



## LAND AND PROPERTY RIGHTS TRIBUNAL

**Citation:** Glass v Ember Resources Inc., 2024 ABLPRT 904081

**Date:** 2024-08-13

**File No.:** RC2019.1053

**Order No.:** LPRT904081/2024

**Municipality:** County of Stettler No. 6

**In the matter of a proceeding commenced under** section 36 of the *Surface Rights Act*, RSA 2000, c S-24 (the “*Act*”)

**And in the matter of** land in the Province of Alberta within the:

NE ¼-22-35-21-W4M as described in Certificate of Title No. 152 005 924 +2 (the “Land”), particularly the area granted for Alberta Energy Regulator Licence No. 0331659 (the “Licence”), collectively (the “Site”).

**Between:**

Ember Resources Inc.  
and  
Trident Exploration (Alberta) Corp.,

Operators,

- and -

Carolyn Glass  
and  
Richard William Glass,

Applicants.

**Before:** Miles Weatherall (“the Panel”)

Appearances by written submissions:

For the Applicants: Paul Vasseur

For the Operators:

Trident Exploration (Alberta) Corp.      No Written Submissions

Ember Resources Inc.      Thomas R. Owen, Owen Law

---

**DIRECTION TO PAY PURSUANT TO  
SECTION 36(6) OF THE ACT**

---

The Tribunal directs the Minister to pay out of the General Revenue Fund the sum of TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-NINE and 59/100 DOLLARS (\$2,189.59) (the “Compensation”) jointly to Carolyn Glass and Richard William Glass of Red Deer, in the Province of Alberta, for compensation that became due in the year 2019.

---

**DECISION AND REASONS**

---

[1] The Applicant filed an application dated May 23, 2019, under section 36 of the *Act* (the Application) seeking recovery of unpaid compensation due under a surface lease agreement, consent of occupant agreement, or Compensation Order for the above Site (the “Right-of-Entry Instrument”). The Applicant claims \$2,400.00 annually, for a total amount of \$2,400.00 under the Application for the year 2019.

[2] On December 17, 2020, the Tribunal sent a Notice and Demand for Payment (“Notice”) to Ember Resources Inc. (“Ember”) in respect of this Application. Ember was granted an extension of time to reply to the Notice, by the Tribunal, until February 21, 2021. On February 16, 2021, Owen Law delivered Ember’s response to the Tribunal (the “Ember Response”).

[3] In the Ember Response, Ember requested that the Tribunal reconsider its Notice and Demand for Payment pursuant to section 29 of the *Act*. Ember did not respond to the merits of the Applicant’s claim. Ember did not use the prescribed form for applications under section 29 of the *Act*, but rather made its request by way of letter to the Tribunal. Ember requested that Tribunal rescind the Notice and Demand for Payment.

[4] The Ember Response also requested that the Tribunal amend the amount of the demand for payment to reflect the gratuitous payments made to the applicant and to reduce the demand by the amount of the payment which was \$210.41 paid to the Landowners on May 5, 2020.

**ISSUES**

[5] The preliminary matters before the Tribunal are:

- (1) Is a Notice and Demand for Payment a decision of the Tribunal to which section 29(1) of the *Act* applies?
- (2) If the Notice and Demand for Payment is a decision, is it an interlocutory or interim decision with a limited ability to be challenged?
- (3) If the Notice and Demand for Payment is a decision, has Ember established the basic requirements that would allow for reconsideration under the Surface Rights Board Rules (the “Rules”)?

- (4) Should Ember be afforded a further opportunity to make submissions on the merits of the Applicant's claims?

[6] The substantive issues before the Panel are:

1. Which corporations are Operators for the purposes of section 36 of the *Act*?
2. Is there money past due that has not been paid by the Operator to the Applicants under a surface lease or compensation order?
3. Should the Tribunal direct the Minister to pay the Applicants any of the money past due under section 36(6) of the *Act*?
4. Should the Tribunal suspend and terminate the Operator's entry rights under section 36(5) of the *Act*?

