

e-document	
F I L E D	FEDERAL COURT COUR FÉDÉRALE
June 4, 2025	
Charlotte Torgerson	
EDM	75

Court File No.: T-1436-22

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

BERNARD ALBERT AND OTHERS

Plaintiffs
(Moving Party, in-part)

and

CANADA POST CORPORATION, HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA

Defendants/Respondents

**RESPONDENT'S MOTION RECORD OF
HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA**

Attorney General of Canada

Department of Justice Canada
300, 10423 – 101 Street NW
Edmonton, Alberta T5H 0E7
Per: Daniel Vassberg/Christine Williams
Tel: (587) 545-3097
E-mail: daniel.vassberg@justice.gc.ca/
christine.williams@justice.gc.ca

Counsel for His Majesty the King
in Right of Canada

Christopher Pigott

Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2T6
Tel: (416) 865-5475
Email: cpigott@fasken.com

Counsel for Canada Post Corporation

Jason Gratl

511-55 Cordova Street East
Vancouver, BC V6A 0A5
Tel: 604-694-1919
Fax: 604-608-1919
E-mail: jason@gratlandcompany.com

Counsel for the Plaintiffs listed in Schedule "A"
of their Notice of Motion

Table of Contents

Written Representations	3
Overview	3
Part I: Facts	4
Part II: Issue	8
Part III: Submissions	8
Part IV: Relief Sought	17
List of Authorities	18

FEDERAL COURT

BETWEEN:

BERNARD ALBERT AND OTHERS

Plaintiffs
(Moving Party, in part)

and

CANADA POST CORPORATION, HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA

Defendants

**WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF
CANADA**

OVERVIEW

1. The Applicants' motion appealing the Order of Associate Judge Cotter dated May 2, 2025 (the **Order**)¹ should be dismissed, with costs. The Order appropriately dismissed the Applicants' motion for an extension of time to appeal *Albert v Canada Post Corporation (Albert)*.² The Applicants were 234 days late in meeting the 10-day deadline to appeal *Albert*, offered no reasonable explanation for the delay, and the delay was inherently prejudicial to the Defendants. In those circumstances, granting an extension of time was not in the interests of justice.³ The Applicants have not identified a palpable and overriding error in that conclusion.

¹ Order of Associate Judge Cotter dated May 2, 2025 [**Order**] [Applicants' Motion Record [AR] at 427–445].

² *Albert v Canada Post Corporation*, [2024 FC 420](#) [*Albert*].

³ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 5 [AR at 431–432].

PART I – FACTS

a) Background

2. The underling action was initiated by 281 current or former Canada Post Corporation (**Canada Post**) employees.⁴ By the time *Albert* was heard, 149 Plaintiffs remained.⁵ Throughout the proceeding, only four Plaintiffs provided instructions to counsel on behalf of all plaintiffs.⁶

3. On March 13, 2024, Associate Judge Coughlan issued the *Albert* decision.⁷ Pursuant to Rule 51, the Applicants had 10 days to appeal, resulting in a deadline of March 25, 2024.⁸

4. On or by March 16, 2024, 40 Plaintiffs, likely all of which are current Applicants, formed an intention to appeal *Albert*.⁹ On April 8, 2024, approximately 83–88 Plaintiffs, some of which are not Applicants, “crystalized” their collective intention to appeal and that intention was communicated to their (now former) counsel, Leighton Grey, with Grey Wowk Spencer LLP (**GWS LLP**), on April 10, 2024.¹⁰

5. At this time, the Applicants believed that they had 30 days to appeal *Albert*, although the Applicants’ affiant had suspected that the appeal deadline might have been 10 days from the date of decision.¹¹

⁴ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 2 [AR at 431].

⁵ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 4 [AR at 431].

⁶ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 6 [AR at 431].

⁷ *Albert*, *supra* note 2.

⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 7-8 [AR at 432-433].

⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 11 [AR at 438]; Cross-Examination Transcript of Karine Solakian dated January 7, 2025 at 77 (lines 22–25) [**Solakian Cross-Examination**] [AR at 318].

¹⁰ Affidavit of Karine Solakian affirmed on November 14, 2024 at para 8 [**Solakian Affidavit**] [AR at 18]; Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 80 (lines 16–18) [AR at 321].

¹¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 12 [AR at 433].

