

Court File No.: A-102-20

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

AIR PASSENGER RIGHTS

Applicant

– and –

CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Respondent

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

TO THE RESPONDENT:

A PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED by the Applicant. The relief claimed by the Applicant appears on the following page.

THIS APPLICATION will be heard by the Court at a time and place to be fixed by the Judicial Administrator. Unless the Court orders otherwise, the place of hearing will be as requested by the Applicant. The Applicant requests that this application be heard at the Federal Court of Appeal in **Vancouver, British Columbia**.

IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION, to receive notice of any step in the application or to be served with any documents in the application, you or a solicitor acting for you must prepare a notice of appearance in Form 305 prescribed by the *Federal Courts Rules* and serve it on the Applicant's solicitor, or where the applicant is self-represented, on the Applicant, **WITHIN 10 DAYS** after being served with this notice of application.

Copies of the *Federal Courts Rules*, information concerning the local offices of the Court and other necessary information may be obtained on request to the Administrator of this Court at Ottawa (telephone 613-992-4238) or at any local office.

**IF YOU FAIL TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION, JUDGMENT MAY BE GIVEN
IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU.**

Date: April 8, 2020

Issued by: _____

JEAN-FRANÇOIS DUPORE
REGISTRY OFFICER
AGENT DU GREFFE

Address of

local office: Federal Court of Appeal
90 Sparks Street, 5th floor
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H9

TO: CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

APPLICATION

This is an application for judicial review pursuant to section 28 of the *Federal Courts Act* in respect of two public statements issued on or about March 25, 2020 by the Canadian Transportation Agency [Agency], entitled “Statement on Vouchers” [Statement] and the “Important Information for Travellers During COVID-19” page [COVID-19 Agency Page] that cites the Statement.

These public statements, individually or collectively, purport to provide an unsolicited advance ruling on how the Agency will treat and rule upon complaints of passengers about refunds from air carriers relating to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Statement was issued without hearing the perspective of passengers whatsoever.

The Applicant makes application for:

1. a declaration that:
 - (a) the Agency’s Statement **is not** a decision, order, determination, or any other ruling of the Agency and has no force or effect of law;
 - (b) the issuance of the Statement on or about March 25, 2020, referencing of the Statement within the COVID-19 Agency Page, and the subsequent distribution of those publications is contrary to the Agency’s own *Code of Conduct* and/or gives rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias for:
 - i. the Agency as a whole, or
 - ii. alternatively, the appointed members of the Agency who supported the Statement;
 - (c) further, the Agency, or alternatively the appointed members of the Agency who supported the Statement, exceeded and/or lost its (their) jurisdiction under the *Canada Transportation Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 10 to rule upon any complaints of passengers about refunds from carriers relating to the COVID-19 pandemic;

2. an interim order (*ex-parte*) that:

- (a) upon service of this Court's interim order, the Agency shall prominently post the interim clarification (below) at the top portion of both the French and English versions of the "Statement on Vouchers" [**Statement**] and the "Important Information for Travellers During COVID-19" page [**COVID-19 Agency Page**] (both defined in paragraphs 11-12 of the Notice of Application):

The Canadian Transportation Agency's "Statement on Vouchers" is not a decision, order, determination, or any legal ruling of the Canadian Transportation Agency. It does **not** have the force of law. The "Statement on Vouchers" is currently pending judicial review by the Federal Court of Appeal. This notice is posted by Order [insert URL link to PDF of order] of the Federal Court of Appeal.;

- (b) starting from the date of service of this Court's interim order, the Agency shall bring the above interim clarification to the attention of anyone that contacts the Agency with a formal complaint and/or informal inquiry regarding air carriers' refusal to refund arising from the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (c) the Agency shall not issue any decision, order, determination, or any other ruling with respect to refunds from air carriers in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic; and
- (d) this interim order is valid for fourteen days from the date of service of this Court's interim order on the Agency, and may be renewed by the Applicant under Rule 374(2);

3. an interlocutory order that:

- (a) the Agency shall forthwith completely remove the Statement from the Agency's website including any references to the Statement within the COVID-19 Agency Page and substitute it with this Court's interlocutory order, or alternatively the order renewing the interim clarification (subparagraph 2(a) above), until final disposition of the Application;

