

LRB 203-24

IN THE MATTER OF AN ADJUDICATION  
PUSUANT TO SECTION 2-75 AND 4-6 OF  
*THE SASKATCHEWAN EMPLOYMENT ACT*



**Appellants:**

Meadow Lake Co-operative Association Ltd.

AND

**Respondent:**

Rhonda Paramzchuk and The Director of Employment Standards

Date of Adjudication:

April 14, 2025

Date of Decision:

May 8, 2025

1. On October 18, 2024, Wage Assessment # 1-000879 was issued on behalf of the Director of Employment Standards. The Wage Assessment was issued to the Meadow Lake Co-operative Association Limited [the 'appellant' or the 'Co-op'].
2. The Wage Assessment directed the appellant to pay \$8,177.72 to former employee Rhonda Paramzchuk [the 'employee' or 'Ms. Paramzchuk'].
3. The appellant appealed the Wage Assessment. Robert Frost-Hinz represented the appellant at the appeal hearing. Wade Schmidt was the Director's designate and represented the Director. He did not represent the employee, Rhonda Paramzchuk. Ms. Paramzchuk was present throughout the hearing and represented herself. At the start of the hearing, the parties agreed that the appeal was properly constituted and within the permissible time limit. I reviewed the materials filed and agree that this is correct.
4. Mr. Frost-Hines agreed that there was only one issue in dispute with respect to the Wage Assessment. That issue is just cause for termination of Ms. Paramzchuk's employment. The Co-op says Ms. Paramzchuk's employment was terminated for cause and so no notice or pay in lieu of notice is required as a result of the termination. In all other respects the Co-op accepts the Wage Assessment. The Director and Ms. Paramzchuk take the position that the Co-op did not have just cause to terminate Ms. Paramzchuk's employment. The Director and Ms. Paramzchuk take the position that just cause was not present, and since no notice was provided, Ms. Paramzchuk is owed payment in lieu of notice which based on her rate of pay and length of service totals \$8,177.72. Again, the rate of pay and length of service are not in dispute.
5. Four witnesses testified at the hearing. They were the Co-op's Human Resources Manager Precious Boye, the Co-op's Operations Manager Ron Dishko and the Co-op's Office Manager Precious Boyle
6. Mr. Schmidt filed an 8 tab 52 page electronic document, which I marked as Exhibit EE-1. Mr. Frost-Hinz filed a 29 tab, 293 page electronic document which I marked as Exhibit ER-1.
7. Most of the testimony given at the hearing was consistent. Rather than summarize the testimony of each witness separately, I shall summarize the

testimony as a whole, pointing out where there was inconsistent testimony and indication what I find the facts to be.

8. The Co-op has seven different locations where it sells a variety of goods, including petroleum.

9. Ms. Paramzchuk began her employment at the Co-op in 2009. She was offered the "Credit, Collections & BRIC clerk" position in a letter dated September 13, 2019. She accepted the position. The letter is in ER-1 Tab 1. 'BRIC' stands for 'Bulk Records Inventory Control'.

10. Federated Co-op Ltd. ('FCL') would provide the Co-op with recommended petroleum prices two times per week. This information was received every Tuesday, with prices to be effective Wednesday morning and every Friday with prices to be effective Saturday morning.

11. Once this information was received someone at the Co-op, usually the BRIC clerk, had to enter the information into a spreadsheet where the margins on the petroleum were set. The employee would have to then take additional steps entering information into the Co-op's system. Data would then be downloaded to memory sticks, and the memory sticks would be given to Co-op truck drivers. These steps were time sensitive, as the price adjustments were to be made on a specified schedule.

12. Ms. Paramzchuk was the Co-op's BRIC clerk, and so generally she would perform the BRIC procedures. She developed a handwritten instruction guide on how to perform the BRIC procedures at the Co-op.

13. Mr. Dishko testified that when Ms. Paramzchuk was not at work, he would perform the BRIC procedures. There is an FCL BRIC procedure document, which Mr. Dishko described as a "generic how-to document". Ms. Paramzchuk's testimony suggested FCL document was sufficient for an employee to use to follow the BRIC procedures. Mr. Dishko testified that even though he is the Operations Manager, and had been the Petroleum manager, he would not perform the BRIC procedures off the top of his head. Instead, he would use the step by step guide written by Ms. Paramzchuk, which she called a "job aid". Mr. Dishko said the procedures were not particularly hard, but given the various account types and other variables, it would be easy to miss a step if one did not follow guiding notes written by Ms.

