

SCHEDULE (Section 48)

Federal Court

Between

IYOBOSA MATTHEW OBASOHAN

Plaintiff

and

His Majesty The King

Defendant

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Facts

1. Briefly, the facts leading to this statement of claim are that the Plaintiff, bearing Social Insurance Number 520 516 840, applied for employment insurance benefits in 2019 while he was looking for employment as his services were terminated by Plaintiff's employer. Plaintiff was eligible for receiving employment insurance.
2. The Defendant's Employment and Social Development office denied the claim based on an erroneous report. In error, the Defendant recorded that the Plaintiff left his job voluntarily, however, it later realized that the employer of the Plaintiff had made a mistake in the statement of employment.

101

F I L E D	FEDERAL COURT COUR FÉDÉRALE	D É P O S É
	AOUT 08 2023 AUG	
	REBECCA DUONG	
	TORONTO, ON	

3. When the Defendant was made aware of this error by Plaintiff, the Defendant negligently and in error, failed to validated this fact. Had the Defendant conducted an inquiry and ensured that the employer of the Plaintiff had made a mistake in its statement of employment submitted to the Defendant, the Defendant would have in fact located this error and not wrongfully, punished the Plaintiff for the actions of the Plaintiff's employer.
4. Due to the wrongful actions of the Defendant, the Plaintiff was denied employment insurance. This wrongful action of the Defendant led to a dominos effect which continued
5. As a result, the Plaintiff faced major financial difficulties due to no income after his dismissal and subsequent denial of employment insurance by the Defendant which, the Defendant was required by law to provide the Plaintiff with.
6. This is serious error on the part of the Defendant and costed the Plaintiff dearly, not only monetarily but also psychologically and emotionally. Denying Plaintiff his employment insurance was the first error.
7. The Defendant impoverished the Plaintiff further by committing yet another error. The second error was by asking the Plaintiff to return money to Defendant which money legally belonged to Plaintiff. In error and by mistake, the Defendant's sent a statement to the Defendant which indicated the Plaintiff owed the Defendant a sum of Fourteen Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty-Eight Dollars (\$14,488.00). This came as a rude shock for the Plaintiff.
8. To add insult to the injury, the Defendant was not limited to only asking the Plaintiff for money Defendant erroneously thought belonged to Defendant, the Defendant went further and sent Plaintiff's file the collection agency.

9. The collection agency worked at the behest of the Defendant. The collection agency repeatedly made calls and harassed the Plaintiff demanding money that legally belonged to Plaintiff.
10. Plaintiff tried to explain it to the collection agency that there was an error made by the Defendant, however, the collection agency did not listen to the explanation which the Plaintiff had to offer and demanded money to be paid back to the Defendant.
11. Despite several attempts to explain, the credit agency and Defendant did not heed to Plaintiff's explanation. No inquiry was ever conducted by the Defendant and as a result of Defendant's wrongful actions, the Plaintiff was reported as a defaulter to the credit bureau and suffered further damage as a defaulter when, to begin with, the Plaintiff was the one to whom money was owed by the Defendant in form of Plaintiff's due employment insurance.
12. Once Plaintiff's credit was damaged, Plaintiff was unable to secure any credit from the market and having no source of income and employment insurance, became financially weak and dependent.
13. This financial dependence caused the Plaintiff a lot of stress which made him mentally, psychologically and emotionally weak and as a result of the financial hardship and constant harassment from Defendant and its agencies, the Plaintiff was emotionally and psychologically traumatised by the Defendant.
14. In the year 2020, Defendant deducted two payments, in error, each amounting to around \$400.00 from the Plaintiff's account, when Plaintiff finally decided to take a legal action against the Defendant and sued the Defendant in the Small Claims Court under Court File No.: SC20-82890000.
15. The Small Claims Judge advised that due to jurisdictional issues, it would be advisable to pursue this matter in the Federal Court. The Defendant had an opportunity to settle the matter then but

categorically refused to do so as the Defendant was not sure if the Plaintiff will file an action in the Federal Court as per the advise of the Small Claims Court.

