

General Corporate — Commentary — Articles — English — Vern Krishna —, 2012-08-081 -- Timing is all in notices of objection

2012-09-20

Search Details

Search Query: Table of Contents

Delivery Details

Date: January 8, 2019 at 3:15 p.m.

Delivered By: VERN KRISHNA

Client File: GAAR

Vern Krishna discusses Taxpayers who object to their assessments from the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) must file a timely Notice of Objection to protect their rights. Failure to adhere to the strict timelines eradicates all legal rights of appeal.

Timing is all in notices of objection

Date: September 20, 2012

 [Timing is all in notices of objection](#)

Vern Krishna

Taxpayers who object to their assessments from the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) must file a timely Notice of Objection to protect their rights. Failure to adhere to the strict timelines eradicates all legal rights of appeal. The CRA always stands its ground on its strict and technical legal rights. The Tax Court of Canada is in a straitjacket and cannot provide equitable relief on the statutory timelines, which it cannot extend and must enforce to the letter of the law. Thus, unrepresented individuals unfamiliar with the fiscal statute are particularly vulnerable to the limitation rules and are left without remedy and denied access to justice.

The limitation period is strictly statutory. For an individual filing a Notice of Objection the limit is *90 days from the date of mailing* of the assessment, regardless of whether he receives the mail, or within one year of the taxpayer's "filing due date." This is considerably shorter than the two-year limitation period in provincial courts and ensnares many unrepresented taxpayers who do not know better.

Fairness is not an issue in tax administration and collection. In *Hewstan*, [2012] TCC 292, a recent decision of the Tax Court, the taxpayer's 90 days expired Sept. 9, 2009, and the one-year extension expired a year later. The unrepresented taxpayer did not file an objection until February of 2012. The Tax Court judge dismissed the taxpayer's plea for consideration of her appeal: "... even though the law is unfair I do not have the jurisdiction to change it. We are not a court of equity we are a court of statute ... and even though there maybe some unfairness to what I am deciding I do not have any power to step outside [the] parameters ... of the year and 90-day limitations." The judge was, in effect, handcuffed.

Unlike the courts, the minister of national revenue has equitable powers and may extend the time for filing a Notice of Objection if he is satisfied that the extension would be "just and equitable" in the circumstances. The words "just and equitable" conjure up an impression of soft law and palm tree justice. In fact, the courts are quite reluctant to grant extensions of time.

The taxpayer must have a bona fide intention to object to the assessment and act as soon as circumstances permit and, at the very latest, no later than one year after the expiry of the original time limit.

The two time periods are conjunctive and the taxpayer must satisfy each independently of the other. Thus, the taxpayer should not wait to see if negotiations with the CRA will prove successful and then file for an extension of time if they are not. The better course is to file the application for extension immediately upon becoming aware of the expiration of the initial deadline and to continue negotiations with the CRA on a parallel track. It is also advisable for taxpayers to maintain a

detailed written log of their communications and discussions with the CRA as personnel changes can obliterate corporate memory.

The courts construe the phrase “as soon as circumstances permit” strictly. It does not mean that the taxpayer can simply apply at any time within the maximum limit of one year. For example, in *Canada v. Pennington*, [1987] F.C.J. No. 62, the taxpayer filed a Notice of Objection three days after the 90-day limitation period. The CRA rejected the notice and sent the taxpayer a letter telling him that he could apply for an extension of time, and that the application must be made “as soon as possible and not later than one year” from the 90-day limit. The taxpayer took up the matter with his accountant and asked him to attempt to negotiate a settlement of the matter in issue. When it became clear some time later that a satisfactory settlement was unlikely, the taxpayer applied for an extension of the limitation period. The Federal Court of Appeal refused the extension because the taxpayer did not act “as soon as possible” to file his application and it was not a sufficient excuse in law that he had passed the matter on to his accountant for settlement.

The minister of finance should consider extending the objection limitation period for individuals to two years to harmonize with the provincial rules, and extending the jurisdiction of the Tax Court to remedy bona fide filing oversights, particularly by unrepresented taxpayers. There would be no additional cost to the government for such an amendment as it already collects interest on unpaid amounts on the basis of daily compounding.. It would be a small step in facilitating better access to justice, about which much is spoken but little is done.

Vern Krishna, CM, QC, FRSC is Tax Counsel, Borden Ladner Gervais, LLP, and Professor of Common Law and Executive Director of the Tax Research Centre, University of Ottawa.

vern.krishna@taxchambers.ca

Copyright © 2012 Vern Krishna. Reproduced with permission.

End of Document

© 2019 Thomson Reuters Canada Limited.