[Name]: _____

[Line1]: _____

[Line2]: _____

[Email]: _____

[Date]: _____

Honourable Patty Hajdu
Minister of Jobs & Families
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Honourable John Zerucelli
Secretary of State: Labour
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

ESDC: Employment Canada
Liz Smith *(Deputy General)*
Ombuds Office: Public Interest
140 Promenade du Portage
Gatineau, QC K1A 0J9

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

Hon. Privy Councillors, *(Minister of Jobs + Secretary of Labour + ESDC Ombuds)*

I write to you as a member of the Canadian public with a vested interest in the outcome of the above-noted case. This judicial review currently before the Federal Court of Appeal raises issues that extend far beyond personal circumstances and directly concern the integrity of Canada's Employment Insurance (EI) system.

This case is about far more than any one individual's benefits. It addresses systemic practices that unjustly denied hundreds of thousands of Canadians access to their EI during the COVID-19 Mandate period. Many claimants, wrongly separated from their employment using *'Misconduct' allegations*, often with falsified ROEs, were not afforded the statutory protections Parliament built into the Employment Insurance Act.

Our esteemed Supreme Court previously instituted in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship & Immigration) v.* Vavilov, *2019 SCC 65*, that administrative decisions must be both reasonable & justified considering the statutory scheme. Where Parliament defines a specific test, as in the Employment Insurance Act §29(c), which requires adjudicators to examine 14 *'Causes'* during disentitlement, any departure from that framework undermines the rule of law. *'Just Cause'* analysis includes investigating whether the employer *'acted contrary to law'* or unilaterally *changed* the employment contract. Evidence proves that this required analysis was refused, replaced by *prewritten* denial templates, and revised via secret policy memos designed to expedite rejections rather than uphold the law.

This case reveals how facts were altered & processes abused within the EI system, replacing truth and established law with standardised, reverse-engineered outcomes that denied rightful claimants.

- Statutory definitions & binding processes were re-engineered internally using the discriminatory BE-Memo (2021-10), and the established test was altered with logic errors directing decision-makers to deny claims.
- Widespread COVID mandates created a 65% relative-increase in national EI denial rates and doubled SST appeals during that time, while over 25% of Members left the Tribunal, many seemingly mid-appointments.
- Approximately $13 billion was deprived from aggrieved claimants by denying their rightful EI benefits.

The public interest in this case is therefore threefold:

1. **Rule of Law** – Canadians must be assured that tribunals and benefits adjudicators will apply the legislation faithfully, as written, not override decision-making using discretionary, predetermined policy objectives.
2. **Fairness and Accountability** – Several hundred thousand families were left without income support in a time of crisis, often based on flawed or unlawful reasoning. This appeal is an opportunity to restore both justice to individual claimants and confidence in the EI program as a whole.

3. **Binding Precedent** – This precedent will decide whether future EI claimants can rely on the *rule of law*, or whether they can be subjected to unlawful reasoning and systematised, engineered denial processes.

No one is above the law. Parliament sets the rules and every Canadian – from ordinary citizens to administrative decision-makers – is bound by them. Adjudicators and tribunals cannot create shortcuts or substitute new internal policies for statutory obligations. We are all held to the same standards under the rule of law, and it is the role of our Courts to ensure that these standards are upheld without exception.

On behalf of myself and thousands of others who were affected by similar unjust denials, I respectfully ask our Honourable ESDC Leadership to give full consideration to the future systemic implications of this case. While you were not responsible for COVID-era decisions, you do now control whether agency actions are law-abiding. How you respond to this case will not only impact this entitlement but also signal whether ordinary Canadians can trust the institutions designed to protect them in times of need. Please do not defend the indefensible – and do not treat these compounded injustices as 'binding precedent' in future EI benefits decision-making...

Thank you for your careful attention to this matter of broad public concern.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]: _____

[Name]: _____

◯ **My Own EI Case was affected by this Engineering.**

◯ **See Attachment: My Personal Impact Statement.**

CC: Federal Court of Appeal: Hon. Yves de Montigny *(Chief Justice, FCA)*
Supreme Court of Canada: 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: Elizabeth Smith *(Deputy Governor: Ombuds Office)*

◯ [My MP]: _____ *(MP)*