Paramzchuk. Where Ms. Paramzchuk's evidence varies from Mr. Dishko's evidence, I accept Mr. Dishko's evidence. Mr. Dishko provided his evidence in an unbiased manner, and I found him to be to honest and straight forward witness.

14. Ms. Paramzchuk had a pre-existing medical condition which required some accommodation by the Co-op. The Co-op says it provided the required accommodation. Ms. Paramzchuk did not dispute this.

15. Ms. Paramzchuk was very familiar with the BRIC procedures. In her own words, she 'trained' the last three Petroleum managers. As mentioned earlier, she also wrote out a document which was a step by step guide describing how to implement the BRIC procedures at this particular Co-op. Ms. Paramzchuk applied for the Petroleum Manager position in late October 2023, but was not the successful candidate.

16. Ms. Paramzchuk testified that on November 2, 2023 she was at work in the morning. She had learned the previous week that she did not get the Petroleum Manager position. She said she knew that she would be training the successful candidate. She testified that she knew some procedures had changed since she created the document she referred to as a 'job aid' or 'cheat sheet'. She testified that she was going to take all the information from that document and re-write it, so that it was up to date, so she shredded the documents without taking any photos of them. She testified that no one instructed her to destroy the documents. After she shredded the document she said she worked a couple of hours, cleaned out her desk and left to go to a medical office to get a doctor's note in relation to being off work.

17. Ms. Paramzchuk then left work on November 2, 2023 and did not return. She provided the Co-op with a note from a medical practitioner indicating she would be off work for medical reasons from November 2, 2023 to December 4, 2023. A copy of the note is at tab 8 of ER-1. Ms. Paramzchuk never returned to work at the Co-op.

17. In Ms. Paramzchuk's absence, Mr. Dishko went to locate the step by step guide which had been written by Ms. Paramzchuk, but as he said, "it was gone". He contacted the person responsible for asset protection at the Co-op.

18. The Co-op says it has a video showing Ms. Paramzchuk shredding the step by step guide. The video was not entered into evidence, but it was not required. Ms.

Paramzchuk admits that she shredded the document of her own volition without taking any photos of it.

19. On May 3, 2024 Ms. Paramzchuk attended a meeting with Ms. Boye Mr. Dishko, Ms. Voth and a person named Dustin Calvert. Mr. Calvert did not testify. Ms. Boye testified Ms. Paramzchuk was upset during this meeting. Ms. Voth took notes of this meeting, which are contained at tab 22 of ER-1. I found Ms. Voth to be a trustworthy witness, and I find the notes to be an accurate summary of what happened at the meeting.

21. At the May 3 meeting Ms. Paramzchuk told the others that she had taken photos of the document before shredding it and emailed those photos to her work email. She said that she shredded the document because she was going to update it, so that she could better train the new petroleum manager. Ms. Voth said at the meeting that she would check Ms. Paramzchuk's work computer and email to locate the photos of the document.

20. I give Ms. Boye's testimony, Mr. Dishko's testimony and Ms. Voth's testimony significant weight. I found each to be honest and straight forward in their testimony, and I believe their accounts to be truthful.

22. I do not accept Ms. Paramzchuk's account with respect to why she shredded the document. With all due respect to her, the account simply does not make sense. If she was going to update the document, it makes no sense to shred the only copy prior to updating it. I find on a balance of probabilities that Ms. Paramzchuk willfully destroyed the document so that others could not use it while she was on leave. I find that it is much more likely than not that having been caught on video shredding the document, Ms. Paramzchuk then tried to construct an innocent explanation for why she destroyed the document.

23. Tabs 25 and 26 of Exhibit ER-1 relate to the apparent deletion of hundreds of emails from Ms. Paramzchuk's work email account. The Co-op alleges that Ms. Paramzchuk deleted these emails. Ms. Paramzchuk says she has no idea how the emails were deleted, but that she did not delete them.

24. Ms. Paramzchuk testified that she did not share access to her work email account. Ms. Voth testified that following the May 3 meeting when she asked Ms. Paramzchuk for her password so that she could access Ms. Paramzchuk's work

email, Ms. Paramzchuk gave her an incorrect password. By the time Ms. Voth gained access to Ms. Paramzchuk's work email only six emails remained on that account. Meadow Lake Co-op's email system is operated by FCL.

