

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE  
ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009*,  
(the “Act”) and Ontario Regulation 97/13 (Professional Misconduct) thereunder;

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** a discipline proceeding against  
Luciano Pannunzio, a member of the Ontario College of Trades.

PANEL: Sherry Darvish, Chair  
John Borlase  
Vish Jadunauth

BETWEEN: )  
)  
) Louis Strezos,  
) College Counsel  
) Ontario College of Trades  
**ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES** )  
)  
)  
-and- )  
) Andrew Bradie,  
) Member’s Counsel  
)  
**LUCIANO PANNUNZIO** )  
(Member #13106333) )  
)  
) Rebecca Durcan,  
) Independent Legal Counsel  
)  
) Heard: August 16, 2018

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

1. A hearing of this matter took place before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the “Panel”) pursuant to section 46(1) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009* (the “Act”) on August 16, 2018 at Victory Verbatim, Court Reporting Services, 222 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario.
2. A *Notice of Hearing* issued November 10, 2017 was served on Luciano Pannunzio (the “Member”) and a first appearance in this matter took place by teleconference on December 14, 2017; Pre-Hearing Conferences were held on February 16, 2018, March 1, 2018, March 29, 2018, May 28, 2018 and June 28, 2018; and the

hearing of this matter on its merits was subsequently scheduled for August 19, 2018.

## THE ALLEGATIONS

1. Mr. Strezos on behalf of the College, by way of a Notice of Motion marked as Exhibit 1, submitted that that the College intended to withdraw allegations (e) and (f) in the *Notice of Hearing* and requested the Panel's permission to withdraw those allegations. Permission to withdraw allegations (e) and (f) was granted by the Panel.

Allegations (a), (b), (c) and (d) in the *Notice of Hearing*, along with particulars, were as follows:

**"IT IS ALLEGED** that Luciano Pannunzio has engaged in professional misconduct as defined in subsection 46(2) of the *Act* and/or Ontario Regulation 97/13 made under the *Act* in that he:

- a) engaged in conduct that contravenes the *Act*, the regulations or the by-laws (the *Act*, paragraph 46(2)(a)), including but not limited to: (i) holding himself out to a client as able to install a commercial air-conditioning unit (the "Unit") when he was not qualified to do so and without holding a Certificate of Qualification ("C of Q") in the compulsory trade of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (trade code 313A); (ii) installing the Unit outside the scope of practice ("SoP") of his C of Q in the compulsory trade of Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (trade code 313D); and (iii) employing and directing an individual to diagnose and repair the Unit when the individual did not hold the required C of Q for the 313A compulsory trade;
- b) failed to take reasonable steps to safeguard the life, health or property of a person who may be affected by the work of the member and of any person for whom he is responsible, when he knew or ought to have known that there was a risk to life, health or property (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(1));
- c) undertook work that the member knew or ought to have known he was not competent to perform by virtue of his certification, training and experience and that his employee was not competent to perform by virtue of his certification, training and experience (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(3)); and
- d) was found guilty of contravening laws, the contravention of which is relevant to his suitability to hold a C of Q (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(9));

**PARTICULARS OF THE ALLEGATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:**

**I. BACKGROUND**

2. Luciano Pannunzio, Membership No. 13244626, (the “Member”) is a member of the Ontario College of Trades (the “College”). On June 23, 2015, an employee of the Member, Mr. Ryan Schauer, was directed by the Member to diagnose and repair a commercial air-conditioning unit. Mr. Schauer was killed while doing so. He was found the next morning, June 24, 2015, near the heating, ventilation and air conditioning (“HVAC”) unit. The cause of his death was found to be electrocution.

