

Expanding the Meaning of Employer/Employee Relationships in the "Modern Workplace"

November 01, 2016

In *TCF Ventures Corporation v. The Cambie*, 2016 BCSC 1521, the Supreme Court of British Columbia had to determine whether a unique contractual relationship between two corporations constituted an employer/employee relationship.

In April 2009, the plaintiff (through his personal corporation) began working for the defendant company as its CFO. During that time, his responsibilities and remuneration changed several times. At one point, he also took on a fundraising role where he received a commission of 4% of all capital that he raised towards the defendant's expansion ventures. Further adding to the unclear nature of the relationship between the parties, in September 2012, the plaintiff took on a consulting contract with a third-party client. By the end of October 2012, the relationship between the plaintiff and the defendant had deteriorated. The defendant terminated the contract and the plaintiff brought an action against the defendant alleging wrongful dismissal.

There were two main issues before the court. The first was whether the relationship between the plaintiff and defendant was one akin to an employer/employee relationship. The second was what notice, if any, the plaintiff was entitled to receive as a result of being terminated without cause.

The court acknowledged that there were "material differences" between the relationship between these parties and what one might characterize as a "traditional" employment relationship. For example, the plaintiff's role changed several times, there was no formal employment agreement between the parties, and the plaintiff took outside work from a third party while he was working with the defendant. The court noted, however, that employment law has evolved in order to recognize the "realities of the modern workplace." In the modern workplace, parties can come to a variety of different working arrangements, and the relationship between workers and those to whom they provide their services are "not simply binary." In other words, it is becoming increasingly difficult to define these types of relationships as either employer/employee relationships or that between a company and an independent contractor.

In determining whether the plaintiff was an employee, the court applied the non-exhaustive list of factors from the B.C. Court of Appeal decision of *Marbry Distributors Ltd. v. Avreca Int. Inc.*, which included the duration and permanency of the relationship;

the degree of reliance and closeness of the relationship; and the degree of exclusivity. The court held that, despite the fact that the provision of services was through a corporation and that there was a lack of complete exclusivity, the nature of the relationship was akin to that of an employer/employee situation as opposed to purely independent.

Having determined that the plaintiff was an employee, the court then had to determine the amount of notice that he was entitled to receive from the defendant. The court determined that the appropriate amount of notice was nine months. When applied to the plaintiff's salary at the time of his termination (\$75,000) and his commission, the total notice amounted to \$131,250. However, the court deducted the plaintiff's earnings from his outside consulting job, reducing the total damage award to \$107,893.33.

This decision is significant for two reasons. First, it highlights the risks companies face when characterizing a relationship as a contractual relationship when it is, in fact, more akin to an employment relationship. Second, it emphasizes that significant awards of reasonable notice can be given to short-term employees.

By

[Allison Jaquish](#)

Expertise

[Labour & Employment](#)

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2025 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.