25. Ms. Voth reached out to FCL information technology staff and asked when the emails had been deleted from Ms. Paramzchuk's work email account. FCL ran an audit report, and provided the raw data which is located at tab 25 of ER-1. Ms. Voth then created a spreadsheet from this raw data. It is located at tab 26 of ER-1.

26. The data show that no emails were deleted from the account between September 1, 2023 and November 20, 2023. The data also show that hundreds of emails were deleted April 8 in a one hour period beginning at beginning at 4:30. The operation 'MoveToDeletedItems' indicates that the email was moved to the trash. The operation 'SoftDelete' indicates the trash was emptied. The 'Appid' column indicates that the emails were deleted by a device with the corresponding Apple ID. The Co-op does not use Apple devices and so the deletions must have occurred when someone signed in to the Co-op system from an outside location. Ms. Paramzchuk uses an iPhone which of course is an Apple device. I do not know what the Apple ID of Ms. Paramzchuk's device is.

27. Ms. Paramzchuk questioned how some of the emails in question could reference e-transfers, as she was not able to accept e-transfers on her work phone. The simple explanation given by Ms. Voth is that the emails were simply a notification of an e-transfer. There was no suggestion that Ms. Paramzchuk was accepting e-transfers.

28. Ms. Paramzchuk gave no explanation of how the emails were deleted at the dates indicated. She confirmed that she did have access to her work email while she was on leave. She testified that she deleted work emails as soon as she was done working with the email, so she would never have had hundreds of emails on her work computer. This is contrary to the evidence in the FCL audit report. I conclude that the FCL audit report is correct, and that Ms. Paramzchuk is not being truthful when she says she never had hundreds of emails on her computer when she went on leave or at any other time. I also conclude that Ms. Paramzchuk is not being truthful when she says she did not delete the emails while on leave.

29. Although Ms. Paramzchuk says she did not delete hundreds of emails while on leave, the fact remains the emails were deleted remotely, and Ms. Paramzchuk was the only person with access to her password protected email account. Ms. Voth did

not gain access to the email account until after the emails in question had been deleted. I conclude that the evidence establishes on a balance of probabilities that Ms. Paramzchuk deleted the work emails on the dates indicated in the audit report.

30. I conclude that Ms. Paramzchuk was untruthful in the May 3 meeting when she told the Co-op managers that she had emailed photos of the shredded document to her work email, and in her testimony when she testified that she did not say that she had emailed the photos of the step by step guide to herself. I conclude that Ms. Paramzchuk did tell the Co-op managers that she emailed photos of the step by step guide to herself in order to cover up the fact that she had destroyed the only copy of the guide.

31. This is not a case of progressive discipline. The Co-op alleges just cause for the dismissal. The onus is on the employer to establish on a balance of probabilities that it had just cause to end the employment relationship. [*Swidovich v Saskatchewan Place Assn. Inc.*, 2019 SKQB 50 at para 119, [2019] 8 WWR 320] If the employer had just cause to end the employment relationship, no pay in lieu of notice pursuant to *The Saskatchewan Employment Act* sections 2-60 and 2-61 is required.

32. The employer solely relies on the incidents of Ms. Paramzchuk shredding the step by step guide document and deleting hundreds of emails from her work account as constituting just cause. Importantly this includes Ms. Paramzchuk's behaviour, including being dishonest about her rationale for shredding the document, about sending photos of the document to her work email, about deleting hundreds of work emails after she was on leave and otherwise dishonestly covering up her actions. The Co-op says these actions destroyed the trust inherent in the employer-employee relationship and thus constitute just cause.

33. The Supreme Court of Canada, in *McKinley v. BC Tel* 2001 SCC 38 at paragraph 449 stated the test for determining whether a single act of dishonesty by an employee establishes just cause. It is:

*(1) whether the evidence established the employee's deceitful conduct on a balance of probabilities; and*

*(2) if so, whether the nature and degree of the dishonesty warranted dismissal.*

34. Just cause is defined by the common law, not legislation. Thus, there are many statements defining it. The appellant provides one from Saunders J. of the BCSC in *Leung v Doppler Industries Inc.* (1995), 10 CCEL (2d) 147 at paragraph 26:

*Just cause is conduct on the part of the employee incompatible with his or her duties, conduct which goes to the root of the contract with the result that the employment relationship is too fractured to expect the employer to provide a second chance.*

35. The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *Balzer v. Federated Co-operatives Ltd.* 2014 SKQB 32 at para 59, 437 Sask R 10, aff'd 2018 SKCA 93, [2019] 1 WWR 411 quoted the Ontario Court of Appeal's summary of the *McKinley* analysis of just cause. The appellant's Brief of Law provides a helpful excerpt of this decision at paragraph 32.