**(A) THE MEMBER**

3. At all material times, the Member held C of Qs, Journeyperson class, in the compulsory trades of Sheet Metal Worker (308A) and Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313D).
4. The Member never held any licence, C of Q or valid registered trade agreement (“RTA”) in the compulsory trade of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313A).
5. The Member applied for his Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313D) C of Q in April 2013. As part of that application, he self-certified, in a document titled “Affirmation of Skills for Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic - Branch 2” that he had read and possessed all the mandatory skill sets required for working on *residential* air conditioners as a Journeyperson. The self-certification process did not relate to the installation, repair or maintenance of commercial air-conditioning units.
6. At all material times, the Member carried on business as Pannunzio Mechanical, the registered business name of the Member’s sole proprietorship (the “Business”). The Business specializes in the installation and servicing of HVAC equipment for residential *and* commercial customers. The Business, based in Wheatley, Ontario, was registered in 2011; and has been in actual operation since 2012.
7. At the material times, the Member’s Business operated with two employees, plus the Member.

**(B) MR. SCHAUER – EMPLOYEE OF THE MEMBER’S BUSINESS**

8. At all material times, Mr. Schauer held C of Qs, Journeyperson class, in the trades of Sheet Metal Worker (308A), and Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313D). Mr. Schauer never held any licence, C of Q or valid RTA in the compulsory trade of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313A).

## **II. INSTALLATION OF COMMERCIAL HVAC UNIT FOR NEW-TEC TOOLS LTD.**

9. Between February 9-27, 2015, the Member, on behalf of his Business, sold and installed an HVAC unit, serial number #5614M06887 (the "Commercial HVAC Unit") for client New-Tec Tools Ltd. ("New-Tec"). The Commercial HVAC Unit was installed by the Member on the rooftop of a building located at 5345 Brendan Lane in Oldcastle, Ontario, used by New-Tec as a machine shop and as commercial space.
10. The Commercial HVAC Unit is a combination heating-cooling unit supplied with electricity of 600 volts AC fused at 20 amperes, fed from an electrical disconnect inside the New-Tec building.
11. Neither the Member nor Mr. Schauer held a Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic (313A) C of Q or RTA in respect of the installation, maintenance and servicing of the Commercial HVAC Unit.
12. At the time of the initial installation of the Commercial HVAC Unit, the Member, as the contractor and installer, did not apply for an electrical inspection as required by the *Electrical Safety Code*, being Regulation 164/99 under the *Electricity Act* ("Electrical Safety Code").

### **(A) SERVICING OF COMMERCIAL HVAC UNIT BY THE MEMBER'S UNCERTIFIED EMPLOYEE AND RESULTING FATALITY**

13. On June 23, 2015, Mr. Ryan Schauer was an individual employed by the Member's Business as a servicer and installer of HVAC units. At that time, Mr. Schauer had been so employed by the Business for one year and seven months.
14. Throughout his employment with the Business and, more specifically, at the material times, Mr. Schauer was acting on the instructions of the Member, who was his direct supervisor.
15. Upon employing Mr. Schauer, the Member was aware that the employee had never commenced or

completed an apprenticeship in the Residential Air Conditioning Systems Mechanic trade (313D).

16. In or about early June 2015, the Member received a service call from New-Tec in regards to the improper functioning of the cooling function of the Commercial HVAC Unit. At that time, the Member performed himself an initial diagnosis of the unit.
17. On June 23, 2015, the Member instructed Mr. Schauer to attend the New-Tec location, in order to further diagnose and then repair the cooling function of the Commercial HVAC Unit.
18. On that day, Mr. Schauer arrived at New-Tec at approximately 12:30 p.m. After accessing the electrical disconnect inside the building and diagnosing the Commercial HVAC Unit on the rooftop, he phoned the Member and reported his observations: a fused contactor in the unit and blown fuses in the electrical disconnect in the shop area. This was the Member's last contact with Mr. Schauer.
19. Throughout the day, Mr. Schauer repeatedly accessed the electrical disconnect inside the New-Tec shop, and went up to and down from the building's rooftop. At 5:30 p.m. that day, when New-Tec workers left the shop, they observed that the Pannunzio Mechanical van driven by Mr. Schauer was still present on location and the ladder used by him to access the rooftop was still in place.
20. At 6:30 a.m. on June 24, 2015, workers arrived back at New-Tec. They observed that the van and ladder were where they had been the night before. A worker went up to the roof to check things out and found Mr. Schauer, apparently deceased. He was lying on his back by the Commercial HVAC Unit. The unit was open and Mr. Schauer's tool bag was nearby. Emergency services arrived and pronounced Mr. Schauer dead at the scene. He was observed to have a burn on one hand and the coroner later determined his cause of death to have been electrocution. No personal protective equipment for working on live electrical equipment, pad locks or lock out tags were observed at the scene.
21. The power to the Commercial HVAC Unit was on when Mr. Schauer was last repairing the unit. He was working without the necessary safety equipment and he was electrocuted when he came into direct contact with the live portion of the 600 V AC electrical system within the HVAC control panel, while troubleshooting the equipment on the rooftop. This resulted in his death.