16. This honourable court is requested to call the Small Claims Court under Court File No.: SC20-82890000 and add it to the record of this file.
17. The Plaintiff has already filed a Notice of Constitution Question which is also attached to this Statemen of Claim as **Schedule “A”**. NO response by the Defendant to the Constitutional Question.
18. The Defendant did not stop at only this, as recently as in April of 2023 the Plaintiff was very sick and incapable of doing is job. The Defendant applied for sick benefits and the Defendant again refused it by holding the Defendant to the strict standard of a **Very serious violation requiring 1,225 hrs instead of 875 hrs for a minor violation or 700 hrs for without violation as per the chart below**. In June, 2023, the Plaintiff wrote to the Defendant stating its entire case and specifically stating: **“I strongly protest and make a formal request for reconsideration to the Commission. Please treat this request with utmost priority. I have paid my employment insurance dues regularly and am legally entitled to these benefits within the framework set up under Employment Insurance Act and its Regulations.”** A copy of this letter is attached hereto as **Schedule “B”** hereto. Till date, the Defendant has NOT replied to this letter from the Plaintiff, further agonizing the Plaintiff.

Regional rate of unemployment	Without violation	Minor violation	Serious violation	Very serious violation	Subsequent violation
6% and under	700	875	1,050	1,225	1,400

19. Due to the aforesaid wrongful acts of the Defendant, the Plaintiff has suffered numerous losses and setbacks including but not limited to the following:

19.1 **Undue harassment and depletion of self-worth leading to compromising the security and well-being of the Plaintiff:** The Plaintiff has been inconvenienced and harassed consistently by credit collection agencies, which process was wrongly initiated by the Defendant. The Plaintiff was wrongfully harassed and mentally tortured beyond limits which has adversely impacted Plaintiff's self-esteem, feeling of self-worth, and caused the Plaintiff huge financial consequences which, amongst other things, has limited the Plaintiff from purchases of goods and services and effectively revoked Plaintiff's right to a decent livelihood which is a constitutional guarantee in form of a Legal Right, provided under Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of Constitution Act, 1982.

19.2 **Undue Loss of Wages:** Loss of Plaintiff's wages and Plaintiff's time which the Plaintiff suffered only due to the wrongful acts of the Defendant. These wrongful acts of the Defendant have caused the Plaintiff to suffer a reduced standard of living and a reduced level of well beingness and consequentially, a reduced standard of living of Plaintiff's family.

19.3 **Undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress:** The wrongful acts of the Defendant have also caused the Plaintiff, acute mental, emotional, psychological and physical stresses. Together, these have depleted the mental and physical health of the Plaintiff and vitiated his thought process and had an adverse impact on Plaintiff's family life. These wrongful acts were absolutely unreasonable and unnecessary. These could have been well avoided if the Defendant had worked properly and given due care while dealing with the Plaintiff's file.

19.4 **Acute depression:** Plaintiff has suffered a severe and acute depression due to consistent harassments caused by the Defendant. Whether this was intentional or unintentional is not an issue here. The fact that this has been caused to Plaintiff by the Defendant is proven and admitted by the Defendant. This mistake of the Defendant has caused the Plaintiff a grave and irreparable harm and injury.

20. **Issues:** The following is the legal basis for the constitutional question and issues:

20.1 **Reasonable Basis:** Whether the Defendant had a reasonable basis, on the facts above and the evidence to be tendered at the appropriate stage of the proceeding, for concluding that the actions of the Government causing:

20.1.1 Undue harassment and depletion of self-worth leading to compromising the security and well-being of the Plaintiff

20.1.2 Undue Loss of Wages

20.1.3 Undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress

20.1.4 Acute depression

given the Defendant's pressing and substantial objective of maintaining fairness in the Employment Insurance Claims?