*32. A more recent consideration of the McKinley approach is found in Balzer v Federated Cooperatives Ltd. In the trial judgment in that case, Laing J. referenced the McKinley analysis and adopted a summary of it written by the Ontario Court of Appeal:*

*[59] With respect to the concept of "just cause", the Supreme Court of Canada in McKinley v. BC Tel, 2001 SCC 38, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 161 (S.C.C.), explained that one must use a contextual analysis, along with the principle of proportionality, to determine whether just cause exists. This case was summarized in the Ontario Court of Appeal in Dowling v. Ontario (Workplace Safety & Insurance Board) (2004), 246 D.L.R. (4th) 65, 192 O.A.C. 126 (Ont. C.A.), at paragraphs 49 and 50:*

*[49] Following McKinley [2001 SCC 38, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 161], it can be seen that the core question for determination is whether an employee has engaged in misconduct that is incompatible with the fundamental terms of the employment relationship. The rationale for the standard is that the sanction imposed for misconduct is to be proportional—dismissal is warranted when the misconduct is sufficiently serious that it strikes at the heart of the employment relationship. This is a factual inquiry to be determined by a contextual examination of the nature and circumstances*

*of the misconduct.*

*[50] Application of the standard consists of:*

- 1. determining the nature and extent of the misconduct;*
- 2. considering the surrounding circumstances; and,*
- 3. deciding whether dismissal is warranted (i.e. whether dismissal is a proportional response).*

*[51] The first step is largely self-explanatory but it bears noting that an employer is entitled to rely on after discovered wrongdoing, so long as the later discovered acts occurred pre-termination. See Lake Ontario Portland Cement Co. v. Groner, [1961] S.C.R. 553.*

*[52] The second step, in my view, is intended to be a consideration of the employee within the employment relationship. Thus, the particular circumstances of both the employee and the employer must be considered. In relation to the employee, one would consider factors such as age, employment history, seniority, role and responsibilities. In relation to the employer, one would consider such things as the type of business or activity in which the employer is engaged, any relevant employer policies or practices, the employee's position within the organization, and the degree of trust reposed in the employee.*

*[53] The third step is an assessment of whether the misconduct is reconcilable with sustaining the employment relationship. This requires a consideration of the proved dishonest acts, within the employment context, to determine whether the misconduct is sufficiently serious that it would give rise to a breakdown in the employment relationship.*

36. The first step in applying the McKinley standard is determining the nature and extent of the misconduct. I have laid out the nature and extent of the misconduct in detail above. To briefly summarize, the conduct consists of Ms. Paramzchuk shredding a document which was the property of the Co-op, which was used to assist individuals in taking the biweekly steps necessary to make petroleum price adjustments when the same were recommended by FCL, deleting hundreds of work

emails while on leave, and being untruthful with Co-op management about whether she did these actions.

37. The second step in applying the McKinley standard is considering the surrounding circumstances. I have previously mentioned some of those surrounding circumstances. Ms. Paramzchuk had a medical condition which required accommodation. The Co-op established that she had been provided with several accommodations, and there was no evidence presented that the accommodations present were lacking in any way. Similarly there was no evidence presented that there was any direct connection between the reasons for the accommodations or the accommodations themselves and the actions alleged to constitute just cause.

38. Ms. Paramzchuk said she was dissatisfied with how Co-op managers had answered some questions involving a Workers' Compensation Board ('WCB') disability claim she had made. Ms. Paramzchuk questioned why the Co-op completed the WCB forms the way they did. Ms. Boye testified that the documents had been correctly completed, and no evidence was presented to contradict her testimony. I also point out that Ms. Paramzchuk herself disclosed in her closing argument that she had begun a human rights complaint against the Co-op. I make no comment about these claims themselves. I simply point out that the surrounding circumstances in which the misconduct occurred included several conflicts between Ms. Paramzchuk and the Co-op: the dispute over the shredding of the document; the dispute over the deletion of hundreds of emails; the dispute over Ms. Paramzchuk's honesty as well as a dispute over information related to information provided to WCB and a human rights dispute.