## DECISION

[7] The Panel decides in relation to the preliminary matters:

- (1) A Notice and Demand for Payment is not a decision of the Tribunal to which section 29(1) of the *Act* applies. Neither of its constituent parts reflects a final decision by the Tribunal. Both are issued in advance of a panel of the Tribunal considering and determining the merits of the application. Ember has not been prejudiced in that it has had since December 17, 2020, to provide submissions in response to the Notice and Demand for Payment.
- (2) In the alternative, if the Notice and Demand for Payment is a decision of the Tribunal, then the Panel finds it is at best an interlocutory or interim decision and that the test provided for in 689799 *Alberta v Edmonton (City)*, 2018 ABCA 212 (CanLII), which would allow for a review has not been established. As a section 29 application is a discretionary remedy, this Panel would not consider a review in these circumstances.
- (3) In the further alternative, if a Notice and Demand for Payment is a decision of the Tribunal that the Tribunal may review under section 29(1) of the *Act*, Ember has not established the basic requirements set out in Rule 37(3) that would allow for re-consideration.
- (4) Ember had ample opportunity to respond to the substance of the Applicant's claims and has elected not to do so. It will not be granted an opportunity to make further submissions in response to the Application before the Panel determines the substance of the Applicant's claims.

[8] The Panel decides in relation to the merits of the Applicants' substantive claims:

1. For the purposes of section 36 of the *Act*, the Operators are Trident Exploration (Alberta) Corp. ("Trident") and Ember.
2. The Compensation is payable to the Applicants by the Operators and the written evidence satisfactorily proves that it has not been paid.
3. Unless the Tribunal receives satisfactory evidence that the Compensation has been paid in full to the Applicants then, without further notice, the Tribunal may direct

- the Minister to pay the Applicants the Compensation of \$2,189.59 from the General Revenue Fund.
4. Unless the Tribunal receives satisfactory evidence that the Compensation has been paid in full to the Applicants, the entry rights of Ember shall be suspended and terminated on the dates in the attached Order.

## ANALYSIS

### **Preliminary Matters**

[9] Ember has asked the Tribunal to reconsider the issuance of the Notice and Demand for Payment under section 29(1) of the *Act* and rescind the Notice and Demand for Payment.

[10] Section 29(1) of the *Act* sets out the Tribunal's jurisdiction to review its decisions and orders. It states, in part:

- 29(1)** The Tribunal may
- (a) rehear an application before deciding it; [or]
  - (b) review, rescind, amend or replace a decision or order made by it [...]

[11] Section 37(3) of the *Rules* sets out when the Tribunal will exercise its discretion to review its decision or order. Rule 37(3) provides in part:

- (3) The Board may only decide to review a decision or order if one of the following basic requirements for review are met:
- (a) the decision or order shows an obvious and important error of law or jurisdiction;
  - (b) the decision or order shows an important error of fact, or an error of mixed fact and law, in the decision or order that affects the decision or order;
  - (c) the decision or order was based on a process that was obviously unfair or unjust; [...]

[12] Ember submits that reconsideration is appropriate because the Notice and Demand for Payment is showing an important error of fact that affects it.

[13] The Panel finds that the Notice and Demand for Payment is not a "decision" of the Tribunal and is not subject to reconsideration under section 29(1) of the *Act*. In the alternative, if the Notice and Demand for Payment is a "decision" of the Tribunal, the Panel finds that the "decision" complained of was an interim one that did not adversely affect Ember's rights and was therefore not ripe for review, and that, in any event, the Tribunal did not exceed its jurisdiction or otherwise commit an error of fact in issuing the Notice and Demand for Payment, or issue it as the result of an unfair process.

#### *1. Is a Notice and Demand for Payment a "decision" of the Tribunal?*

[14] Ember submits that a Notice and Demand for Payment is a decision of the Tribunal and that the Tribunal reconsider its decision to issue the Notice for the following reasons: Error of Fact and that the amount demanded is not the amount that is due to the Landowner in any event.

[15] Ember's characterization of a Notice and Demand for Payment as a "decision" of the Tribunal that can be re-considered is important because section 29(1) of the *Act* only grants the Tribunal jurisdiction to review, rescind, amend or replace decisions or orders of the Tribunal.

[16] Is a Notice and Demand for Payment a "decision" of the Tribunal and therefore subject to review under section 29(1) of the *Act*? The starting point for the Panel's analysis is the oft quoted "modern" rule of statutory interpretation:

Today there is only one principle or approach; namely the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

Construction of Statutes, 2nd ed. (1982) Elmer Driedger p. 87; Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., Re. 1998 (S.C.C.), Bell Express Vu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex. 2002 (S.C.C.)

[17] The terms "decision" and "order" are not defined in the *Act*. One must therefore look to the scheme and context of the *Act* – and particularly section 36 of the *Act* – to ascertain their meaning.