20.2 Can the Defendant be justified in harassing it's citizens, causing them loss of wages, causing them undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress and causing them acute depression in the garb of being fair while implementing an Employment Insurance Claim?

- 20.3 Is the instant case demonstrating counter intuitive and absolutely opposite of the values of what the Defendant's main rationale is behind the formation of the Employment Insurance body?
- 20.4 Has there been a violation of Plaintiff's rights under Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada?
- 20.5 **NOT Minimal Impairment** – if the wrongful acts of the Defendant would have had a minimal impairment of the Charter Rights of the Plaintiff guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada then it might still have been appropriate and something which the Plaintiff could not have challenged. However, given the facts above, it is clear that there was a Substantial Impairment of the Plaintiff's Constitutional Rights and not a Minimal Impairment which would have justified Defendant's action.
- 20.6 Section 32(1) defines the scope of the Charter's application. The text of section 32(1) provides "a strong message that the Charter ... is essentially an instrument for checking the powers of Government over the individual": McKinney v. University of Guelph, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 229 at 261.
- 20.6.1 Following this decision, is it not necessary to check the actions of the Defendant in the instant case which caused the Plaintiff the pain and suffering described above?
- 20.6.2 Could these actions of the Government be justified?
- 20.6.3 If not, then is the Plaintiff entitled to a relief?
- 20.7 **Marked departure from the Standard of Care** - The lack of observing the standard of care which the Government should have applied caused these wrongful acts and the Plaintiff is

expected to bear the burden of this lack of care. This is arbitrary and not something which a civilized and democratic society would permit.

20.8 Violation Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter:

20.8.1 Section 7 of the Charter explicitly states that “Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.” In the instant case, the security of the Plaintiff has been seriously compromised as the wellbeing, mental health and psychological and emotional state of the Plaintiff has been seriously compromised due to Defendant’s action as per the facts stated above.

20.8.2 Section 15 of the Charter guarantees: “Equality before and under law and equal protection and benefit of law

15. (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

Affirmative action programs 15. (2) Subsection (1) does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.”

20.9 Has the Plaintiff has been given an equal treatment as compared to other citizens of Canada and as such has been discriminated against by the Defendant? Given that, Plaintiff is a person

of colour and in his day to day life also experiences micro aggressions, are the steps Defendant took can be viewed to be an equal treatment based on the colour of the Plaintiff?

21. Plaintiff has suffered the consequences of Wrongful Acts of the Defendant. Consequences for the wrongful actions of Defendant which are unjustified can not be expected to be born by Plaintiff. In a just and a civilized society of Canada, it/s subjects are assured of the fact that the Government will not, without a just reason, let it's subjects suffer the consequences of its wrongful acts. This will be contrary to the principles of rights and freedoms that Canadians believe are necessary in a free and democratic society.

Relief Sought

The plaintiff therefore claims as follows:

- **(a)** The Plaintiff claims monetary compensation in the amount of Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$70,000.00) as a relief to the Plaintiff for the irreparable mental, emotional and psychological harm caused by the wrongful actions of the Defendant to the Plaintiff, which included but is not limited to:
 - wrongfully taking the Plaintiff's money from his account and impoverishing him;
 - causing the Plaintiff psychological and emotional stress, which resulted in diminished self-worth, harassment, and loss of income;
 - causing the Plaintiff financial injury by removing the guarantee of employment insurance for which the Plaintiff had paid regular insurance premium;

- violating, amongst other things, Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada.
- **(b)** A letter of apology from the Defendant admitting to its mistakes and errors.
- **(c)** A positive response to the Constitutional Question – Schedule A by deciding this case in favour of the Plaintiff.
- **(d)** Ordering the Defendant to provide the Plaintiff with a positive response to the letter dated June 6, 2023 granting Plaintiff his right to employment Insurance for the period of sickness.

