

[Name]: \_\_\_\_\_  
[Line1]: \_\_\_\_\_  
[Line2]: \_\_\_\_\_  
[Email]: \_\_\_\_\_

FCA: [Hon. Yves de Montigny](#) (Chief Justice, FCA)  
SCC: [Rt. Hon. Richard Wagner](#) (Chief Justice, SCC)  
DOJ: [Hon. Sean Fraser](#) (Attorney General of Canada)  
DOJ: [Morgan Macdougall-Milne](#) (Director of Litigation)  
ESDC: [Hon. Patty Hajdu](#) (Minister of Jobs & Families)  
ESDC: [Hon. John Zerucelli](#) (Secretary of State: Labour)  
ESDC: [Liz Smith](#) (Deputy Governor: Ombuds Office)

**Re: Public Interest in: *DA v. Canada* (#A-63-24) – Employment Insurance Appeal**

Honourable Recipients,

☐ See Reverse: My Personalised Impact Statement

I'm including this letter to add my own personal situation into the record. I too was denied EI Benefits – and also for the same reasons and errors being challenged in this specific case. **[Among them] My EI Adjudicators:**

- ☐ ...**Found** my **employment contract *ultra vires***, despite invoking its Management Rights clause. ([Issue #6](#))
- ☐ ...**Violated** their **Home Statutes** (*EI Act or DESDA*) and justified that by citing various case law. ([Issue #8](#))
- ☐ **Refused** to conduct statutorily-mandated **Just Cause analysis**, per [EI Act §29\(c\)](#), by refusing to consider whether my employer: **(xi)** acted '*contrary to law*' or **(vii/ix)** *unilaterally 'changed'* my contract. ([Error #1](#))
- ☐ **Found** considering whether my **employer broke the law or violated my statutory rights *ultra vires***, despite: [DESDA §64\(1\)](#), [2006 SCC 2 \[¶145-46\]](#), [CUB 16209](#), [CUB 51219](#), et al (*cf.* [2023 SST 1886 \[¶98\]](#)) ([Error #3](#))
- ☐ **Found** a *unilaterally imposed policy superseded my contract* and refused to consider any breaches, despite: [EIA §51](#), [DBEP §21.2.2](#), [2017 SCC 55 \[¶20-21\]](#), [2013 SCC 34 \[¶24-26\]](#), '[KVP](#)' [p.85], et al ([Error #4](#))
- ☐ Used a modified 'Misconduct Test' containing two **logical fallacies** that *undermined* [EIA §29\(c\)\(xi\)](#). ([Error #5](#))
- ☐ Refused required analysis by [mis]citing clearly **distinguishable case law** with different fact patterns. ([Error #6](#))
- ☐ Relied on an *arguably falsified ROE* & refused to consider that fact. ([CC §398](#), [ROE Box 16 / 22](#)) ([Error #9](#))
- ☐ '**Selectively**' **applied** key legal principles *inversely* from other related cases, aligning outcomes. ([Error #11](#))
- ☐ **Relied** [in-part] on **internal records**: [ESDC's] '[BE-Memo \('21-10\)](#)' policy. (*cf.* [Vavilov \[¶95\]](#)) ([Error #12](#))
- ☐ ...Denied my EI Benefits citing *erroneous* '**TaxPayer**' consequences, despite that being **\$0**. ([Error #13](#))
- ☐ ...Used erroneous *prewritten* '**Atrium Templates**' in my Decision, that also appear in others. ([Errors #14-15](#))
- ☐ [Also]: The CEIC **changed facts** in their SST Written Submissions, claiming mere '*clerical error*'. ([Error #10](#))
- ☐ My employer *granted themselves* the 'right' to **break binding laws & contracts by issuing policy**. ([Issues #3-4](#))

Respectfully submitted,

[Case #s]: \_\_\_\_\_

[Name]: \_\_\_\_\_

[Date]: \_\_\_\_\_ [Signature]: \_\_\_\_\_

**Personal Impact Statement:**

[Date]: \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, affirm the following is true, complete to my knowledge & presented in good faith:

Respectfully submitted,

[Name]: \_\_\_\_\_

[Case#]: \_\_\_\_\_

[Signature]: \_\_\_\_\_