- (b) the interim orders in subparagraphs 1(b)-(c) above are maintained until final disposition of the Application;
 - (c) the Agency shall forthwith communicate with persons that the Agency has previously communicated with regarding the Statement and bring those persons' attention to this Court's interlocutory order and the removal or clarification of the Statement; and
 - (d) the Agency shall forthwith communicate with air carriers under the Agency's jurisdiction, the Association of Canadian Travel Agencies, and Travel Pulse and bring those persons' attention to this Court's interlocutory order and the removal or clarification of the Statement;
4. a permanent order that:
- (a) the Agency prominently post at the top portion of the COVID-19 Agency Page that the Agency's Statement has been ordered to be removed by this Court;
 - (b) the Agency remove the Statement, and references to the Statement within the COVID-19 Agency Page, from its website and replace the Statement with a copy of this Court's judgment;
 - (c) in the event the Agency receives any formal complaint or informal inquiry regarding air carriers' refusal to refund in respect of the COVID-19 pandemic, promptly and prominently inform the complainant of this Court's judgment; and
 - (d) the Agency, or alternatively the appointed members of the Agency who supported the Statement, be enjoined from dealing with any complaints involving air carriers' refusal to refund passengers in respect of the COVID-19 pandemic, and enjoined from issuing any decision, order, determination or any other ruling with respect to refunds from air carriers for the COVID-19 pandemic;
5. costs and/or reasonable out-of-pocket expenses of this Application; and

6. such further and other relief or directions as the Applicant may request and this Honourable Court deems just.

The grounds for the application are as follows:

A. Overview

1. The present Application challenges the illegality of the Canadian Transportation Agency's Statement, which purports to provide an unsolicited advance ruling in favour of air carriers without having heard the perspective of passengers beforehand.
2. The Statement and the COVID-19 Agency Page preemptively suggest that the Agency is leaning heavily towards permitting the issuance of vouchers in lieu of refunds. They further suggest that the Agency will very likely dismiss passengers' complaints to the Agency for air carriers' failure to refund during the COVID-19 pandemic, irrespective of the reason for flight cancellation.
3. Despite the Agency having already determined in a number of binding legal decisions throughout the years that passengers have a fundamental right to a refund in cases where the passengers could not travel for events outside of their control, the Agency now purports to grant air carriers a blanket immunity from the law via the Statement, without even first hearing passengers' submissions or perspective as to why a refund is **mandated** by law. This is inappropriate.
4. The Agency, as a quasi-judicial tribunal, must at all times act with impartiality. That impartiality, unfortunately, has clearly been lost, as demonstrated by the Agency's issuance of the unsolicited Statement and usage thereof.
5. The fundamental precept of our justice system is that "*justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done*" (*R. v. Yumnu*, 2012 SCC 73 at para. 39). This fundamental precept leaves no room for any exception, even during difficult times like the COVID-19 pandemic.
6. Impartiality is further emphasized in the Agency's own *Code of Conduct* stipulating that the appointed members of the Agency shall not express an opinion on potential cases.

B. The COVID-19 Pandemic

7. The coronavirus [COVID-19] is a highly contagious virus that originated from the province of Hubei in the Peoples Republic of China, and began spreading outside of the Peoples Republic of China on or around January 2020.
8. On or about March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a global pandemic.
9. On or about March 13, 2020, the Government of Canada issued a blanket travel advisory against non-essential travel outside of Canada until further notice and restricting entry of foreign nationals into Canada, akin to a “declaration of war” against COVID-19, and that those in Canada should remain at home unless absolutely necessary to be outside of their homes [Declaration].
10. COVID-19 has disrupted air travel to, from, and within Canada. The disruption was brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic and/or the Declaration, such as:
 - (a) closure of borders by a number of countries, resulting in cancellation of flights by air carriers;
 - (b) passengers adhering strictly to government travel advisories (such as the Declaration) and refraining from air travel (and other forms of travel) unless absolutely necessary; and
 - (c) air carriers cancelling flights on their own initiative to save costs, in anticipation of a decrease in demand for air travel.