[18] Section 36 of the *Act* creates a statutory remedy that would not otherwise exist. It does not change the contractual obligations of the parties; it provides relief to landowners if operators do not pay the required compensation to them. However, to access this relief the applicant landowner must take certain steps and satisfy certain conditions before the application can be advanced.

[19] First, section 36(3) of the *Act* requires that, when commencing an application, the applicant provide to the Tribunal written evidence that compensation has not been paid under a surface lease and that the due date has passed.

[20] Second, under section 36(4) of the *Act*, upon receiving the applicant's evidence, the Tribunal must "consider" whether the applicant's evidence "satisfactorily proves the non-payment". The language of section 36(4) is important. The Legislature has not used the word "decide" – it has instead used the word "consider". In addition, the Legislature has included the concept of "satisfactorily" proving payment. In the context of section 36(4), "consider" and "satisfactorily" suggest that the Tribunal is not finally determining the matter at this stage, but rather the Tribunal is considering whether the applicant has, on a *prima facie* basis, satisfied the evidentiary requirements for the Tribunal to proceed to the next stage of the scheme set out in section 36 – *i.e.*, the issuance of a Notice and Demand for Payment under section 36(4) of the *Act*.

[21] Once the applicant has established the existence of a claim on a *prima facie* basis, section 36(4) of the *Act* requires that the Tribunal issue a demand for payment to the operators: "[...] the Tribunal shall send a written notice to the operator demanding full payment". Again, the words are important: Written notice of the application is required, and the particulars of that written notice must include a demand for payment. The *Act* provides the Tribunal no discretion in this regard.

[22] Issuance of the Notice and Demand for Payment entails no immediate consequences for the recipient; it is the first step in a long-standing decision-making procedure that applies equally to all operators. Once the Notice and Demand for Payment is issued, section 36 of the *Act* clearly outlines the possible consequences to the operator of failing to respond to the Notice and Demand for Payment. These include the Tribunal suspending the operator's right to enter the site (section 36(5)(a)) and subsequently terminating the operator's rights under the surface lease (section 36(5)(b)) by written decision or order served on the operator. Additionally, under section 36(6) of the *Act* the Tribunal may direct the Minister to pay to the applicant out of the General Revenue fund the amount of money to which the applicant is entitled,

after which the Minister can seek to recover the money from the operator as a debt to the Crown (section 36(9)).

[23] However, before any of these steps are taken, the *Rules* provide a procedure to ensure that due process has been provided. Decisions and orders finally determining an operator's liability and resulting remedies are not issued until the Tribunal has given the operators an opportunity to respond to the application and conducted a written or in-person hearing.

[24] The Alberta Courts have provided guidance on the object and purpose of section 36 of the *Act* and how the Tribunal's functions under it are to be carried out.

[25] Justice Sirrs in *Devon Canada Corp. v. Surface Rights Board*, 2003 ABQB 7 (CanLII) reflected upon the purpose of section 36:

...the function of section 36(5) and 36(6) appears to me to provide the surface owner with some assurance that if they cooperate with providing the oil industry access to their lands, they need not fear the operator will not pay them.

The sections provide a pragmatic solution whereby the surface owner need only provide that existence of a lease and that rent has not been paid....(Para 29)

[26] Justice Erb in *Provident Energy Ltd. v. Alberta (Surface Rights Board)*, 2004 ABQB 2004 ABQB 650 (CanLII) expanded on Justice Sirrs' comments:

In my opinion, the purpose of Section 36 of the Act is obvious. It is to provide a mechanism by which the surface owner is guaranteed payment of the compensation to which he is entitled whether the compensation has been fixed by an agreement or not. In order to carry out its duties in some sensible fashion, the Board would have to determine whether the lease was valid and whether compensation was payable to any party and by whom. As Sirrs J. held in the Devon case, the application of Section 36 is discretionary and even if a land owner shows sufficient evidence that a lease exists, the Board is not bound to order compensation. If the Board was bound to do so, this would amount to a fettering of its discretion.

[27] The Court of Appeal has described the process undertaken by the Tribunal to determine compensation as intended to be "*an expeditious yet fair method.*" (*Imperial Oil Resources Ltd. v. 826167 Alberta Inc.*, ABCA 131 at Para 16). That same language was used by the Court of Queen's Bench in *Husky Oil Operations v. Scriber*, 2013 ABQB 74 at Para 11.

[28] Thus, considered in the context, object and purpose of section 36 of the *Act* as a whole, the Panel finds that a Notice and Demand for Payment does not reflect a decision of the Tribunal. Rather, in context, the Notice and Demand for Payment could be said to be akin to a commencement document such as a Statement of Claim or Originating Application in a civil court setting.

