

LITIGATION

– Employment Update

MARCH 2011

Human Rights Update – Dealing with Applications at a Preliminary Stage

By Mark Edelstein

Applications under the *Human Rights Code* (“**Code**”) present a real risk for employers and an important avenue of redress for employees. Proceedings before the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (“**HRTO**”) are less formal, may be more accessible for employee-applicants, and may present a broader range of remedies than an action in the courts, including the possibility of reinstatement. However, like any legal proceeding, there is a range of methods by which a hearing before the HRTO may be dismissed at a preliminary stage. This article provides a brief introduction to some of the most important means of disposing of applications without having to prepare for a costly and time-consuming full hearing.

Timeliness

As in any proceeding, the first issue to consider is always the relevant limitations period. An application must be made “within one year after the incident to which the application relates” or with respect to a “series of incidents”, within one year after the last incident in the series.

The HRTO may also accept late applications if “the delay was incurred in good faith and no substantial prejudice will result to any person affected by the delay”.

The HRTO has been reluctant to hold that most delays in filing applications meet the “good faith” standard. Not making inquiries regarding one’s rights, or a desire to consider other forums of redress, are generally not sufficient to meet the test. However, in the case of disabled employees, employers should be aware that an inability to seek redress due to one’s disability may found a claim of good faith delay.

HRTO case law regarding the term “series of incidents” raises a risk that employers may have to address allegations that reach back beyond the one-year period. The HRTO has held that if there has not been more than a year between each relevant incident, a claim can reach back a number of years. Claims that reach back in time based on a “series of incidents” are not constrained by statutory language regarding “good faith” or prejudice.

Deferral or Dismissal Due to Parallel Litigation and Settlement

The *Code* also contains provisions that allow the HRTO to defer an application. The HRTO has emphasized that decisions with respect to deferral are considered on a case-by-case basis, but deferral has been commonly granted where there are

parallel administrative employment proceedings, such as proceedings under the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act* or the *Employment Standards Act, 2000*.

Deferral is useful because it reduces the possibility of duplicative litigation and helps the parties focus on resolving their dispute rather than dealing with the procedural demands of parallel proceedings. More useful still is the HRTO's ability to dismiss applications where "another proceeding" previously had "appropriately dealt with the substance of the application".

The HRTO has not been entirely consistent in when it will dismiss applications. But, decisions under the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act* and the *Employment Standards Act, 2000*, grievance proceedings and even settlement agreements have all founded dismissals.

Parallel Civil Proceedings

Rather than going before the HRTO, an applicant may instead seek to remedy a breach of the *Code* by way of a civil action. Section 46.1 creates a civil remedy for violations of the *Code*, allowing the court to order compensation or restitution orders where the court finds there was a breach of the *Code*. Section 46.1, however, does not permit a plaintiff to bring a civil action **solely** on the basis of a breach of the *Code*; a s. 46.1 claim must be brought as part of a civil action alongside other viable causes of action.

An employee alleging a *Code* violation, then, must elect whether to seek out a remedy for the alleged breach in court or before the HRTO. Section 34(11) of the *Code* bars applications

before the HRTO where there is active civil litigation in which the applicant is seeking remedies for breach of the *Code*, applications where the issue of infringement was determined by the court, or where the civil action that addressed an allegation of infringement was settled. The HRTO will apply s. 34(11) to dismiss an application even if s. 46.1 has not been explicitly pleaded in the civil action; the HRTO has barred applications as long as the *Code* is the basis for an element of the damage claim. An application, however, will not be dismissed in the face of parallel civil litigation based on the same facts that does not make a claim flowing from an alleged *Code* violation, though the application may be deferred until the civil action based on the same fact situation is dealt with.

Summary Hearings

The HRTO, in the summer of 2010, introduced a new method of dealing with applications. Respondents may request that a summary hearing be held in order to dismiss an application on the ground that it has "no reasonable prospect of success". The HRTO may also order that a summary hearing be held of its own accord (in the latter case the HRTO will generally order a summary hearing be held in lieu of the respondent putting in a complete response). Such proceedings can focus on:

1. whether the allegation can be reasonably considered to be a *Code* allegation; or
2. whether there is a reasonable prospect that evidence the applicant has or that is reasonably available to him or her can show a link between the event and an alleged prohibited ground under the *Code*.

The first basis for a summary hearing is focused on events where, on its face, there is a factual link between the event and the applicant's characteristics (such as disability), but applying the law to the facts clearly indicates that the *Code* has not been breached.

The second basis for a summary hearing is focused on events where there is no link between relevant characteristics caught by the *Code* and the conduct at issue. Complaints that make broad allegations of "unfair treatment" are an example of a type of application ripe for dismissal under this second form of request.

A summary hearing is attractive because:

1. the application will be dealt with more quickly;
2. summary hearings are not subject to the costly and time-consuming disclosure and document exchange rules that would apply to a hearing; and
3. a summary hearing is a flexible procedure that can be tailored to address and dispose of the key issues in dispute, such as matters of law, without having to engage in tangential factual issues. Often the HRTO holds summary hearings by way of a teleconference based on submissions from the parties. This is in contrast to a full hearing, which is a trial-like process that requires putting forward evidence through the examination of witnesses.

Often a request for summary hearing can be put in at the same time as a response; in applications where a request for summary hearing is warranted, the substance of the

Our Employment Law Practice: Experience and Expertise

In the ever-changing nature of today's workplace, employers and employees often face difficult situations, which are further complicated by complex laws and regulations – the *Human Rights Code* is just one of an array of regulatory issues to consider.

The members of the Employment Law Practice at WeirFoulds LLP have broad experience with regard to all aspects of the employment relationship, from preparing comprehensive employment agreements, to advising on workplace issues and disputes, to guiding our clients through the minefield of termination.

We are excellent problem solvers and ready to tackle the toughest workplace issues so that our clients can focus on achieving their goals. Our team of employment experts includes skilled drafters, tax experts, privacy practitioners and seasoned

litigators who appear before all levels of court, the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the Workplace Safety and Insurance Appeals Tribunal and both the Ontario and Canadian Human Rights Commissions. In this context, WeirFoulds partner Raj Anand is the former Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

Our clients include both federally and provincially regulated employers and employees in many industries. We represent public and private businesses, non-profit organizations, and charities, including educational, research and health organizations. We are experts in providing advice to municipalities and public officials regarding the unique aspects of the employment relationship which relate to these clients. We also represent local, national and international unions and employees in internal union disputes and unionized workplaces.

For more information on how our Employment Law Practice can serve you or your organization, contact:

Carole McAfee Wallace

Practice Chair

T: 416.947.5098

E: cmcafee@weirfoulds.com

ABOUT THIS NEWSLETTER

For over 150 years, the lawyers of WeirFoulds have been proud to serve our clients in their most difficult and complex matters. We are the firm of choice for discerning clients within our core areas of practice: (1) Litigation; (2) Corporate; (3) Property; and (4) Government Law. Within these core areas, as well as key sub-specialties, we address highly sophisticated legal challenges. We have acted in some of Canada's most significant mandates and have represented clients in many landmark cases. Reflecting the firm's focus, our lawyers are consistently recognized as leaders in their chosen areas of practice and in the profession at large. To learn more about our firm, visit www.weirfoulds.com.

Information contained in this publication is strictly of a general nature and readers should not act on the information without seeking specific advice on the particular matters which are of concern to them. WeirFoulds LLP will be pleased to provide additional information on request and to discuss any specific matters.

If you are interested in receiving this publication or any other WeirFoulds publication by e-mail, please let us know by sending a message to publications@weirfoulds.com.

© WeirFoulds LLP 2011