C. The Agency’s Actions in Relation to COVID-19, Including the “Statement on Vouchers”

11. Since March 13, 2020 and up to the date of filing this Application, the Agency has taken a number of steps in relation to COVID-19. Those listed in the four sub-paragraphs below are **not** the subject of review in this Application.
 - (a) **On March 13, 2020**, the Agency issued Determination No. A-2020-42 providing, *inter alia*, that various obligations under the *Air Passen-*

ger Protection Regulations, SOR/2019-150 [APPR] are suspended until April 30, 2020:

- i. Compensation for Delays and Inconvenience for those that travel: compensation to passengers for inconvenience has been reduced and/or relaxed (an air carrier's obligation imposed under paragraphs 19(1)(a) and 19(1)(b) of the *APPR*);
 - ii. Compensation for Inconvenience to those that do not travel: the air carrier's obligation, under subsection 19(2) of the *APPR* to pay compensation for inconvenience to passengers who opted to obtain a refund instead of alternative travel arrangement, if the flight delay or the flight cancellation is communicated to passengers more than 72 hours before the departure time indicated on the passengers' original ticket; and
 - iii. Obligation to Rebook Passengers on Other Carriers: the air carrier's obligation, under paragraphs 17(1)(a)(ii), 17(1)(a)(iii), and 18(1)(a)(ii) of the *APPR*.
- (b) **On or about March 25, 2020**, the Agency issued Determination No. A-2020-47 extending the exemptions under Decision No. A-2020-42 (above) to June 30, 2020. This Determination further exempted air carriers from responding to compensation requests within 30 days (s. 19(4) of *APPR*). Instead, air carriers would be permitted to respond to compensation requests 120 days *after* June 30, 2020 (e.g. October 28, 2020).
- (c) **On or about March 18, 2020**, the Agency issued Order No. 2020-A-32, suspending **all** dispute proceedings until April 30, 2020.
- (d) **On or about March 25, 2020**, the Agency issued Order No. 2020-A-37, extending the suspension (above) to June 30, 2020.
12. On or about March 25, 2020, almost concurrently with the Order and Determination on the same date (above), the Agency publicly posted the Statement on its website (**French:** <https://otc-cta.gc.ca/fra/message-concernant-credits>; **En-**

glish: <https://otc-cta.gc.ca/eng/statement-vouchers>) providing that:

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused major disruptions in domestic and international air travel.

For flight disruptions that are outside an airline's control, the Canada Transportation Act and Air Passenger Protection Regulations only require that the airline ensure passengers can complete their itineraries. Some airlines' tariffs provide for refunds in certain cases, but may have clauses that airlines believe relieve them of such obligations in force majeure situations.

The legislation, regulations, and tariffs were developed in anticipation of relatively localized and short-term disruptions. None contemplated the sorts of worldwide mass flight cancellations that have taken place over recent weeks as a result of the pandemic. It's important to consider how to strike a fair and sensible balance between passenger protection and airlines' operational realities in these extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances.

On the one hand, passengers who have no prospect of completing their planned itineraries with an airline's assistance should not simply be out-of-pocket for the cost of cancelled flights. On the other hand, airlines facing huge drops in passenger volumes and revenues should not be expected to take steps that could threaten their economic viability.

While any specific situation brought before the CTA will be examined on its merits, the CTA believes that, generally speaking, an appropriate approach in the current context could be for airlines to provide affected passengers with vouchers or credits for future travel, as long as these vouchers or credits do not expire in an unreasonably short period of time (24 months would be considered reasonable in most cases).

The CTA will continue to provide information, guidance, and services to passengers and airlines as we make our way through this challenging period.

13. On or about March 25, 2020, concurrently with the Statement, the Agency posted an amendment to the COVID-19 Agency Page on its website, adding four references to the Statement (French: **Information importante pour les voyageurs pour la période de la COVID-19** [

importante-pour-voyageurs-pour-periode-covid-19]; English: **Important Information for Travellers During COVID-19** [<https://otc-cta.gc.ca/eng/important-information-travellers-during-covid-19>]).