6. Between April 10 and May 13, 2024, the Applicants do not recall following up with GWS LLP, and did not provide any evidence of same, to request any status updates.¹²

7. On April 18, 2024, GWS LLP wrote this Court to request directions concerning a motion for an extension of time to appeal *Albert*.¹³ On April 23, 2024, Associate Judge Coughlan issued a direction advising that “if the Plaintiffs wish to file a motion for an extension of time to appeal, they are free to do so”.¹⁴

8. On May 14 and June 6, 2024, the Applicants requested updates from GWS LLP via email.¹⁵ The Applicants left a voicemail on June 19, 2024.¹⁶

9. On July 3, 2024, the Applicants’ affiant sent an email to GWS LLP requesting an update.¹⁷ The next day, GWS LLP advised that the materials would be provided “before the weekend”, being July 5, 2024.¹⁸ There is no evidence that GWS LLP provided a draft by that weekend or that the Applicants followed up on that missed deadline.¹⁹

10. On July 17, 2024, GWS LLP provided a progress update and draft motion materials to the Applicants.²⁰

¹² Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 93–94 (93 at lines 13–27, 94 at lines 1–3) [AR at 334–335].

¹³ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 13 [AR at 434].

¹⁴ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 14 [AR at 434].

¹⁵ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 15–17 [AR at 434]; Solakian Affidavit, *supra* note 10 at para 11 [AR at 18]; Affidavit of Jodi Kaldestad dated January 10, 2025 at 2 (response to UT #2), the Applicants advised that the May 13 email referenced in the Solakian Affidavit was on May 14 [AR at 58–59].

¹⁶ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 18 [AR at 435].

¹⁷ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 19 [AR at 435].

¹⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 19 [AR at 435].

¹⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 19 [AR at 435].

²⁰ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 20 [AR at 435].

11. On July 22, 2024, the Applicants provided comments on the draft pleadings.²¹
12. Between July 29 and September 4, 2024, the Applicants did not follow up with GWS LLP to request any status updates.²²
13. As of September 3, 2024, the Applicants were aware that the anticipated appeal was approximately five months late and that GWS LLP had been unresponsive to their inquiries, and that GWS LLP had at times not followed their instructions, but made no attempts to find new counsel.²³
14. On September 4, 2024, GWS LLP advised via letter that it would no longer be working on the anticipated motion or appeal.²⁴
15. On September 22, 2024, the Applicants retained their current counsel, Gratl & Company.²⁵ The first Applicants completed their retainers and provided identification verification that day.²⁶
16. Between September 22 and November 13, 2024, the Applicants did not file the anticipated motion or appeal, asserting that it took approximately eight weeks to provide completed retainers and income verification.²⁷ The Applicants merely provided general statements concerning that delay.²⁸

²¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 20 [AR at 435].

²² Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 21–22 [AR at 435-436]; Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 106 (7–12) [AR at 347].

²³ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 22 [AR at 435-436].

²⁴ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 22 [AR at 435–436].

²⁵ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 23 [AR at 436].

²⁶ Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 120 (lines 6–10) [AR at 361].

²⁷ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 24-26 [AR at 436-437]; Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 120-121 (120 at lines 6-27 and 121 at lines 1-15) [AR at 361-362].

²⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 27 [AR at 437].

17. On November 14, 2024, the Applicants served a motion for an extension of time (**Motion**). The four “instructing Plaintiffs” did not wait for the other Applicants to explicitly consent or confirm instructions to file the Motion.²⁹

18. Between April 23 and November 14, 2024, the Applicants did not provide any notice to Canada or Canada Post that they were proceeding with a motion for an extension of time.³⁰

b) The Order

19. On May 2, 2025, the Order was issued, and the Applicants’ motion for an extension of time to appeal *Albert* was dismissed, with costs.³¹

20. In the Order, Associate Judge Cotter outlined the non-exhaustive principles for considering a motion for an extension of time, namely whether:

1. the moving party has a continuing intention to pursue the matter;
2. the moving party has a reasonable explanation for the delay;
3. there is some merit to the matter; and
4. prejudice arises from the delay.³²

21. Associate Judge Cotter also identified that it was not necessary for a moving party to satisfy each of the above four criteria and that the overriding consideration is whether the interests of justice would be served by granting the extension of time.³³

²⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 24–27 [AR at 436–437]; Solakian Cross-Examination, *supra* note 9 at 125–126 (125 at lines 12–27, 126 at lines 1–23) [AR at 361–362].

³⁰ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 28 [AR at 437].

³¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 45–47 [AR at 444–445].

³² Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 29–30 [AR at 437–438].