Dated at Toronto the 8th day of August , 2023.



(Signature)
(*plaintiff acts for himself*)

Name: Iyobosa Matthew Obasohan
Address: 157 Duncanwoods Drive
North York, Ontario M9L 2E2
Tel.: 647-771-5098
Social Insurance Number: 520 516 840
E-mail: iyobosao@hotmail.com

- R.S., 1985, c. F-7, Sch.
- 2002, c. 8, s. 58

Name of Defendants	Address
<p>His Majesty The King</p> <p>The Government of Canada Employment Insurance Office</p>	<p>5353 Dundas Street West, Suite 101</p> <p>Etobicoke, Ontario M9B6H8</p> <p>EI Call Centre:1-800-206-7218</p>
<p>The Attorney General of Ontario (as required by section 109 of the Courts of Justice Act) Constitutional Law Branch</p>	<p>4th floor</p> <p>720 Bay Street</p> <p>Toronto, Ontario M5G 2K1</p> <p>Fax: (416) 326-4015</p>
<p>The Attorney General of Canada (as required by section 109 of the Courts of Justice Act)</p>	<p>Suite 3400, Exchange Tower</p> <p>Box 36, First Canadian Place Toronto,</p> <p>Ontario M5X 1K6</p> <p>fax: (416) 952-0298</p>

SCHEDULE A

FORM 4F

Courts of Justice Act

NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

IYOBOSA MATTHEW OBASOHAN

Plaintiff

and

THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Defendant

NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

The *Plaintiff, IYOBOSA MATTHEW OBASOHAN* intends to question the constitutional validity (or applicability) of the government's action in the form of the following:

1. Wrongful acts of the government of Canada Employment and Social development office ("Government" hereinafter) at RM 606-875 Chemin Heron Road, Gieme Etage, Salle 606, 6th Floor, Ottawa ON K1A 1A2 for wrongfully and falsely accusing the Plaintiff of falsifying information on Plaintiff's Employment Insurance Claim;
2. The Government made an error recording that the Plaintiff left his job voluntarily. However, later the Government discovered that Plaintiff's employer made an error in the statement of employment.
3. Wrongful acts of the Government whereby instead of providing Plaintiff with employment insurance, the Government, wrongfully bombarded the Plaintiff with mails on a regular basis claiming that the Plaintiff in fact owes \$14,488.00 to the Government. This was yet another serious mistake made by the Government which costed the Plaintiff dearly.
4. Wrongful acts of the Government whereby instead of resolving the Plaintiff's issue, the Government, in error, sent the Plaintiff's file to the collection agencies by mistake.
5. Wrongful acts of the Government whereby the Government wrongfully withdrew from the Plaintiff's account two payments, each amounting to around ~\$400.00 of unauthorized withdrawals in the year 2020 until the Plaintiff stopped the Government from withdrawing these amounts by filing a Statement of Claims in the Small Claims Court vide Court File No.: SC20-82890000.

SCHEDULE A

(identify the particular legislative provisions or the particular rule of common law) (or to claim a remedy under subsection 24 (1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in relation to an act or omission of the Government of Canada (or Ontario)).

Reasonable Basis for concluding that the Government impaired the relevant rights of the Plaintiff as little as possible given the Government's pressing and substantial objectives being implementing a fair employment insurance claim.

Minimal Impairment of Plaintiff's rights while the Government carries out its pressing and substantial objectives being implementing a fair employment insurance claim.

Section 32(1) which defines the scope of the Charter's application.

Marked departure from the Standard of Care which the Government should have followed

Violation of Plaintiff's right under Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada.

The question is to be argued on _____(day), _____(date), at _____(time), at (address of court house).