[29] One can also look to the Tribunal's *Rules* for direction on the proper characterization of a Notice and Demand for Payment. Section 8(2) of the *Act* gives the Tribunal the power to establish its own rules governing practice and procedure. While there is no definition of "decision" or "order" in the *Rules*, there is direction with respect to what constitutes a "hearing" and what "notice" entails.

[30] The *Rules* define “proceeding” in terms of a pre-hearing dispute resolution conference or hearing. “Hearing” is defined as “a hearing by the Board [Tribunal] under the Act or other legislation authorizing the Board to make a decision.” There is a separate definition for “Notice of Hearing” defined as:

...a notice from the Board [Tribunal] stating the date, time and place that the Board [Tribunal] will hold a hearing and giving reasonable particulars of the matter in respect of which the hearing will be held.

[31] Rule 23(2) provides that: “if the Board [Tribunal] is considering an application by way of written submissions, the Board [Tribunal] may issue a notice to the parties”. Subsections (a) through (f) list the requirements for notice. It must:

- a) be in writing;
- b) briefly describe the subject matter of the application;
- c) indicate the date by which a written submission must be filed;
- d) state that the Board [Tribunal] may grant the application or issue a decision if there are no submissions objecting to the application;
- e) indicate that copies of the application and other documents filed in support of the application are available upon request; and
- f) contain any other information that the Board [Tribunal] considers necessary.

[32] The *Rules* also provide direction as to what is required to be included in a decision. Rule 33 specifies that a decision “must be signed on behalf of the panel by a member of that panel”. Decisions also must specify an effective date. Rule 34 requires:

The decision of a panel of the Board [Tribunal] is the official decision of the Board [Tribunal] effective on and after the date the decision is signed, unless otherwise specified by the Board [Tribunal].

[33] Decisions of the Tribunal are also assigned decision numbers.

[34] The Notice and Demand for Payment that was delivered to Ember was not signed by a member, nor did it indicate an effective date or bear a decision number. Under the *Rules*, it bears none of the hallmarks of a “decision” that the Tribunal issues after a hearing; it bears the hallmarks of a notice of hearing that the Tribunal issues prior to a hearing.

[35] Finally, assistance can be found in academic commentary. Sara Blake in her definitive text *Administrative Law in Canada*, 5th Edition, provides this direction:

Before a decision is made, notice must be given to all person who may be affected by it (except in cases of emergency). Failure to give notice will likely be fatal to any decision. **The purpose of notice is to alert persons whose interests may be affected so that they may take steps to protect their interests.** (Page 29-30) [emphasis added]

[36] Ms. Blake also discusses what sorts of actions by a public official would not give rise to judicial review:

Not everything that a public official does is reviewable. A court may decline to review a communication that does not involve the exercise of authority, such as a letter expressing an opinion, **warning the recipient to comply with requirements**, proposing a meeting or refusing a request to do something in the absence of an obligation to do it. (Page 177) [emphasis added]

[37] In this context, the Panel finds that the Notice and Demand for Payment is not a reviewable decision, but rather a notice provided to Ember to alert it that it may need to take steps to protect its interests and warning it of the potential consequences of ignoring the Notice and Demand for Payment.

[38] In summary, the *Act* creates a unique statutory remedy, but one that can only be accessed if certain statutory requirements are met. Given that the purpose of the *Act* is to provide a pragmatic and expeditious process, it would make no sense to characterize notices issued pursuant to those statutory requirements as decisions or orders that would be capable of being reconsidered or reviewed under section 29(1) of the *Act*. It is a panel of the Tribunal that ultimately decides if the claims set out in the application have been proved, and it is the panel's decision and orders in that regard that can be reconsidered or reviewed under section 29(1) of the *Act*.

[39] Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Notice and Demand for Payment in this matter is not a "decision" of the Tribunal and therefore section 29(1) of the *Act* does not apply.

2. *If the Notice and Demand for Payment could be characterized as a "decision" of the Tribunal, is it a final decision or an interim/interlocutory decision and what consequences flow from the characterization?*

[40] If this Panel is mistaken as to the characterization of the Notice and Demand for Payment, then it must determine whether the nature of the "decision" reflected in the Notice and Demand for Payment is one that should be capable of reconsideration.

