

**Date:** 20250625

**File:** 561-02-41296

**Citation:** 2025 FPSLREB 79

*Federal Public Sector  
Labour Relations and  
Employment Board Act and  
Federal Public Sector  
Labour Relations Act*



Before a panel of the  
Federal Public Sector  
Labour Relations and  
Employment Board

---

BETWEEN

**LOUISE BELISLE**

Complainant

and

**PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE OF CANADA**

Respondent

Indexed as

*Belisle v. Public Service Alliance of Canada*

In the matter of a complaint made under section 190 of the *Federal Public Sector  
Labour Relations Act*

**Before:** Bryan R. Gray, a panel of the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and  
Employment Board

**For the Complainant:** Herself

**For the Respondent:** Andrew Montague-Reinholdt, counsel

---

Decided on the basis of written submissions,  
dated March 24, April 24 and May 20, 2025.

### **I. Complaint declared frivolous and vexatious, and dismissed**

[1] This duty-of-fair-representation complaint is declared frivolous and vexatious due to the failure of Louise Belisle (“the complainant”) to abide by the rules and the repeated clear direction of the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board (“the Board”) and the ongoing delays she has caused in the complaint process. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed.

[2] I have been actively case-managing this file with both parties for 24 months. Despite the best efforts of the Board and its registry, the complainant has not provided the Public Service Alliance of Canada (“the respondent”) with clearly enunciated allegations and the related particulars that would allow it to prepare its case, to defend itself. That information is an essential requirement of all hearings before the Board.

[3] The complaint was made on October 2, 2019, and was scheduled for a hearing in August 2023, which was postponed at the complainant’s request in July 2023.

[4] In late July 2023, the respondent made a motion to dismiss the complaint, which relied, in part, upon the assertion that many vague allegations in it dated back many years before the date on which the complaint was made. In December 2023, the Board determined that it was in the interests of fairness to convene a hearing, to allow for oral arguments and questions from the Board about the motion and, more importantly, the matter of the allegations and particulars that gave rise to the complaint. After several last-minute requests from the complainant to postpone the one-day hearing were rejected, it was held on November 8, 2024, in person in Ottawa.

[5] After a full-day discussion of many varied topics put forth by the complainant, including many past problems with her employer and her desire to challenge the constitutionality of the well-established and consistently respected 90-day deadline set by Parliament for complainants to make duty-of-fair-representation complaints, the Board concluded that it would reserve its decision on the motion to dismiss, pending the receipt of the concise one-page summary written statement of the complainant’s allegations and related particulars.

[6] That outcome and the requirement for information from the complainant was issued in writing on November 12, 2024, and stated as follows:

...

*The previous request of the Board (dated **September 24, 2024**) that the complainant provide a one-page detailed list of particulars to explain each of her allegations against the respondent is repeated and this must be provided to the respondent no later than the end of **February 2025**. This shall include exact details of who from the union did what or failed to do something where, and when and if any other person witnessed it, and if so, who.*

...

[Emphasis in the original]

[7] In December 2024, after 24 months of communications and requested submissions and the one-day hearing to consider the motion to dismiss the complaint, another hearing of its merits was set for October 27 to 30, 2025.

[8] That hearing date was set pending the repeatedly requested one-page concise statement of allegations and related particulars, which was required to allow the respondent to be able to understand the case being made against it and to prepare its evidence, witnesses, and arguments in defence.

[9] On March 3, 2025, having received no reply from the complainant to its November 2024, direction, the Board issued the following to her:

...

*As directed in the Board's letter of **November 12, 2024** (enclosed), the complainant was directed to provide a one-page detailed list of particulars to explain each of her allegations against the respondent is repeated and this was to be provided **no later than the end of February 2025**. This was to include exact details of who from the union did what or failed to do something where, and when and if any other person witnessed it, and if so, who.*

*I have been directed by the Board Member assigned to this matter, Mr. Bryan Gray, to inform the parties that the complainant is required to file this document with the Board and the Respondent no later than **Monday, March 10, 2025**.*

...

[Emphasis in the original]

[10] In the absence of any response from the complainant, the respondent made another submission on March 24, 2025, requesting the disposition of its motion to dismiss.

[11] On April 15, 2025, the Board wrote to the complainant, reiterating its earlier direction to provide the one-page list of particulars and concluding with the following:

...

*It is now almost 7 months since the Board has been requesting this information be provided.*

***Please be advised that if this information is not provided to the respondent with a copy to the Board no later than April 28, 2025 the Board may proceed to close your file with no further notice to you and no further opportunities for you to have this complaint heard before the Board.***

...

[Emphasis in the original]

[12] That elicited a lengthy email response from the complainant dated April 24, 2025, which included the following passages:

...

*I am catching up on many emails. I will need time to go through them. I am not abandoning anything and do find it rather strange that if my privacy is not violated how emails from FPSLREB appear to come at the same time.*

*I advised that the information book would be prepared and shared however, as a natural living women, and as per the due process and the so called constitutions am advising that I understood that the 1 pager was no longer required due to the information that was provided during the information hearing.*

...