The following are the material facts giving rise to the constitutional question:

1. The Plaintiff applied for employment insurance benefits in order to allow the Plaintiff to continue searching for work in and around the year 2019. The Plaintiff was frustrated during the process because the Government of Canada, Employment and Social development office made Plaintiff's life a living hell by not only denying his claim to add insult to injury also created issues by collecting the money from the Plaintiff instead.
2. This was a mistake made by the Government which costed the Plaintiff dearly and ultimately led to undue harassment and depletion of self worth leading to compromising the security and well being of the Plaintiff; undue loss of wages of the Plaintiff; undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress due to the wrongful acts of the Government and caused the Plaintiff acute depression.
3. The Government made an error recording that the Plaintiff left his job voluntarily. However, later the Government discovered that Plaintiff's employer made an error in the statement of employment. By this time the Plaintiff was already in a deep financial trouble due to his bills mounting, no income from his employment from which he was terminated and no employment insurance, which the Government was rightfully supposed to pay the Plaintiff as a matter of Plaintiff's legal right.
4. The error of the Government continued and despite the Government realizing its mistake and awarding the Plaintiff the due employment insurance, the Government compounded its error by erroneously sending a statement to the Plaintiff showing that it was the Plaintiff who in fact owed \$14,488.00 to the Government.

SCHEDULE A

5. In or around the year 2020, Plaintiff's account was sent to collections by the Government in error, which seriously and adversely impacted Plaintiff's credit score depriving him of any security financial or otherwise as not only Plaintiff's financial security suffered but Plaintiff's physical well being also was seriously and acutely compromised.
6. In continuing its wrongful acts, the Government withdrew from the Plaintiff's account two payments, each amounting to around ~\$400.00 of unauthorized withdrawals in the year 2020 until the Plaintiff stopped the Government from withdrawing these amounts by filing a Statement of Claims in the Small Claims Court vide Court File No.: SC20-82890000.
7. Plaintiff tried to mitigate his damages by trying to secure justice from the Small Claims Court. Plaintiff's Statement of Claim in the Small Claim's Court is attached herewith as Schedule "A". However, the technicality raised by the Government was that the matter actually belongs to the Federal Court. **Hence the necessity to file this Notice of Constitutional Question.** Enclosed herewith as Schedule 'B' is the latest Offer to Settle which the Plaintiff had filed with the Government's/Defendant's counsel which has been rejected by the Defendant's Counsel.
8. Due to the above wrongful acts of the Government, the Plaintiff has suffered numerous losses and setbacks including but not limited to the following:
 - a. **Undue harassment and depletion of self worth leading to compromising the security and well being of the Plaintiff:** The Plaintiff has been inconvenienced and harassed consistently by credit collection agencies, which process was wrongly initiated by the Canadian Government. The Plaintiff was wrongfully harassed and mentally tortured beyond limits which has adversely impacted Plaintiff's self-esteem, feeling of self-worth, and caused the Plaintiff huge financial consequences which, amongst other things, has limited the Plaintiff from purchases of goods and services and effectively revoked Plaintiff's right to a decent livelihood which is a constitutional guarantee in form of a Legal Right, provided under Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of Constitution Act, 1982.
 - b. **Undue Loss of Wages:** Loss of Plaintiff's wages and Plaintiff's time which the Plaintiff suffered only due to the wrongful acts of the Government. These wrongful acts of the Government have caused the Plaintiff to suffer a reduced standard of living and a reduced level of well beingness and consequentially, a reduced standard of living of Plaintiff's family.
 - c. **Undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress:** The wrongful acts of the Government have also caused the Plaintiff, acute mental, emotional, psychological and physical stresses. Together, these have depleted the mental and physical health of the Plaintiff and vitiated his thought process and had an adverse impact on Plaintiff's family life. These wrongful acts were absolutely unreasonable and unnecessary. These could have been well avoided if the Government had worked properly and given due care.

SCHEDULE A

- d. **Acute depression:** Plaintiff has suffered a severe and acute depression due to consistent harassments caused by the Government. Whether this was intentional or unintentional is not an issue here. The fact that this has been caused to Plaintiff by the Government is proven and admitted by the Government. This mistake has caused the Plaintiff a grave harm.