[41] The authors of Macaulay, Sprague and Sossin's *Practice and Procedure Before Administrative Tribunals* make this observation:

Every time an agency elects to do something (or to do nothing), it has made a decision. Decisions are the things the agency resolves to do, or not to do, to allow or not to allow. Every question before an agency results in a decision, even if that decision is to do nothing. (Page 22-1)

[42] It is therefore arguable that by issuing a Notice and Demand for Payment the Tribunal has decided to do something – it satisfied itself that there was *prima facie* evidence of nonpayment and decided to issue the Notice and Demand for Payment so that the application could proceed. But that is not the end of the analysis. The authors also point out that the courts are loathe to exercise their discretionary power to review what are variously described as interim, interlocutory or preliminary decisions – *i.e.*, decisions that are not finally determinative of the substantive issue in dispute. Examples include the following:

- (1) The Federal Court in *Black v. Canada* (Attorney General), 2013 CarswellNat 3386, and Alberta's Court of Appeal in *689799 Alberta Ltd. v. Edmonton (City)*, 2018 ABCA 212, have used the term "interlocutory" to describe a decision that is not determinative of the substantive issue.
- (2) The Supreme Court of Canada in *Bell Canada v. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission*, 1989 CanLII 67 (SCC), [1989] 1 S.C.R. 1722, described a decision that does not affect the merits of the case as an interim order. That same term was used by the Court of Appeal in *Synchrude Canada Ltd. Alberta (Human Rights and Citizenship*

*Commission*), 2008 ABCA 217, and in *Encana Corporation v. Alberta (Energy & Utilities Board)*, 2004 CarswellAlta.

- (3) In the context of a designated industrial property assessment, Justice Martin in *Canadian Natural Resources Limited v. Wood Buffalo (Regional Municipality)*, 2011 ABQB 220, used the term “preliminary” decision.

[43] But regardless of the nomenclature, the result is the same:

- (1) In *Black*, the Court refused to interfere with a decision by an adjudicative board in determining whether notice had been provided “forthwith”. Interestingly, there was no challenge to the issuance of the notice itself, only its timeliness.
- (2) In 689799 *Alberta Ltd.* the Court of Appeal reviewed the case law and the underlying rationale of the rule. The first consideration is that the court typically gives deference to the administrative decision-maker. The second relates to efficiency, cost, and the preservation of the administrative regime. Dealing specifically with the language in the *Expropriation Act*, which provides for an appeal to the Court of Appeal of “any determination or order” the Court focused on the context in the legislation as “evince[ing] the goal of expedience resolution” that “does not support a legislative intention to provide for multiple appeals.” The Court held that matters such as rulings on undertakings, disclosure of information, and production of financial information should be left to the Tribunal.
- (3) In *Synchrude*, although the Court was dealing with what was clearly characterized as an “order”, the Court did not intervene: “The Act does not contemplate multiple appeals. The legislative scheme must be read to further the goal of speedy and inexpensive resolution of human rights complaints” (Para 13).
- (4) In *Encana* at para. 25 the Court ruled: “...appeals of interim decisions, particularly where the appeal will not resolve any final or significant issues, are generally to be discouraged. In addition to delay, there are many pragmatic reasons not to hear such appeals including added cost, waste of judicial resources and the need to discourage other premature applications” (Para 25).
- (5) In the *Wood Buffalo* case, Justice Martin stated: “The Alberta courts have adopted a strong policy against litigation in installments” (Para 26).

[44] While the above decisions were made in the context of courts being asked to judicially review tribunal decisions, the Panel considers that the courts’ logic applies equally in the context of a request for reconsideration under section 29(1) of the *Act*. If issuance of the Notice and Demand for Payment is a “decision” of the Tribunal, it is a decision of an interlocutory, interim, or preliminary nature, with which the courts are reluctant to interfere. Likewise, when considering whether to review a Tribunal decision or order under section 29 of the *Act*, the Panel is called upon to exercise discretion, as a review is not obligatory.

[45] Although there may in some cases be extenuating circumstances that justify reconsideration of the issuance of a Notice and Demand for Payment, Ember in this case has provided no basis on which this Panel could come to that conclusion. The Panel concludes that if the Notice and Demand for Payment is a “decision”, it is an interim one, and to pursue multiple reviews on matters leading up to the final decision by the Tribunal would not, in the words of Sirrs J., be “pragmatic”, “inexpensive”, or “expeditious”, particularly when the option of reconsideration is discretionary. The Panel therefore declines to exercise its discretion to review the Notice and Demand for Payment.

