claimant in this case. He has asked for permission to appeal a General Division decision.¹ I will give him permission if he has a reasonable chance of winning the appeal.

[4] The General Division decided the Claimant voluntarily left his job without just cause.² The General Division found he had two reasonable alternatives to quitting in the circumstances that existed when he quit. He could have talked to his employer to try resolving the dispute. And he could have searched for another job. Instead, he quit "somewhat impulsively." So, it dismissed his appeal. And he is disqualified from getting EI regular benefits.³

[5] The Claimant says the General Division made a legal error and an import factual error.

[6] But he hasn't shown an arguable case the General Division made either error. This means he doesn't have a reasonable chance of winning his appeal. And I can't give him permission to appeal.

Issue

[7] Does the Claimant's appeal have a reasonable chance of success?

¹ The Appeal Division process has two steps. (1) A person applies for permission to appeal a General Division decision. If they don't get permission, their appeal ends. (2) If they get permission, they get to argue their appeal in writing or at a hearing.

² See section 29(c) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (EI Act).

³ See section 30(1) of the EI Act.

I'm not giving the Claimant permission to appeal

[8] Before making my decision, I read the Claimant's application to appeal.⁴ I read the General Division decision. I reviewed the documents in the General Division file.⁵ And I listened to the hearing recording.⁶

[9] For the reasons that follow, I can't give the Claimant permission to appeal.

The permission to appeal test screens out appeals without a reasonable chance of success⁷

[10] The Claimant has applied for permission to appeal. I give permission when there's an arguable case the General Division made an error that gives a claimant a reasonable chance of winning their appeal.⁸

[11] The law says I can consider four types of errors—the General Division used an unfair procedure, or made a jurisdictional error, a legal error, or an important factual error.⁹

The Claimant's appeal has no reasonable chance of success

[12] The Claimant checked the legal error box on his appeal form.

[13] The General Division makes a legal error when it misinterprets the law or uses the wrong legal test to decide an issue. None of the Claimant's reasons for appeal explain or given an example of a legal error. So, he hasn't shown an arguable case of the General Division made that error.¹⁰

⁴ See AD1. The Claimant's reasons for appeal set out the key issues and central arguments I have to consider. See *Hazaparu v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2024 FC 928 at paragraph 13.

⁵ See GD2, GD3, GD4, GD6, and GD7.

⁶ The hearing recording is in three parts, because the hearing was interrupted by technical difficulties.

⁷ See section 58(2) of the *Department of Employment and Social Development Act* (DESD Act); *Paradis v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2016 FC 1282 at paragraph 32.

⁸ See *Osaj v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2016 FC 11.

⁹ See section 58(1) of the DESD Act.

¹⁰ When a claimant doesn't explain or give details about an alleged error, that ground of appeal has no reasonable chance of success. See *Twardowski v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2024 FC 1326 at paragraph 59.

[14] The Claimant also checked the important factual error box.

[15] But none of the Claimant's arguments show an arguable case of a factual error.¹¹ He is repeating what he said at the General Division, trying to reargue his case because he disagrees with a General Division finding.

- He argues he made an attempt to speak with the Operations Manager, who responded with negativity. The General Division didn't ignore or misunderstand the Claimant's evidence about this (paragraph 31). The General Division found it was reasonable for him to speak to the head of HR (owner's wife), but he didn't try that (paragraphs 32 to 34).
- He argues he applied to the Canadian Armed Forces in July 2025 and is waiting to hear. And he applied to multiple temp agencies and reported this to EI. The General Division didn't misunderstand or ignore relevant evidence about this (paragraph 35).¹² At the hearing the Claimant testified he didn't look for work before quitting, only after.¹³ He said he wasn't looking for work because the first full week on the job, before the day he quit, was "just beautiful."
- He says he felt the employer would have dismissed him based on their behaviour towards him. The General Division understood that's what he believed, but didn't find his employer wanted him to leave (paragraphs 11, 31). The General Division found he had a choice to stay or leave his job—and he chose to quit (paragraphs 11, 12).

[16] Simply disagreeing with the General Division's findings, or the outcome of the appeal, doesn't show an arguable case the General Division made an error.¹⁴

¹¹ See AD1-6.

¹² Listen to the General Division hearing recording at 8:10.

¹³ Listen to the General Division hearing recording at 10:45.

¹⁴ See *Griffin v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2016 FC 874 at paragraph 20.

Conclusion

[17] The Claimant's appeal doesn't have a reasonable chance of success. This means his appeal can't go forward.

Glenn Betteridge
Member, Appeal Division