

The Limited Rights of Unionized Employees to sue without the consent of the Union that has breached

November 01, 2016

On October 13, 2016, the Québec Court of Appeal, through the Honourable Justice Marie-France Bich, rendered an important and unanimous judgment, holding that a union will retain the exclusive right of representation of its members in petitioning for judicial review, even where a court has previously ruled that the union has failed in its duty to represent those same employees.

Facts

The facts are as follows: In the municipal mergers that occurred in 2002, the City of Saint-Laurent became a borough of the City of Montréal. A collective agreement therefore had to be concluded between the new employer (the City of Montréal) and the Syndicat des fonctionnaires municipaux de Montréal (SCFP) (the "Union"). The Union acted on behalf of all the white-collar employees of the City of Montréal, and not only those who had worked for the City of Saint-Laurent. In those negotiations, the employees previously employed by the City of Saint-Laurent realized that the Union had abolished their rights under a group insurance plan, thus abolishing a right which they considered to be vested. They requested that the Union take action, but it failed to do so. The employees then filed a claim, in 2004, against the Union for contravening its **duty of fair representation pursuant to section 47.2 of the Labour Code**. These legal proceedings ended in 2011 when the Court of Appeal held that the Union had indeed breached its duty of fair representation. The Court of Appeal ordered that the grievances **of the unionized employees against the City of Montréal be referred to arbitration and that these employees be represented by legal counsel of their choice, at the expense of the Union.**

Arbitrator Foisy heard the employees' case and rendered an arbitral award dismissing their grievances. The employees then filed a motion for judicial review before the Superior Court of Québec. The Superior Court, after hearing the case, granted the City of Montréal's motion to dismiss the case, holding that the employees could not file such a motion without the prior consent of the Union. The whole matter was then appealed to the Court of Appeal of Québec.

Practical Aspects

Essentially, the Court of Appeal of Québec held that the Union had indeed lost their exclusive right or representation of the employees in regards to the filing and hearing their grievances, but had regained that right when arbitrator Foisy rendered his decision. **The Court of Appeal of Québec maintained that the employees were then compelled to ask the Union to file a motion for judicial review on their behalf. If the Union then refused to file the motion for review, the employees, in order to be entitled to file a judicial review, would then have to file a new motion with the Québec Labour Tribunal (the "Tribunal administratif du travail")**, in order to obtain another judgment declaring that the Union had failed once more to fulfill its duty of fair representation.

The Court of Appeal acknowledged that its reasoning would give rise to a multiplicity of legal proceedings, lengthy periods for filing contestations, as well as substantial legal costs; but the Court found that that was simply one of the risks inherent in labour relations. The risk was therefore deemed acceptable under the circumstances. Thus, before any case is heard, an employer must await the outcome of such parallel proceedings.

Although the solution proposed by the Court of Appeal may complicate the notion that motions for judicial review must be filed within a "reasonable" period of time, which is **generally considered to be 30 days, the Québec Court of Appeal found that the filing of new proceedings under section 47.2 of the Labour Code**, when the Union refuses to file a motion for judicial review, could constitute exceptional circumstances under which the notion of "reasonable time" may be extended. Thus, in certain circumstances, the employer may expect to receive a motion for judicial review several months or even several years after an arbitrator has rendered his or her award, should a tribunal or a court recognize the employees were once more wrongfully represented by their trade union, **as per section 47.2 of the Labour Code**.

It is important to note that where a grievance is granted by an arbitrator, and where the employees who filed the grievance are represented by legal counsel of their choice (as the union has breached its duty of fair representation), the Court of Appeal recognizes that the employer should file its motion for judicial review against the employees, because they would then be able to institute legal proceedings in defence. However, it may be advisable, in such a case, to include the union in the proceedings, so as to ensure that the employer can defend itself against a possible motion to dismiss based on the union's right of exclusive representation.

Although this judgment is an important one, it might still be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, because the legal deadline for doing so has not yet expired. We will keep you informed of any and all future developments that may arise in this case.

By

[Catherine Deslauriers](#)

Expertise

[Labour & Employment](#)

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2024 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.