All of the above together are the facts on basis which the Plaintiff is entitled to file this Notice of Constitutional Question.

The following is the legal basis for the constitutional question:

Reasonable Basis: Question is whether the Government had a reasonable basis, on the facts above and the evidence to be tendered at the appropriate stage of the proceeding, for concluding that the actions of the Government causing:

1. Undue harassment and depletion of self worth leading to compromising the security and well being of the Plaintiff
2. Undue Loss of Wages
3. Undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress
4. Acute depression

given the Government's pressing and substantial objective of maintaining fairness in the Employment Insurance Claims?

Can the Government be justified in harassing it's citizens, causing them loss of wages, causing them undue mental, emotional, psychological and physical stress and causing them acute depression in the garb of being fair while implementing an Employment Insurance Claim?

Is the instant case demonstrating counter intuitive and absolutely opposite of the values of what the Government's main rationale is behind the formation of the Employment Insurance body?

Has there been a violation of Plaintiff's rights under Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada.

NOT Minimal Impairment – if the wrongful acts of the Government would have had a minimal impairment of the Charter Rights of the Plaintiff guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada then it might still have been appropriate and something which the Plaintiff could not have challenged. However, given the facts above, it is clear that there was a **Substantial Impairment** of the Plaintiff's Constitutional Rights and not a Minimal Impairment which would have justified Government's action.

Section 32(1) defines the scope of the Charter's application. The text of section 32(1) provides "a strong message that the Charter ... is essentially an instrument for checking the powers of Government over the individual": McKinney v. University of Guelph, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 229 at 261.

1. Following this decision, is it not necessary to check the actions of the Government in the instant case which caused the Plaintiff the pain and suffering described above?

SCHEDULE A

2. Could these actions of the Government be justified?
3. If not, then is the Plaintiff entitled to a relief?

Marked departure from the Standard of Care - The lack of observing the standard of care which the Government should have applied caused these wrongful acts and the Plaintiff is expected to bear the burden of this lack of care. This is arbitrary and not something which a civilized and democratic society would permit.

Violation Section 7 and Section 15 of the Charter:

Section 7 of the Charter explicitly states that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice." In the instant case, the security of the Plaintiff has been seriously compromised as the well being, mental health and psychological and emotional state of the Plaintiff has been seriously compromised due to Government's action as per the facts stated above.

Section 15 of the Charter guarantees: "Equality before and under law and equal protection and benefit of law 15. (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

Affirmative action programs 15. (2) Subsection (1) does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability."

Plaintiff has not been given and equal treatment as compared to other citizens of Canada and as such has been discriminated against by the government. Additionally, Plaintiff is a person of colour and in his day to day life also experiences micro aggressions. However, the steps Government took can not be said to be equal treatment based on the colour of the Plaintiff.

Consequences of Wrongful Acts of the Government: Consequences for the wrongful actions of Government which are unjustified can not be expected to be born by Plaintiff. In a just and a civilized society of Canada, it/s subjects are assured of the fact that the Government will not, without a just reason, let it's subjects suffer the consequences of its wrongful acts. This will be contrary to the principles of rights and freedoms that Canadians believe are necessary in a free and democratic society.

January 31, 2023

Name of the Plaintiff (Self Represented and not through a Lawyer): IYOBOSA MATTHEW OBASOHAN

157 Duncanwoods Dr.

North York ON M9L 2E2

Telephone: 647-771-5098

Email: iyobosao@hotmail.com

SCHEDULE A

TO The Attorney General of Ontario (as required by section 109 of the Courts of Justice Act) Constitutional Law Branch

4th floor
720 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2K1
fax: (416) 326-4015

The Attorney General of Canada (as required by section 109 of the Courts of Justice Act)

Suite 3400, Exchange Tower
Box 36, First Canadian Place Toronto,
Ontario M5X 1K6
fax: (416) 952-0298