**(B) MEMBER PLED GUILTY AND WAS CONVICTED IN PROVINCIAL OFFENCES COURT**

22. As a result of a College inspection relating to the incident, the Member was charged in September 2015 with employing or otherwise engaging Mr. Schauer to perform the work of a compulsory trade, without a C of Q or valid RTA, contrary to s. 4 of *OCTAA*.
23. As a result of investigations into the fatality by the Ministry of Labour (“MOL”) and the Electrical Safety Authority (“ESA”), the Member was also charged with four counts, under the respective organizations’ enabling legislation.
24. On April 13, 2017, as a result of a joint prosecution by the College, MOL and ESA, the Member pled guilty and was convicted by the Ontario Court of Justice of the following offences:
- a) employing or engaging an improperly licensed individual to perform the work of a compulsory trade, contrary to *OCTAA*;
  - b) failing as an employer to ensure that health and safety measures and procedures were carried out by his employee at the New-Tec location, contrary to regulations under the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, R.S.O. 1990;
  - c) as a contractor, failing to request an inspection of electrical work performed at the New-Tec location, contrary to the Electrical Safety Code.

**MEMBER’S PLEA**

25. Both verbally at the hearing and in an *Agreed Statement of Facts* signed in counterparts (marked as Exhibit 2 ) the Member admitted the professional misconduct set out in allegations a, b, c & d of the *Notice of Hearing*.
26. The Panel conducted a plea inquiry with the Member, whereby the Member confirmed that he understood the nature of the allegations against him; that he voluntarily admitted to the allegations; that by admitting to the allegations, the hearing would proceed on the basis of the facts agreed upon; that he understood that the Panel was not obligated to accept any resolution achieved by the parties; and finally that the Member was aware of the range of penalties that the Panel could impose upon

him.

## **PRIOR DISCIPLINE**

27. The Member has no prior discipline history.
28. Independent Legal Counsel advised that the evidence before the Panel in this matter was solely Exhibit 2. She advised that the task of the Panel was to determine whether the evidence contained in Exhibits 2 proved, on a balance of probabilities, allegations (a)-(d) in *the Notice of Hearing*.

## **DECISION**

29. Following a recess to deliberate, the Panel accepted the contents of Exhibit 2 and found that the College had proven the allegations in *the Notice of Hearing*, on a balance of probabilities.
30. Therefore, pursuant to section 46(2)(c) of the Act, the Panel found the Member guilty of professional misconduct for having engaged in conduct that is defined as being professional misconduct in Ontario Regulation 97/13, section 1, paragraphs 1, 2, 8 and 9, namely that the Member:
  - a. failed to take reasonable steps to safeguard the life, health or property of a person who may be affected by the work of any person for whom he is responsible, when he knew or ought to have known that there was a risk to life, health or property (subsection 1(1));
  - b. failed to act to correct or report a situation that he knew or ought to have known may endanger the safety or welfare of the public (subsection 1(2));
  - c. signed or issued, in the Member's capacity as a member of the College, a document that the Member knew or ought to have known contained a false, improper or misleading statement (subsection 1(8)); and
  - d. was found guilty of contravening a law that is relevant to his suitability to hold a certificate of qualification (subsection 1(9));

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

31. With regard to paragraph 32(a) above, the Panel was satisfied that the Member failed to take reasonable

steps to safeguard the life, health or property of a person who may be affected by the work of any person for whom he is responsible, when he knew or ought to have known that there was a risk to life, health or property. In light of that finding, the Panel concluded that the Member engaged in professional misconduct, as defined in Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(1).

