

Social Benefits Tribunal  
1075 Bay Street 7<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
Toronto, ON M5S 2B1  
**FAX: 1-416-326-5135**

Mr. Robert T. Chisholm,  
**251 Ridgepark Private**  
Ottawa,  
**ON K2G 1H1**

June 29th, 2007

**FOR THE ATTENTION OF: MS. ROSLYNNE MAINS – MEMBER, SOCIAL  
BENEFITS TRIBUNAL**

Dear Ms. Mains,

**Re: Tribunal File 0605-04207 – Robert Chisholm**

**With reference to your letter to me dated June 15th, and in particular the following :-**

Quote :

‘ In deciding whether or not to grant a reconsideration, I have had the benefit of the decision, your application for reconsideration and the objection filed by the Administrator. In my view, the decision reached by the Tribunal member is both reasonable and consistent with the legislation. I do not find that she erred. It follows that I do not find that there should be a new hearing in this matter.

This letter will serve to confirm the decision of the Tribunal in this appeal. ‘

The above is not acceptable because:-

1. Consistent with the line that the Social Benefits Tribunal has been taking up to now in my case, you continue to ignore the financial realities concerning income and expenditures in my case. In particular:-

(a) You ignore that the situation with our property in Montreal was in fact worse than I had indicated at the hearing, and you ignore the documents proving this that I submitted.

(b) You ignore the fact that if we had sold it in 1995 there would have been no release of capital to offset any social benefits payments to me; in fact, the numbers show that it would have forced us into bankruptcy.

(c) You ignore the fact that the situation was caused by my being wrongly refused Unemployment Insurance benefits and access to any re-training back in 1995, and a current Tribunal member – Roger R. Presseault – was directly involved in this.

2. As a Member of the Tribunal, involved in this affair against me, you are knowingly and deliberately attempting to protecting the Tribunal's reputation at my expense when you also know that a current Tribunal member, Roger R. Presseault, was partly responsible for this

situation in the first place. You should also know that Mr. Presseault's involvement in causing the problem has already been documented.

3. I was not sent any copy of the "...objection filed by the Administrator..." and nor have you stated what the said objection is. Thus I have had no opportunity to reply to it.

4. I would agree that there is no necessity for any new formal hearing in this matter; what is required is simply the reversal of the decision which was clearly wrong.

To summarise, your letter serves merely to waste both your time and mine, and everybody else's, and to continue pursuing me for money based on an approach which is both (a) unprofessional, in that it ignores key facts of the situation, and (b) amounts merely to legalistic arrogance, backed by money to pay all the people who have been involved in this affair.

The decision of the Tribunal was clearly wrong and must be reversed.

(SIGNED)

Robert T. Chisholm

cc. Mr. R. Fox, City of Ottawa