

**AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD ADMINISTRATIVE
MONETARY PENALTIES ACT**

DECISION

In the matter of an application for a review of the facts of a violation of section 40 of the *Health of Animals Regulations*, alleged by the Respondent, and requested by the Applicant pursuant to paragraph 9(2)(c) of the *Agriculture and Agri-Food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act*.

Grozko Stankov, Applicant

-and-

Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Respondent

CHAIRMAN BARTON

Decision

Following a review of the written submissions of the parties including the report of the Respondent, the Tribunal, by order, determines the Applicant committed the violation and is liable for payment of the penalty in the amount of \$200.00 to the Respondent within 30 days after the day on which this decision is served.

REASONS

The Applicant did not request an oral hearing.

The Notice of Violation dated August 8, 2003, alleges that the Applicant, on or about 15:45 hours on the 8th day of August, 2003 at L.B.P. Airport, in the province of Ontario, committed a violation, namely: "Import an animal by product, to wit: meat, without meeting the prescribed requirements" contrary to section 40 of the *Health of Animals Regulations* which states:

40. No person shall import into Canada an animal by-product, manure or a thing containing an animal by-product or manure except in accordance with this Part.

In general, *Part IV* of the *Health of Animals Regulations* permits importation into Canada of most animal by-products, if the country of origin is the United States. If the country of origin is other than the United States, importation into Canada is only permitted (except for certain specified products such as gluestock and bone meal, for which there are other specific requirements) if the importer meets one of the following four prescribed requirements of *Part IV* of the *Health of Animals Regulations*, namely:

1. Under subsection 41(1) if the country of origin has a disease-free designation and the importer produces a certificate signed by an official of the government of the country of origin that shows that the country of origin is the designated country referred to in the disease-free designation.

No such certificate was provided.

2. The importer meets the requirements of subsection 52(1) which provides as follows:

52(1) Notwithstanding anything in this Part, a person may import an animal by-product if the person produces a document that shows the details of the treatment of the animal by-product and the inspector is satisfied, based on the source of the document, the information contained in the document and any other relevant information available to the inspector and, where necessary, on an inspection of the animal by-product, that the importation of the animal by-product into Canada would not, or would not be likely to, result in the introduction into Canada, or the spread within Canada, of a vector, disease or toxic substance.

.../3

No such document was produced.

3. The importer has acquired an import permit pursuant to subsection 52(2).

No such permit was tendered.

4. The importer has presented the animal by-product for inspection and a satisfactory inspection has been carried out under paragraph 41.1(1)(a) which states as follows:

41.1(1) Notwithstanding section 41, a person may import into Canada an animal by-product or a thing containing an animal by-product, other than a thing described in section 4, 46, 47, 47.1, 49, 50, 51, 51.2 or 53, if

(a) an inspector is satisfied on reasonable grounds that the animal by-product is processed in a manner which would prevent the introduction into Canada of any reportable disease or any other serious epizootic disease to which the species that produced the animal by-product is susceptible and which can be transmitted by the animal by-product, provided that the animal by-product or the thing containing the animal by-product is not intended for use as animal food or as an ingredient in animal food.

No inspection of this nature took place.

The pertinent and uncontradicted evidence is that the Applicant imported approximately 8 pounds of salami products with a country of origin of Bulgaria without any certificates or permits for the meat product and no documents pertaining to treatment of the imported salami.

The Applicant cooperated fully with the Respondent's inspector and was unaware that he was committing a violation. Unfortunately for the Applicant, the lack of knowledge of the violation is no defence by reason of subsection 18(1) of the *Agriculture and Agri-Food Administrative Monetary Penalties Act* which states as follows:

.../4

18.(1) A person named in a notice of violation does not have a defence by reason

that the person

(a) exercised due diligence to prevent the violation; or

(b) reasonably and honestly believed in the existence of the facts that, if true, would exonerate the person.

The Applicant alleges the Customs officer had a hostile attitude and treated him harshly during processing through customs. Although sympathetic to the allegations of the Applicant, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction over the conduct of the officer in question, its mandate being restricted to determining whether or not a violation has been committed, and whether the penalty has been properly assessed in accordance with the *Health of Animals Regulations*.

Dated at Ottawa this 6th day of November, 2003.

Thomas S. Barton, Q.C., Chairman