3. *Has Ember established the basic requirements set out in Rule 37(3) that would allow for reconsideration?*

[46] Finally, if this Panel is mistaken and the Notice and Demand of Payment is a decision or interlocutory decision that it is appropriate to reconsider under the case law cited above, the Panel must still determine whether the *Rules*' basic requirements for re-consideration have been met.

[47] The first requirement under the *Rules* is that the party seeking review of a decision or order deliver an application to the Tribunal. The application must be in writing, and it must contain, among other things, the "decision or order number" for which a review is being sought (Rule 37(2)(a)). Where there is an application form, Rule 14(2) provides that "the application must include a completed form". Ember did not use the Tribunal's prescribed form for reconsideration and its letter application did not reference a decision or order number. It is therefore arguable that Ember's reconsideration application should be dismissed for failure to comply with the *Rules*.

[48] However, setting aside these deficiencies of form, the Panel must decide whether reconsideration is appropriate in the circumstances. Rule 37(3) requires that the Tribunal carry out a two-step process when deciding whether to exercise its discretion to reconsider an order or decision. It states:

The Board [Tribunal] may only decide to review a decision or order if one of the following requirements for review are met:

- (a) the decision or order shows an **obvious and important** error of law or jurisdiction;
- (b) the decision or order shows an **important** error of fact, or an error of mixed fact and law, in the decision or order that affects the decision or order;
- (c) the decision or order was based on a process that was **obviously** unfair or unjust;
- (d) the decision or order is inconsistent with an earlier Board decision or order, binding judicial authority, or provision of the legislation, regulation or rules; or
- (e) there was evidence at the time of the hearing that was not presented because it was unavailable to the party asking for review, and which is likely to make a substantial difference to the outcome of the decision or order. [bold added]

[49] A party seeking reconsideration must first establish the pre-requisites for reconsideration on a balance of probabilities. Only once the Tribunal determines that the pre-requisites have been met does it go on to the next step to determine whether it should exercise its discretion to review the decision in the specific case before it (*Canadian Natural Resources Limited v. Main*, 2020 ABSRB 735).

[50] Ember bases its request for reconsideration because the Tribunal allegedly made an error of fact falling under Rule 37(3)(b) by issuing the Notice and Demand for Payment.

[51] The Panel will address Ember's submissions and consider whether Ember has established the pre-requisites for a reconsideration under section 29 of *Act* and Rule 37(3).

Did the Tribunal make an important error of fact?

[52] The Tribunal is a creature of statute and can only do that which it is empowered to do under the *Act* or other legislation. The *Act* establishes the process, and if the Tribunal follows that process it cannot be said that it has exceeded its jurisdiction.

[53] The process for issuing a Notice and Demand for Payment begins in section 36(3) of the *Act*, which requires that the Tribunal be satisfied that the following questions are answered in the affirmative:

- Is money payable?
- Is there an operator who is required to pay?
- Is that obligation to pay under a surface lease or compensation order?
- Has the money not been paid?
- Has the due date for payment passed?
- Is the Applicant the person entitled to receive the compensation?
- Has there been a written application?

[54] The application form that the applicant is required to complete addresses each of these elements and requires that the applicant acknowledge in writing that it understands that providing false and misleading evidence may result in the Tribunal taking action, including dismissing the claim, rescinding any order awarding compensation, or ordering costs against the applicant.

[55] Once the Tribunal is satisfied that these questions have been answered affirmatively, section 36(4) of the *Act* provides that the Tribunal “shall” send a written notice to the operator demanding full payment. It is difficult therefore to characterize the Notice and Demand for Payment as a “decision” of the Tribunal when the *Act* requires that the Tribunal issue it. As the process by which the Notice and Demand for Payment was sent is prescribed in the legislation it cannot be said that the process is beyond the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

[56] In the following sections, the Panel addresses Ember’s error of fact arguments.

a) Did the Tribunal Make an Error of Fact Prior to Issuing the Notice and Demand for Payment?

[57] Ember submits that the amount owing by Ember under this lease was not owing at the time the Notice was issued. The amount claimed is for a payment allegedly missed before Ember became an operator within the meaning of s.36(1) of the *Act* which states:

“In this section, “operator” means any person who, at the time of non-payment under a surface lease, right of entry order or compensation order, became liable to pay the money in question...”