³³ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 29–30 [AR at 437–438].

22. Associate Judge Cotter considered the four criteria and concluded that it was not in the interests of justice to grant an extension of time.³⁴ He accepted that the Applicants had a continuing intention to appeal *Albert* and assumed that there was merit in the appeal, but held that the prejudice from the delay and the lack of a reasonable explanation for the delay augured heavily against the Applicants. Associate Judge Cotter accordingly concluded that it was not in the interests of justice to grant the extension of time.³⁵

PART II – ISSUE

23. Did Associate Judge Cotter commit a palpable and overriding error in concluding that the extension of time sought was not in the interests of justice?

PART III – SUBMISSIONS

24. The Order does not contain a palpable and overriding error. Associate Judge Cotter appropriately considered all factors, deferentially assumed that there was merit to the proposed appeal, and reasonably concluded that even if there was merit, the inherently prejudicial and insufficiently explained delay vitiated against an extension of time being in the interests of justice. In the alternative, an analysis of the merit of the proposed appeal reveals that there is no merit as against Canada, which alone is sufficient to warrant rejecting the extension of time sought.

³⁴ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 31 [AR at 438-439].

³⁵ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 31 [AR at 438-439].

a) Standard of review

25. A discretionary decision of an associate judge in relation to a motion for an extension of time attracts the standard of review of “palpable and overriding error” for questions of mixed fact and law.³⁶

26. The Applicants incorrectly assert that the standard is correctness on the basis that Associate Judge Cotter committed an error of law by applying the legal principles in a “selective and determinative manner without sufficiently balancing each party’s interests.”³⁷ However, Associate Judge Cotter correctly identified the governing legal framework, namely, the *Hennelly* factors, and recognized the overarching principle that an extension of time will only be granted where it serves the interest of justice.³⁸

27. After correctly identifying the *Hennelly* factors, Associate Judge Cotter exercised discretion in considering each of the four factors and ultimately concluded that an extension was not warranted in the circumstances. In doing so, he appropriately weighed the interests of both parties in reaching his conclusion. Whether Associate Judge Cotter gave sufficient weight to those interests is not a pure question of law, but a matter of judicial discretion involving mixed fact and law. As such, it attracts deference and is reviewable only for palpable and overriding error.

³⁶ *Hospira Healthcare Corporation v Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology*, [2016 FCA 215](#) at para [28](#); *Sabok Sir v Canada*, [2021 FC 82](#) at paras [14](#) and [17](#); *Thompson v Canada (AG)*, [2018 FCA 212](#) at para [8](#).

³⁷ Applicants’ Written Representations at para 15 [AR at 450].

³⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 29-30 [AR at 437–438].

b) Rules

28. As noted in the Order,³⁹ pursuant to Rule 51, an order of an associate judge may be appealed by a motion to a judge of the Federal Court, within 10 days of issuance of the order.⁴⁰

29. Pursuant to Rule 8, this Court may extend or abridge a period provided in the *Rules* or fixed by an order.⁴¹

30. In *Canada v Hennelly* (***Hennelly***), the Federal Court of Appeal (**FCA**) set out the following non-exhaustive factors to consider in a request for an extension of time:⁴²

1. a continuing intention to pursue the matter;
2. that the underlying claim has some merit;
3. whether prejudice arises from the delay; and
4. that a reasonable explanation for the delay exists.

31. The overriding principle in motions for an extension of time is whether the extension is in the interests of justice.⁴³

32. A motion for an extension of time may be dismissed solely on the basis that it lacks merit.⁴⁴

c) *There is no reasonable explanation for the delay*

33. As noted in the Order, there is no reasonable explanation for the 234-day delay period.⁴⁵

³⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 7 [AR at 432].

⁴⁰ *Federal Courts Rules*, [SOR/98-106](#) at [r 51](#) [*Rules*].

⁴¹ *Rules*, *supra* note 40 at [r 8](#).

⁴² *Canada (AG) v Hennelly*, [244 NR 399](#), [1999 CanLII 8190](#) (FCA); *Gutierrez v Canada*, [2024 FCA 93](#) at para [4](#); *Citizen for My Sea to Sky v Canada (Environment and Climate Change)*, [2023 FC 1721](#) at para [15](#) [*Citizen for My Sea to Sky*].

⁴³ *Oleynik v Canada (AG)*, [2023 FCA 162](#) at para [36](#) [*Oleynik*].

