

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: ***Atfield v. Employment and Assistance Appeal Tribunal***,  
2006 BCSC 1883

Date: 20061218  
Docket: S062413  
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

**William J. Atfield Jr.**

Petitioner

And:

**Employment and Assistance Appeal Tribunal  
and Minister of Employment and Assistance**

Respondents

Before: The Honourable Mr. Justice Groberman

**Supplementary Reasons for Judgment**

Appearing on his own behalf

W.J. Atfield

Counsel for the Attorney General of B.C.

S.J. Martorana

Place of Hearing:

Vancouver, B.C.

[1] On September 22 of this year, I heard this matter and delivered oral reasons for judgment. At paragraphs 15 and 16 of the judgment, I stated:

[15] .... The parties have agreed that the best place for that matter to be resolved is at the Tribunal, rather than remitting this matter to the original line worker.

[16] In the circumstances, I am remitting the matter to the Tribunal with a direction that it determine the cost of the least expensive appropriate mode of moving, and to order reimbursement of that amount.

[2] Since the pronouncement of the judgment, counsel have reached the conclusion that section 24(2)(b) of the ***Employment and Assistance Act***, S.B.C. 2002, c. 40 requires decisions as to the amount to be reimbursed to be made by the Minister, and not by the Tribunal.

[3] In the result, I am amending my order, which is not yet entered, to remit the matter to the Minister, rather than to the Tribunal. The direction set out in paragraph 16 of the judgment will apply to the Minister's determination.

"H.M. Groberman, J."  
The Honourable Mr. Justice H. M. Groberman