*It is my file and have every intention of providing the documents as promised, but it must be noted that if you required more details on constitutions and precedence by both Federal & Supreme crt rulings that due process in accordance to the constitution which is the foundation of Canada and my fundamental rights which existed long before Canada did, but there is Canada's obligation under the international convenient on the civil & political rights, and other international law or instruments which bring forth our common law rights, our natural rights and our human rights. Canada DID NOT CREATE THEM.*

...

*The rule of law is that living men and women have natural rights and freedoms that are not to be limited or abridged never. The rule is the superior rule concerning law, everything else is subject to this rule.*

...

*Thus, once I have completed what is necessary I will provide and share the evidence. They were not in a rush to have this heard and thus, this is my file and will continue to work on it at the ability I am able with the family obligations and work obligations I have.*

...

[Sic throughout]

[13] On May 20, 2025, the respondent requested the immediate dismissal of the complaint on the grounds that the complainant had repeatedly failed to provide the one-page list particularizing her allegations despite being provided with multiple opportunities to do so. It noted the prejudicial effect of this failure on its ability to defend itself against the complaint.

[14] The case management of this file has consumed vast resources from the Board and its registry. The respondent has also expended considerable resources by having legal counsel represent it through the many communications and motions and in the preparation and conduct of the one-day hearing and its follow-up.

[15] After two years of significant efforts, including holding a one-day hearing at which it was repeatedly explained in detail to the complainant what was required of her, and why, within the context of the Board's hearing process and the jurisprudence related to the outcomes of duty-of-fair-representation cases, there are still no clear allegations or supporting particulars of what led to this complaint being made.

[16] In her last communication with the Board, the complainant asserted that she understood that the one-page document that the Board requested was no longer required after the November 8, 2024, hearing. That statement lacks credibility.

[17] The Board wrote to the complainant three times after the November 8, 2024, hearing, as confirmed earlier in this decision, to confirm and remind her that she was required to provide the one-page summary of her allegations and particulars, as was previously required of her in writing on September 24, 2024.

[18] In its April 15, 2025, letter, the Board specifically warned her that if she failed to provide the required summary by April 28, 2025, the Board may close her file without further notice or opportunity for her to have this complaint heard.

[19] In her most recent communication with the Board, the complainant wrote that after 24 months of the Board's efforts, she needs more time to prepare her allegations and essentially states that she will provide this information when she chooses to.

[20] In the past, the Board has had several months pass, with no responses to its communications from the complainant, during the spring and summer period. She later explained that she is busy with other things in the summer and is unable to

respond then to the Board's requests. Given that, the resolution of the outstanding request for particulars cannot be allowed to wait indefinitely, as doing so would risk the respondent having late or no notice for its hearing preparation and thus risk yet another hearing postponement.

[21] I must conclude that this is a failure and a refusal to follow a clear and repeated Board direction.

[22] Section 21 of the *Federal Public Sector Labour Relations and Employment Board Act* (S.C. 2013, c. 40, s. 365) empowers the Board to "... dismiss summarily any matter that in its opinion is trivial, frivolous, vexatious or was made in bad faith."

[23] The Federal Court identified several indicia of vexatious behaviour in *Wilson v. Canada (Revenue Agency)*, 2006 FC 1535 where it stated:

...  
[31] Other indicia of vexatious behaviour include the initiation of frivolous actions or motions, the making of unsubstantiated allegations of impropriety against the opposite party, legal counsel or the Court, the refusal or failure to abide by rules or orders of the Court ....

...  
[24] I also note the recent decision of the Federal Court of Appeal in the *Public Service Alliance of Canada v. Abi-Mansour*, 2025 FCA 81:

...  
[7] As community property, courts and judges must ensure that their finite resources and limited capacity to deal with all sorts of litigants, who come before them, are not squandered. As stated in *Olumide* at paragraph 19 (see also for e.g., *Coady v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2020 FCA 154 at para. 22 (*Coady*)):

[19] [...]. Every moment devoted to a vexatious litigant is a moment unavailable to a deserving litigant. The unrestricted access to courts by those whose access should be restricted affects the access of others who need and deserve it. Inaction on the former damages the latter.

[8] A non-exhaustive list of vexatiousness indicia can be gleaned from this Court's case law: (a) being admonished by various courts for engaging in vexatious and abusive behaviour; (b) instituting frivolous proceedings; (c) making scandalous and unsupported allegations against opposing parties or the Court; (d) re-litigating issues which have already been decided against the vexatious litigant; (e) bringing unsuccessful appeals of interlocutory and final decisions; (f) ignoring court orders and court rules; and (g) refusing

*to pay outstanding costs awards (see Feeney v. Canada, 2022 FCA 190 at para. 20; Turmel v. Canada (Attorney General), 2023 FCA 197 at para. 2).*

...

[25] The complainant has, despite my repeated clear direction and warning, failed or refused to abide by rules and direction of this Board. She has also, largely without justification, caused ongoing and significant delays in the complaint process. This falls squarely within what has been found to be frivolous and vexatious behavior.

[26] For all those reasons, and consistent with the decisions stated in *Wilson*, and *Abi-Mansour*, I dismiss this complaint on the basis that it is frivolous and vexatious.

[27] For all of the above reasons, the Board makes the following order:

*(The Order appears on the next page)*

**II. Order**

[28] The complaint is dismissed.

June 25, 2025.

**Bryan R. Gray,  
a panel of the Federal Public Sector  
Labour Relations and Employment Board**