⁴⁴ *Oleynik*, *supra* note 43 at paras [36–43](#).

⁴⁵ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 35 and 38 [AR at 440–441].

34. The Applicants did not provide a reasonable explanation for the 53-day delay from September 22 through November 14, 2024.⁴⁶ It was incumbent on the new counsel, Gratl & Company, to act quickly.⁴⁷ The general excuses provided were insufficient in establishing a reasonable explanation for that delay period.⁴⁸

35. Additionally, the Applicants did not provide a reasonable explanation for the initial six-month delay from March 25 through September 22, 2024.⁴⁹ The Applicants exclusively blamed their former counsel, GWS LLP, for the delay.⁵⁰ Regardless of whether the Applicants were responsible for the actions of that counsel, or if their behaviour during that time could be independently considered, the Applicants' occasional follow-up did not evidence diligence or explain the lengthy delay.⁵¹

36. The Applicants' delay in bringing the Motion was devoid of reasonable diligence. The Applicants experienced numerous periods of excessive delay with no explanation, each of which far exceeded the 10-day appeal deadline imposed by the *Rules*. The delay was not the result of a minor oversight or a situation where an error was promptly corrected. Each of the Applicants, GWS LLP, and Gratl & Company were aware of the applicable deadline, but cumulatively took 234 days to request an extension of time. There is not a reasonable explanation for the delay.

37. The conclusions in the Order were consistent with existing case law concerning explanations for delay. This Court recently held that an applicant's decision to still be represented by counsel who missed their Rule 51 appeal deadline by 6 weeks was "illogical" and that their

⁴⁶ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 32–35 [AR at 439–440].

⁴⁷ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 34 [AR at 439–440].

⁴⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at paras 34–35 [AR at 439–440].

⁴⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 38 [AR at 441].

⁵⁰ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 36 [AR at 440–441].

⁵¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 37 [AR at 441].

“submissions do not accord with their own conduct, and fall short of establishing a reasonable explanation for the delay”.⁵² Here, the Applicants were aware that they had missed their Rule 51 appeal deadline, yet waited 25 weeks from when *Albert* was issued, at which point the former counsel advised that his office would not be handling the appeal. In any event, changes in counsel and lack of financial resources do not necessarily explain delay.⁵³

[37] It is not enough for a litigant to allege that its counsel was negligent and then to claim that it knows nothing more. A litigant in such a situation must make the necessary inquiries of its counsel to find out exactly why the filing deadline was missed and to offer clear and convincing evidence to substantiate its own lack of responsibility. Usually that is accomplished by providing an affidavit sworn by counsel admitting to the error and confirming that the client was blameless. If that evidence is not put forward, it is often because counsel has a different version of what took place. The affidavits filed here on behalf of [the applicants] are not sufficient to establish that it bears no responsibility for the filing error. In fact, the affidavits are insufficient to establish why the filing deadline was missed at all.

38. More recently, this Court has taken a more definitive position that “Counsel are acting—or failing to act—in the shoes of their clients, and clients can therefore not expect to escape the consequences of their counsel’s carelessness”.⁵⁴ Although the Court will consider such excuses in minor or trivial situations involving mere days of delay or unintentional oversights,⁵⁵ this is not such a scenario.

39. The Applicants have not provided *any* documentary evidence of admitted wrongdoing by GWS LLP or that a complaint has been filed with the Law Society of Alberta regarding the adequacy of their representation. Other than cursory follow-up, and despite an admitted awareness

⁵² *Petre v Canada (RCMP)*, [2024 FC 1768](#) at para [53](#).

⁵³ *Canada (AG) v Larkman*, [2012 FCA 204](#) at para [83](#).

⁵⁴ *Singh v Canada (CI)*, [2023 FC 380](#) at para [37](#); see also: *Fortin v Canada*, T-2083-24 (unreported) at 8 [AR at 417–425].

⁵⁵ *Montminy v Canada (AG)*, [2024 FC 830](#) at paras [40–42](#).

that the applicable deadline had been long exceeded, none of the Applicants sought to file motions for an extension of time or dismissed their former counsel.