Ember noted the Surface Lease date is April 24, 2007, the date of alleged non-payment is April 24, 2019, and Ember first acquired interest in the Site on February 21, 2020. The date of non-payment comes before the date Ember required an interest in the Site. Ember argued that it was not an operator at the time of non-payment and, because it is not liable for those payments, it is not the correct respondent in the Application. Ember asserted that the landowner must claim any such amount from the operator at the time of non-payment. The Notice was predicated on a finding that there was money owing by Ember. This represents an error of fact which Ember submits affects the Notice. Therefore, the Notice was made in error and should be rescinded.

[58] As the Panel has previously noted, the Tribunal’s issuance of a Notice and Demand for Payment is a requirement of the *Act* to commence the process set out in section 36 of the *Act*. It takes place after the Tribunal has reviewed the application for completeness and considers that the applicant has shown on a

*prima facie* basis that it has evidence to satisfy each of the pre-requisites to bringing an application in section 36(3) of the *Act*. Section 36(4) of the *Act* does not require that the Tribunal make final and binding findings of fact prior to issuing a Notice and Demand for Payment, and the Tribunal does not do so.

[59] In this respect, the Panel further notes that Ember's assertion that the amount demanded is not the amount that is due to the Landowner because Ember made a gratuitous pro-rated payment to the landowners based on the percentage of the rental year that it had an interest in the Site. Ember submitted it was not legally obliged to pay any rental until the next rental date following its acquisition and interest in the Site. The Notice did not take this payment into account.

[60] Section 36(5) of the *Act* goes on to state what the Tribunal may do by way of subsequent written order served on the operator if it does not comply with the Demand for Payment. These potential remedies are also set out in the Notice and Demand for Payment.

[61] However, between the steps set out in sections 36(4) and 36(5) of the *Act* the Tribunal conducts an in-person or written hearing procedure in accordance with the *Rules*. It is only at this stage that a Panel of the Tribunal weights the applicant and operators' evidence, makes findings of fact, determines the validity of the applicant's claims and issues a decision setting out its findings of fact and issuing orders or authorizing future orders.

[62] The Tribunal has separate processes for issuing decisions, orders and directions, which are set out in sections 36(5), (6) and (7) of the *Act* and Rules 33 to 35, which processes only take place after a hearing has been conducted as described in the preceding paragraph.

[63] The Panel therefore finds that the Notice and Demand for Payment does not need to be based on definitive findings of fact by a Panel of the Tribunal to be validly issued.

[64] For all the reasons set out above, the Panel finds that the Tribunal did not commit an error in fact. As such, the Panel finds that Ember has not established that the basic requirement for review in Rule 37(3)(b) has been met.

[65] The Panel therefore finds that Ember has not established the basic requirements that are necessary before a Panel can exercise its discretion whether to conduct a review under section 29 of the *Act*. As such, the Panel declines to conduct such a review.

Does issuance of a notice under section 36(4) of the *Act* have a significant adverse effect on Ember?

[66] Ember alleges that the Notice and Demand for Payment has an adverse effect on it:

Ember is directly affected by the Notice and the Decision because it is being required to pay money it does not owe.

If Ember does not comply with the demand for payment, in the full amount demanded, Ember will owe an unjust debt to the crown and have its access terminated despite its having complied with its obligations under each lease.

[67] Inclusion of an explanation of how the party seeking a review is adversely affected by the decision or order is a requirement of Rule 37(2)(c). However, for the purposes of deciding whether the Applicant has met the basis requirements to bring an application under Rule 37(3), adverse effect is not a consideration. As the Panel has declined to grant a review of the Notice and Demand for Payment, it is not necessary to address these submissions in detail.

[68] However, if the Panel is wrong and Ember has satisfied the basic requirements in Rule 37(3), the Panel finds that issuance of the Notice and Demand for Payment did not cause any adverse effect on Ember. The Notice and Demand for Payment does not allow for immediate suspension or termination of Ember's rights of access. As described above, after the Tribunal issues a Notice and Demand for Payment the respondents are provided an opportunity to provide evidence and submissions in response, and an in-person or paper hearing is conducted. Only after these steps are taken does the Tribunal issue a decision and orders that may have an adverse effect on a party.

[69] In short, the Notice and Demand for Payment is just the first step in the section 36 application process and does not have any effect on operators *per se*, other than requiring them to defend the claim if they elect to do so.