(or Justice Building
234 Wellington Street Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8 fax: (613) 954-1920)

Details of Parties in Small Claims Court vide Court File No.: SC20-82890000

Name of the Plaintiff (Self Represented and not through a Lawyer): IYOBOSA MATTHEW OBASOHAN

157 Duncanwoods Dr.
North York ON M9L 2E2
Telephone: 647-771-5098
Email: iyobosao@hotmail.com

Name of the Defendant (in the Small Claims Court)

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Ontario Regional Office
120 Adelaide Street West
Suite 400 Toronto ON M5H 1T1

(This notice must be served as soon as the circumstances requiring it become known and, in any event, at least 15 days before the question is to be argued, unless the court orders otherwise.)

SCHEDULE B

Service Canada
Richmond Hill SCC 3557
P.O Box 2602
Mississauga ON L4T 0B1

Subject: Notice of Decision dated May 9, 2023
In case of Matthew Obasohan
SIN No: 520 516 840

Dear Sir or Madam,

This is in response to the Notice of Decision dated May 9, 2023, I received from your office advising me that you have denied to pay my legally due Employment Insurance Benefits. With due respect to your decision I absolutely disagree with your decision as your decision has been made in error.

As per your website <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/benefits/ei/ei-regular-benefit/eligibility.html> following are the number of insurable hours required to qualify for EI benefits.

Number of insurable hours required to qualify for EI benefits

Regional rate of unemployment	Without violation	Minor violation	Serious violation	Very serious violation	Subsequent violation
6% and under	700	875	1,050	1,225	1,400
6.1% to 7%	665	831	998	1,164	1,330
7.1% to 8%	630	788	945	1,103	1,260
8.1% to 9%	595	744	893	1,041	1,190
9.1% to 10%	560	700	840	980	1,120
10.1% to 11%	525	656	788	919	1,050
11.1% to 12%	490	613	735	858	980

SCHEDULE B

Number of insurable hours required to qualify for EI benefits

Regional rate of unemployment	Without violation	Minor violation	Serious violation	Very serious violation	Subsequent violation
12.1% to 13%	455	569	683	796	910
More than 13%	420	525	630	735	840

It appears that your office has adjudicated my case based on a **Very serious violation** basis. I also understand fully that your decisions are based on the Employment Insurance Act and its Regulations. However, considering the Employment Insurance Act and its Regulations, this decision is incorrect. Your office has made this decision in error. There is absolutely no basis for you to consider my case in the category of Very serious violation.

I submit that my case should be considered as without violation or if that is not possible then it be considered as a minor violation. In either of these cases, it would require me to have either 700 hours or at most 875 hours. I have 1013 hours which is way above these minimum eligibility requirements. I am therefore entitled to the employment insurance benefits. These are tough times as I am without a job currently and on top it your decision is not only damaging for me and my entire family but exposes me and my entire family who depends upon me to a great financial, mental and psychological stress. This unfair decision has no basis to be considered as a Very serious violation when clearly this is not the case. It is unfair and an arbitrary decision and it is not correct for your office to put me and my entire family in such a financial jeopardy. Additionally, it is inhuman and cruel to say the least.

I strongly protest and make a formal request for reconsideration to the Commission. Please treat this request with utmost priority. I have paid my employment insurance dues regularly and am legally entitled to these benefits within the framework set up under Employment Insurance Act and its Regulations.

Please feel free to contact me by phone or email if you wish to discuss this further.

Yours very truly,

Matthew Obasohan
Cell Phone: 647-7715098
Email: iyobosao@hotmail.com
157 Duncanwoods Drive
North York ON
M9L 2E2

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above document is a true copy of
the original issued out of / filed in the Court on the _____

day of _____ AUG 08 2023 _____ A.D. 20 _____

Dated this _____ day of _____ AUG 08 2023 _____ 20 _____

PD