39. Ms. Paramzchuk is an employee who had not been previously disciplined. She began working for the Co-op in June 2009 as a clerk. She served in the 'Credit Collections and BRIC' position beginning in 2019. She had very specific skills and knowledge with respect to petroleum sales, including how to complete the required processes when FCL recommended petroleum price changes. FCL made its recommendations two times per week. Ms. Paramzchuk had specialized knowledge and skills in this respect. She testified that she trained the last three petroleum managers how to complete these processes. She wrote the only step by step guide how to complete these processes, save for a 'generic' FCL document.

40. The Co-op is a retail co-operative which has seven locations. It sells a variety of products including petroleum products. The Co-op's job description for the 'Credit Collections and BRIC' position (tab 2 of ER-1) indicates that the position is responsible for maintaining credit files, updating accounts receivable information for board members, maintaining credit files, account reconciliation, making collections phone calls, maintaining write off lists, pricing, cardlock cards, data entry, reconciliations and so forth.

41. The third step in applying the McKinley standard is to decide whether dismissal is warranted, that is whether dismissal is a proportionate response to the misconduct. Dismissal is warranted only in cases where the misconduct is so serious that it 'strikes at the heart of the employment relationship'.

42. Ms. Paramzchuk occupied a critical role within the Co-op's retail organization. Ms. Paramzchuk applied for and did not get a promotion to the petroleum manager position. Shortly after she learned she did not get the position, and hours before she went to see a doctor to obtain a note to begin medical leave, Ms. Paramzchuk shredded the only copy of a step by step guide which explained how to complete the processes involved with making petroleum price changes. That document was Co-op property.

43. By destroying the only copy of what I find to be an important document to assist employees in setting prices for a retail operation, Ms. Paramzchuk engaged in misconduct that was incompatible with the fundamental terms of the employment relationship. This *may* be the type of action which, by itself, could damage the trust an employer has in an employee to the point where just cause has been established. However, I do not have to decide if this is the case, because there was more employee misconduct. Ms. Paramzchuk then falsely told Co-op managers that she had taken photos of the document and emailed those photos to her work email. Now on leave, she then deleted hundreds of emails from her work email account. She was also untruthful about this last action.

44. I conclude that Ms. Paramzchuk's actions are sufficiently serious as to make the employment relationship irreconcilable. Just before Ms. Paramzchuk went on leave, and shortly after she did not receive a promotion she wanted, Ms. Paramzchuk destroyed the one critical document detailing how to implement critical processes. She was the employee most proficient with those processes, and she knew this was

critical information the incoming Petroleum Manager needed. She made a choice to destroy it.

45. While on leave, and before a meeting she was to attend with management, Ms. Paramzchuk deleted hundreds of emails from her work email account. This, like shredding the document just before her leave started, seems to be an attempt to inflict as much harm on the Co-op as she was able to. These actions, and her untruthful explanations, in my view provide just cause for termination of her employment.

46. Ms. Paramzchuk in her evidence and particularly in her closing argument explains how much a finding of just cause will cost her. She has a serious medical condition and I have no doubt that the conclusion that the Co-op had just cause to terminate her employment will have very serious and unfortunate effects on her. Unfortunately, I can only consider whether the Co-op established just cause for her termination. As I understand the law and the evidence presented at the hearing, just cause is clearly established. I would be acting improperly if I avoided this conclusion because its effects will be harsh.

#### Decision

47. The appeal is allowed and Wage Assessment # 1-000879 is hereby declared void.

Dated at the City of Saskatoon, in the Province of Saskatchewan this 8<sup>th</sup> of May, 2025.



Doug Surtees  
Adjudicator

**The Parties are notified of their right to appeal this decision pursuant to Sections 4-8, 4-9 and 4-10 of *The Saskatchewan Employment Act* (the 'Act').**

**The information below has been modified and is applicable only to Part II and Part IV of the *Act*. To view the entire sections of the legislation, the Act can be viewed at [www.saskatchewan.ca](http://www.saskatchewan.ca)**

### **Right to appeal adjudicator's decision to board**

**4-8(1)** An employer, employee or corporate director who is directly affected by a decision of an Adjudicator on an appeal or hearing pursuant to Part II may appeal the decision to the board on a question of law.