40. Between the exorbitant amount of time that the Applicants admit to having taken no or insufficient steps to bring a motion or advance their appeal, and the periods purportedly explained through vague and unsupported assertions of diligence, there was no basis to accept a 234-day delay as having occurred despite reasonable diligence.

d) There is prejudice from the exorbitant delay

41. The exorbitant delay was inherently prejudicial.⁵⁶ Even if significant delay were not inherently prejudicial, the length of delay can still be considered as a separate factor when assessing the interests of justice.⁵⁷

42. In the Order, Associate Judge Cotter reasonably adopted the reasoning of the Alberta Court of Appeal, which has held that significant delay in bringing an appeal by itself causes recognizable prejudice to the Respondent:⁵⁸

[31] The applicants also failed to establish that their late filing has not caused the [respondent] significant prejudice. A favourable judicial outcome is a valuable commodity. A respondent is entitled to expect that it will be able to rely on that benefit if an adverse party does not act in a timely manner to challenge it. The applicants' delay by itself causes recognizable prejudice to the [respondent].

43. Additionally, the Order noted the applicability of this Court's and the FCA's general comments regarding finality and the public interest in maintaining timelines:⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 39 [AR at 442].

⁵⁷ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 42 [AR at 443].

⁵⁸ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 39 [AR at 442]; *Ouellette, et al v Law Society of Alberta*, [2021 ABCA 99](#) at para [31](#) (leave to appeal to a panel dismissed, *Ouellette et al v Law Society of Alberta*, [2021 ABCA 283](#)).

⁵⁹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 40 [AR at 442]; *Canada v Grenier*, [2005 FCA 348](#) at paras [27–29](#); *Citizen for My Sea to Sky*, *supra* note 42 at paras [16–17](#) and [66](#).

[28] I need not expound at length on the importance of the principles of res judicata and the finality of decisions ... I will confine myself to saying that these principles exist in the public interest and that Parliament's intention to protect that interest is illustrated by the short time limit allowed for challenging an administrative decision.

44. The Court of Appeal for British Columbia has adopted similar reasoning regarding the filing of appeals of final decisions.⁶⁰

45. Lengthy delay, including delay of 234 days on a 10-day deadline, significantly prolongs the uncertainty of resolving a matter and is inherently prejudicial to the responding party, and it was not an error for Associate Judge Cotter to so determine.

e) The Applicants did not action any intention to pursue the appeal

46. In the Order, the Court accepted that the Applicants, or at least one of them, held a continuing intention to appeal *Albert*.⁶¹ Associate Judge Cotter appropriately weighed this factor against the lack of a reasonable explanation for the delay and the prejudice from the delay, finding that it would not be in the interests of justice to grant the extension.⁶²

f) The underlying appeal lacks merit

47. In the Order, the Court proceeded with the analysis as if there was merit to the proposed appeal, finding that “even if there were some merit to the appeal, it would not be sufficient to conclude that it is in the interests of justice to grant an extension of time”.⁶³ It was open to Associate Judge Cotter to proceed on such a basis, as the assumption ultimately favours the Applicants. Associate Judge Cotter’s willingness to accept arguable merit demonstrates that, even

⁶⁰ *Douglas Lake Cattle Company v Nicola Valley Fish and Game Club*, [2019 BCCA 439](#) at paras 45–46.

⁶¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 43 [AR at 444].

⁶² Order, *supra* note 1 at para 31 [AR at 438].

⁶³ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 44 [AR at 444].

if there is merit to the appeal, the remaining considerations of unreasonable delay and prejudice outweigh any potential merit.

48. Alternatively, if the Order was erroneous in assuming merit to the proposed appeal, analysis of the same reveals that it has no merit as against Canada.

49. The Applicants' Amended Amended Statement of Claim (**Claim**) pleaded that certain irrelevant public service announcements by Canada bound their employer, Canada Post, to implement its COVID-19 vaccination practice (**Practice**).⁶⁴ This Court in *Albert* struck the Claim as against Canada on the basis that it did not include a connection between the Applicants and Canada.⁶⁵ The Applicants failed to address the explicit and unchallenged evidence of Canada Post that “[at] no time did the federal government order or require Canada Post – through a regulation, order, directive, or other legal mandate - to implement a mandatory vaccination policy”.⁶⁶ In any event, the only means by which the Practice could have been compelled by Canada would have been through directives pursuant to the *Canada Post Corporation Act*⁶⁷ or *Financial Administration Act*,⁶⁸ which were not pleaded as having been utilized, and were not utilized.

50. The Claim fundamentally concerned the employment relationship between the Applicants and Canada Post, and Canada was not a party to that relationship. The Applicants' concerns regarding the Practice would be properly addressed through a grievance or other procedures against their employer,⁶⁹ a processes by which Canada has no, and could have no, involvement.