#### *4. Should the Tribunal Provide Ember a Further Opportunity to Make Submissions?*

[70] While the Panel considered whether to issue a decision solely on Ember's request for reconsideration and provide Ember another opportunity to make submissions on the merits, it decided not to do so for the following reasons:

- Ember specifically asked the Tribunal for an extension to the deadline to make submissions, which was granted. Ember and its counsel had every opportunity to request the application and supporting evidence from the Tribunal and make submissions on the merits within that extended period. They elected not to do so and accepted the risk of not doing so.
- The Application was filed, and the Notice and Demand for Payment was served on Ember in December 2020. Ember requested and was granted an extension to February 21, 2021, to make its submissions – approximately two months. It is now 2024. There is no need to delay the Applicants' receipt of compensation further (if so ordered) by granting Ember an opportunity to make additional submissions that it could and should have made in 2021.

[71] The Panel now turns to consider the merits of the Applicant's claims.

### **The Panel's Findings on the Merits of the Application**

#### **1. Who is an operator for the purpose of section 36 of the *Act*?**

[72] The Tribunal gave notice pursuant to s. 36(4) to Trident and Ember and the Panel is satisfied that the demand for payment and notice meets the requirements of the *Act* pursuant to s. 36(4) and the Interpretation of Section 36(4) *Surface Rights Act* Guideline, ABSRB 2020-1.

[73] Section 36(1) and (2) expands the definition of *operator* so that it has a broader meaning than in the rest of the *Act*.

#### Section 36(1)(c) – Alberta Energy Regulator ("AER") Licence Holder

[74] Under section 36(1)(c) the holder of a licence issued by the AER and its successors, is an Operator. The Licence for the Site is in the name of Ember as of March 26, 2020, therefore, the Panel finds this party is an Operator, as a successor, under section 36(1)(c) for the year 2019.

[75] The Licensee History shown in AER Well Summary Reports dated February 6, 2022, and November 21, 2023, indicates that Trident was the licensee for the Site between January 25, 2012, and March 26, 2020. Therefore, the Panel finds this party is an Operator under section 36(1)(c) for the year 2019.

Section 36(1)(d) – Working Interest Participants

[76] Under s. 36(1)(d) working interest participants and successors are Operators. The Panel finds that Ember is an Operator under section 36(1)(d) for the year 2019 because the AER Well Summary Reports dated February 6, 2022, and November 21, 2023, for the Licence shows it was a working interest participant on the Site as of March 26, 2020.

Section 36(1)(e) – Holder of a surface lease or right of entry order

[77] Under section 36(1)(e) the holder of the surface lease or right of entry order for the Site and its successors, is an Operator. The Panel finds Trident is an Operator for the purpose of section 36(1)(e) on the due date in 2019 because it is the Operator named on the registration on the Certificate of Title for the Site.

2. Is there money past due and unpaid by the Operators to the Applicants under a Right-of-Entry Instrument?

[78] The Certificate of Title confirms the Applicants are the owners, therefore, the Panel finds the Applicants are entitled to receive the money. The Applicants provided evidence of a Right-of-Entry Instrument and the compensation is supported by the Application and supporting documentation. The Applicants declared in writing that the Compensation has not been paid for the year claimed.

[79] The Panel is satisfied that compensation is owed to the Applicants for annual payment due under the Right-of-Entry Instrument. The Panel accepts, based on a balance of probabilities that Ember did make a payment of \$210.41 to the Applicants. The amount is calculated as one payment of \$2,400.00 due for the year 2019 less a payment of \$210.41 for a total amount owing of \$2,189.59. The Site is not reclaimed, and the Right-of-Entry Instrument remains in effect. The Panel finds that at the time the Compensation became due, the Operators are liable for the Compensation due to the Applicants.

3. Should the Tribunal direct the Minister to pay the Applicants any of the money past due from the General Revenue Fund under section 36(6) of the Act?

[80] *Bateman v Alberta (Surface Rights Board)*, 2023 ABKB 640 specified that under s. 36 of the *Act*, the Applicants need only prove there is a Right of Entry Instrument and there is default on the payment, therefore, the Panel directs the Minister to pay the full amount owing. The Panel determined there is a right of entry instrument and money is owing, accordingly the Minister is directed to pay the Applicants \$2,189.59 from the General Revenue Fund.

4. Should the Tribunal suspend and terminate the Operator's rights?

[81] The Tribunal can suspend and terminate an operator's rights to access the Site when appropriate. The Panel reserves its decision to suspend and terminate at this time to avoid delay in payment to the Applicants, however, if the Operator attempts to access the Site but still does not pay compensation, the Tribunal may issue a suspension/termination order.

Dated at the City of Medicine Hat in the Province of Alberta this 13th day of August 2024.

**LAND AND PROPERTY RIGHTS TRIBUNAL**



---

Miles Weatherall, Member