14. The COVID-19 Agency Page cites and purports to apply the Statement in the context of an air carrier's legal obligation in three circumstances: (1) situations outside airline control (including COVID-19 situations); (2) situations within airline control; and (3) situations within airline control, but required for safety.
15. In effect, the COVID-19 Agency Page purports to have relieved air carriers from providing passengers with refunds in practically **every** imaginable scenario for cancellation of flight(s), contrary to the Agency's own jurisprudence and the minimum passenger protections under the *APPR*.

D. Jurisprudence on Refunds for Passengers

16. Since 2004, in a number of decisions, the Agency confirmed passengers' fundamental right to a refund when, for whatever reason, an air carrier is unable to provide the air transportation, including those outside of the air carrier's control:
 - (a) *Re: Air Transat*, Decision No. 28-A-2004;
 - (b) *Lukács v. Porter*, Decision No. 344-C-A-2013, para. 88;
 - (c) *Lukács v. Sunwing*, Decision No. 313-C-A-2013, para. 15; and
 - (d) *Lukács v. Porter*, Decision No. 31-C-A-2014, paras. 33 and 137.
17. The Agency's jurisprudence was entirely consistent with the common law doctrine of frustration, the civil law doctrine of *force majeure*, and, most importantly, common sense.
18. The *APPR*, which has been in force since 2019, merely provides **minimum** protection to passengers. The *APPR* does not negate or overrule the passengers' fundamental right to a refund for cancellations in situations outside of a carrier's control.
19. Furthermore, the COVID-19 Agency Page also suggests that the Statement *would* apply to cancellations that are within airline control, or within airline control but required for safety purposes, squarely contradicting the provisions

of subsection 17(7) of the *APPR*. Subsection 17(7) clearly mandates that any refund be in the original form of payment, leaving no room for the novel idea of issuing a voucher or credit.

20. Finally, whether an air carrier's flight cancellation could be characterized as outside their control, or within their control, remains to be seen. For example, if a cancellation was to save costs in light of shrinking demand, it may be considered a situation within an air carrier's control. However, the Statement and the COVID-19 Agency Page presuppose that **any and all** cancellations at this time should be considered outside an air carrier's control.
21. The combined effect of the Statement and the COVID-19 Agency Page purports to ignore decade old and firmly established jurisprudence of the Agency. This all occurred without any formal hearing, adjudication, determination, or otherwise, or even a single legal submission or input from the passengers.
22. As described further below, the Agency does not even outline its legal basis or provide any support for those public statements.
23. The Agency's public statements are tantamount to endorsing air carriers in illegally withholding the passengers' monies, all without having to provide the services that were contracted for. The air carriers all seek to then issue vouchers with varying expiry dates and usage conditions to every passenger, effectively depriving all the passengers of their fundamental right to a refund, which is a right the Agency itself firmly recognized.

E. The Agency's Conduct Gives Rise to a Reasonable Apprehension of Bias

24. The Agency is a quasi-judicial tribunal that is subject to the same rules of impartiality that apply to courts and judges of the courts.
25. Tribunals, like courts, speak through their legal judgments and not media postings or "statements."
26. The Statement and/or the COVID-19 Agency Page is not a legal judgment. They give an informed member of the public the perception that it would be more

likely than not that the Agency, or the members that supported the Statement, will not be able to fairly decide the issue of refunds relating to COVID-19.

27. The Agency has already stipulated a general rule, outside the context of a legal judgment, that refunds need not be provided. No support was provided for this radical departure from the fundamental rights of passengers. The Agency merely provided a bald assertion or conclusion that passengers are not entitled to any refund.
28. The Agency's own Code of Conduct expressly prohibits members of the Agency from expressing an opinion about potential cases or any other issue related to the Agency's work, or comments that may create a reasonable apprehension of bias:

(40) Members **shall not publicly express an opinion about any past, current, or potential cases or any other issue related to the work of the Agency**, and shall refrain from comments or discussions in public or otherwise that may create a reasonable apprehension of bias.

[Emphasis added.]

29. Although neither the Statement, nor the COVID-19 Agency Page, contain the signature or names of any specific member of the Agency, given the circumstances and considering the Agency's own Code of Conduct providing that the professional civilian staff's role are to **fully** implement the appointed member(s)' directions, the Statement and the COVID-19 Agency Page ought to be attributed to the member(s) who supported the Statement either before or after its posting on the internet.
30. In these circumstances, the Court must proactively step in to protect the passengers, to ensure that "justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done," and to ensure that the administration of justice is not put to disrepute.
31. The Court ought to issue an interim, interlocutory, and/or permanent order restricting the Agency's involvement with passengers' COVID-19 related refunds against air carriers.