(2) A person who is directly affected by a decision of an Adjudicator on an appeal pursuant to Part III may appeal the decision to the board on a question of law.

(3) A person who intends to appeal pursuant to this section shall:

(a) file a notice of appeal with the board within 15 business days after the date of service of the decision of the adjudicator; and

(b) serve the notice of appeal on all persons mentioned in clause 4-4(1)(b) who received the notice setting the appeal or hearing.

(4) The record of an appeal is to consist of the following:

(a) in the case of an appeal or hearing pursuant to Part II, the wage assessment or the notice of hearing;

(b) in the case of an appeal pursuant to Part III, any written decision of an occupational health officer or the director of occupational health and safety respecting the matter that is the subject of the appeal;

(c) the notice of appeal filed with the director of employment standards pursuant to Part II or with the director of occupational health and safety pursuant to Part III, as the case may be;

(d) any exhibits filed before the Adjudicator

(e) the written decision of the adjudicator;

(f) the notice of appeal to the board;

(g) any other material that the board may require to properly consider the appeal.

(5) The commencement of an appeal pursuant to this section does not stay the effect of the decision or order being appealed unless the board orders otherwise.

(6) The board may:

(a) affirm, amend or cancel the decision or order of the adjudicator; or

(b) remit the matter back to the Adjudicator for amendment of the adjudicator's of the adjudicator's decision or order with any directions that the board considers appropriate.

### **Appeal to Court of Appeal**

**4-9(1)** With leave of a judge of the Court of Appeal, an appeal may be made to the Court of Appeal from a decision of the board pursuant to section 4-8 on a question of law.

(2) A person, including the director of employment standards or the director of occupational health and safety, intending to make an appeal to the Court of Appeal shall apply for leave to appeal within 15 business days after the date of service of the decision of the board.

(3) Unless a judge of the Court of Appeal orders otherwise, an appeal to the Court of Appeal does not stay the effect of the decision being appealed.

### **Right of director to appeal**

**4-10** The director of employment standards and the director of occupational health and safety have the right:

(1)(a) to appear and make representations on:

(i) any appeal or hearing heard by an adjudicator; and

(ii) any appeal of an adjudicator's decision before the board or the Court of Appeal; and

(b) to appeal any decision of an Adjudicator on a question of law or a question of mixed law and fact; and

(c) to appeal any decision of the board on a question of law.

(2) If the director of employment standards or director of occupational health and safety intends to appeal to the board pursuant to this section, that director shall:

(a) file a notice of appeal with the board within 30 business days after the date of service of the decision of the adjudicator; and (b) serve the notice of appeal on all parties to the appeal.

(3) The record of an appeal is to consist of the following:

(a) in the case of an appeal or hearing pursuant to Part II, the wage assessment or the notice of hearing;

(b) in the case of an appeal pursuant to Part III, any written decision of an occupational health officer or the director of occupational health and safety respecting the matter that is the subject of the appeal;

(c) in the case of an appeal pursuant to Part V, any written decision of a radiation health officer or the director of occupational health and safety respecting the matter that is the subject of the appeal;

(d) the notice of appeal filed with the director of employment standards pursuant to Part II or with the director of occupational health and safety pursuant to Part III or V, as the case may be;

(e) any exhibits filed before the adjudicator;

(f) the written decision of the adjudicator;

(g) the notice of appeal to the board;

(h) any other material that the board may require to properly consider the appeal.

(4) The commencement of an appeal to the board does not stay the effect of the decision or order being appealed unless the board orders otherwise.

(5) On an appeal, the board may:

(a) affirm, amend or cancel the decision or order of the adjudicator; or

(b) remit the matter back to the adjudicator for amendment of the adjudicator's decision or order with any directions that the board considers appropriate.

LRB 203-24

IN THE MATTER OF AN ADJUDICATION  
PUSUANT TO SECTION 2-75 AND 4-6 OF  
*THE SASKATCHEWAN EMPLOYMENT ACT*



Between

Meadow Lake Co-operative Association Ltd. (Appellants)

AND

Rhonda Paramzchuk and The Director of Employment Standards  
(Respondents)

**EXHIBIT LIST**

EE-1

An 8 tab, 52 page electronic document

ER-1

A 29 tab, 293 page electronic document