⁶⁴ Amended Amended Statement of Claim at paras 14 and 16-19 [AR at 254–255].

⁶⁵ *Albert*, *supra* note 2 at [para 63](#).

⁶⁶ Affidavit of John Deveen dated August 18, 2023 at paras 7, 8, 9, 24, 29, and 33 [AR at 273–276].

⁶⁷ *Canada Post Corporation Act*, [RSC 1985, c C-10](#) at [s 22](#).

⁶⁸ *Financial Administration Act*, [RSC 1985, c F-11](#) at [s 89](#).

⁶⁹ *Adelberg v Canada*, [2023 FC 252](#) at [para 35](#); *National Organized Workers Union v Sinai Health System*, [2022 ONCA 802](#) at [paras 38–39](#).

51. As there were no pleaded harms attributable to Canada, it was plain and obvious that the Claim as against Canada had no merit and was appropriately struck by this Court in *Albert*.⁷⁰

g) It is not in the interests of justice for the extension of time to be granted

52. In the Order, Associate Judge Cotter clearly and concisely outlined that, notwithstanding any assumed merit, the length and insufficiently explained nature of the prejudicial delay precluded an extension of time from being in the interests of justice.⁷¹ The Applicants have not identified a palpable and overriding error in that conclusion.

53. Again, the proposed appeal has no merit whatsoever as against Canada. The Applicants relied on bald assertions linked to the announcements, which had no connection to Canada Post, and overlooked the repeated explicit evidence that Canada did not compel Canada Post to implement the Practice through the means available to compel such action.

54. However, even assuming the appeal has merit, the interests of justice would not be served by granting the extension of time. The Applicants failed to provide a reasonable excuse for numerous periods of delay by themselves and their counsel over a 234-day period. The delay was also inherently prejudicial to Canada, and the Applicants' intention to appeal was not appropriately actioned. The *Hennelly* factors heavily weighed against granting the Motion and it was reasonable for Associate Judge Cotter to so conclude even assuming there was merit to the proposed appeal.

⁷⁰ *Albert*, *supra* note 2 at [para 63](#).

⁷¹ Order, *supra* note 1 at para 31 [AR at 438–439].

PART IV – RELIEF SOUGHT

55. The Appeal should be dismissed as against Canada, with costs payable to Canada.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Dated at Edmonton, Alberta on June 4, 2025.

DVassberg

Daniel Vassberg/Christine Williams
Counsel for the Respondent, Canada

TO: The Registrar
Federal Court of Canada

AND TO: Christopher Pigott, counsel for the Respondent, Canada Post Corporation
Jason Gratl, counsel for the Applicants

List of Authorities

Legislation

1. *Federal Courts Rules*, [SOR/98-106](#)
2. *Canada Post Corporation Act*, [RSC 1985, c C-10](#)
3. *Financial Administration Act*, [RSC 1985, c F-11](#)

Case Law

4. *Albert v Canada Post Corporation*, [2024 FC 420](#)
5. *Hospira Healthcare Corporation v Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology*, [2016 FCA 215](#)
6. *Sabok Sir v Canada*, [2021 FC 82](#)
7. *Thompson v Canada (AG)*, [2018 FCA 212](#)
8. *Canada (AG) v Hennelly*, [244 NR 399](#), [1999 CanLII 8190 \(FCA\)](#)
9. *Gutierrez v Canada*, [2024 FCA 93](#)
10. *Citizen for My Sea to Sky v Canada (Environment and Climate Change)*, [2023 FC 1721](#)
11. *Oleynik v Canada (AG)*, [2023 FCA 162](#)
12. *Petre v Canada (RCMP)*, [2024 FC 1768](#)
13. *Canada (AG) v Larkman*, [2012 FCA 204](#)
14. *Singh v Canada (CI)*, [2023 FC 380](#)
15. *Montminy v Canada (AG)*, [2024 FC 830](#)
16. *Ouellette, et al v Law Society of Alberta*, [2021 ABCA 99](#)
17. *Ouellette et al v Law Society of Alberta*, [2021 ABCA 283](#)
18. *Canada v Grenier*, [2005 FCA 348](#)
19. *Douglas Lake Cattle Company v Nicola Valley Fish and Game Club*, [2019 BCCA 439](#)
20. *Adelberg v Canada*, [2023 FC 252](#)
21. *National Organized Workers Union v Sinai Health System*, [2022 ONCA 802](#)