F. The Applicant

32. The Applicant is a non-profit corporation under the *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act*, SC 2009 that is an advocacy group representing the rights of air passengers.

33. Air Passenger Rights is led by a Canadian air passenger rights advocate, Dr. Gábor Lukács, whose work and public interest litigation has been recognized by this Honourable Court in a number of judgments:

(a) *International Air Transport Assn et al. v. AGC et al.* (Federal Court of Appeal File No. A-311-19, Order of Near J.A., dated March 3, 2020) that:

[...] the Court is of the view that the case engages the public interest, that the proposed intervener [Dr. Gábor Lukács] would defend the interests of airline passengers in a way that the parties [the Agency, the Attorney General of Canada, and an airlines trade association] cannot, that the interests of justice favour allowing the proposed intervention in the appeal, and that the proposed intervention would be of assistance to the Court in deciding the appeal [...]

(b) *Lukács v. Canada (Transportation Agency)* 2016 FCA 174 at para. 6;

(c) *Lukács v. Canada (Transport, Infrastructure and Communities)*, 2015 FCA 269 at para. 43;

(d) *Lukács v. Canada (Transport, Infrastructure and Communities)*, 2015 FCA 140 at para. 1; and

(e) *Lukács v. Canada (Transportation Agency)*, 2014 FCA 76 at para. 62.

G. Statutory provisions

34. The Applicant will also rely on the following statutory provisions:

(a) *Canada Transportation Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 10 and, in particular, sections

25, 37, and 85.1;

(b) *Federal Courts Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. F-7, and in particular, sections 18.1, 18.2, 28, and 44; and

(c) *Federal Courts Rules*, S.O.R./98-106, and in particular, Rules 300, 369, and 372-374; and

35. Such further and other grounds as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court permits.

This application will be supported by the following material:

1. Affidavit of Dr. Gábor Lukács, to be served.
2. Such further and additional materials as the Applicant may advise and this Honourable Court may allow.

The Applicant requests the Canadian Transportation Agency to send a certified copy of the following material that is not in the possession of the Applicant but is in the possession of the Canadian Transportation Agency to the Registry and to the Applicant:

1. Complete and unredacted copies of all correspondences, meetings, notes, and/or documents involving the appointed members of the Agency relating to the Statement and/or issuance of vouchers or credits in relation to the COVID-19 incident, including both before and after publication of the Statement;
2. The number of times the URLs for the Statements were accessed (**French:** <https://otc-cta.gc.ca/fra/message-concernant-credits>; **English:** <https://otc-cta.gc.ca/eng/statement-vouchers>) from March 24, 2020 onward;
3. Complete and unredacted copies of all correspondences, meetings, notes, and/or documents between the Canadian Transportation Agency and the travel industry (including but not limited to any travel agencies, commercial airlines, industry groups, etc.) from February 15, 2020 to the present in respect to issuing of credits, coupons, or vouchers to passengers in lieu of a refund for travel affected

by COVID-19; and

4. Complete and unredacted copies of all correspondences, e-mails, and/or complaints that the Agency received from passengers between February 15, 2020 to the present in respect to issuing of credits, coupons, or vouchers to passengers in lieu of a refund for travel affected by COVID-19.

April 6, 2020

“Simon Lin”

SIMON LIN

Evolink Law Group

4388 Still Creek Drive, Suite 237

Burnaby, British Columbia, V5C 6C6

Tel: 604-620-2666

Fax: 888-509-8168

simonlin@evolinklaw.com

**Counsel for the Applicant,
Air Passenger Rights**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above document is a true copy of the original files in the Court.

JE CERTIFIE que le document ci-dessus est une copie conforme à l'original déposé au dossier de la Cour fédérale.

Filing date April 9, 2020
Date de dépôt

April 9, 2020
Dated
Fait le

JEAN-FRANÇOIS DUPORE
REGISTRY OFFICER
AGENT DU GREFFE