

02 12 26

HEIDI JOY MARFURT,

Applicant,

v.

MINISTÈRE DU REVENU DU QUÉBEC,

Respondent.

THE APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

On May 31, 2002, the applicant requested from the Ministère du Revenu information on her which the public body may have shared or transferred to the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency.

The very same day, May 31, 2002, she made a request for revision to the Commission d'accès à l'information (the "Commission").

THE DECISION

On June 21, 2002, M^e Daniel Bourassa, a lawyer responsible for access to information, wrote to her stating:

The present letter is following your letter dated May 31, 2002, in which you requested, under the *Act respecting the ministère du Revenu* (R.S.Q., c. M-31) and the *Act respecting Access to documents held by public bodies and the protection of personal information* (R.S.Q., c. A-2.1, hereinafter referred to as the "Act respecting Access"), an authorization from ministère du Revenu allowing Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to give you access to the documents related to you that were transferred to theme by our ministry following your letter dated March 6, 2002.

DECISION

We wish to inform you that in regard to the access to the above-mentioned documents, the decision belongs to the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency since they are the one detaining the information. Therefore, for all further request pertaining to that subject please contact Mr. Peter Hull, directeur, Direction de l'information, Agence des douanes et du revenu du Canada, 11^e étage, Tour Albion, 25, rue Nicholas, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0L5. (sic)

Following the ministère du Revenu's response, Ms. Jennifer Stoddart, commissioner and President of the Commission, sent on October 15, 2002, to Ms. Marfurt, a letter asking her to submit her observations.

In a letter dated October 29, 2002, Ms. Marfurt informs the Commission that she still considers the ministère du Revenu has the power to render its decision as required, and not the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency.

Accordingly, in view of the facts revealed in this file, the continued intervention of the Commission would clearly serve no purpose.

CONSEQUENTLY, THE COMMISSION:

DISMISSES the application and **CLOSES** the file.

CHRISTIANE CONSTANT
Commissioner

Montreal, February 3, 2003

M^e Jean Lepage
Attorney of the Respondent