[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◯ **Found** a *unilaterally imposed* **policy superseded my contract** and refused to consider any breaches, despite: EIA §51, DBEP §21.2.2, 2017 SCC 55 [¶20-21], 2013 SCC 34 [¶24-26], 'KVP' [p.85], et al *(Error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,

[Name]: _____

[Date]: _____   [Signature]: _____

Personal Impact Statement: [Date]: _____

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

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]: _____

[Name]: _____