32. With regard to paragraph 32(b) above, the Panel was satisfied that the Member failed to act to correct or report a situation that he knew or ought to have known may endanger the safety or welfare of the public. In light of that finding, the Panel concluded that the Member engaged in professional misconduct, as defined in Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(2).
33. With regard to paragraph 32(c) above, the Panel was satisfied that by the Member signed or issued, in his capacity as a member of the College, a document that he knew or ought to have known contained a false, improper or misleading statement. In light of that finding, the Panel concluded that the Member engaged in professional misconduct, as defined in Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(8).
34. Finally, with regard to paragraph 32(d) above, the Panel was satisfied that by the Member was found guilty of contravening a law that is relevant to his suitability to hold a certificate of qualification. In light of that finding, the Panel concluded that the Member engaged in professional misconduct, as defined in Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(9).

## **PENALTY SUBMISSIONS**

35. The College Counsel filed the *College's Submission on Penalty & Costs* (Exhibit 3). The College clarified that Exhibit 3 was a joint submission between the College and the Member. College Counsel proceeded to make submissions thereon, and asked the Panel to impose the following penalties:
  1. The Registrar shall be directed to suspend the Member's Certificate of Qualification in the trade of 313D for a period of fifteen (15) months, commencing on the date of the order, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(2) of the Act;
  2. The Member shall pay, within fifteen (15) months of the order, a fine in the amount of \$1,000 to the Minister of Finance for payment to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(2) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act* (the "Act")
  3. The Registrar shall be directed to impose terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's 313D

Certificate of Qualification for a period of fifteen (15) months, commencing on the date of the order, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(3) of the Act. The specified terms, conditions and limitations to be imposed shall be as follows:

- a) "The Member may apply for, and the College will not oppose, the registration of Registered Training Agreement (RTA) in the trade of 313A";
  - b) "Should the member pursue an apprenticeship in the 313A trade, the Member shall:
    - i. Provide all the information requested by the College in respect of his apprenticeship; and
    - ii. Obtain the approval of the proposed RTA sponsor, by the College, before the RTA's registration with the Ministry of Training College and Universities";
  - c) "The Member may not pursue a Trade Equivalency Application in the trade of 313A";
  - d) "The Member may only engage in the Scope of Practice of the trade of 313A while under the direct supervision of a sponsor who is a journeyperson in the trade of 313A and carrying on business in the trade in Chatham-Kent and Essex County";
  - e) "For the purposes of paragraph (d), "direct supervision" means the sponsor must physically be present at the work site with the Member while the work is being performed";
  - f) "The Member may not engage or perform any tasks that involve the installation, maintenance or repair of any electrical connections on any HVAC equipment".
4. The Member shall not apply for variation of suspension or the terms, conditions and limitation thereof until the expiry of fifteen (15) month period from the date of the order;
  5. The Member shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Panel at the conclusion of the hearing and the fact of the reprimand shall be recorded on the Public Register for a period of fifteen (15) months, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(3) of the Act;
  6. The finding and the Order of the Panel shall be published in summary, with the name of the Member, in the official publication of the College and on the website of the Ontario College of Trades, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(3) of the Act; and
  7. The Member shall pay to the College, within fifteen (15) months of the order, costs in the amount

of \$2,000, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(4) of the Act.

36. College Counsel submitted that the proposed penalty was appropriate in light of the facts of this case.
37. The Panel was cognizant that agreements on penalty are to be accepted except when the Panel is concerned that in accepting the agreement, the Panel would be bringing the disciplinary process into disrepute.
38. The Panel expressed concern about the proposed joint submission and inquired as to the range of penalties that may be applicable in this matter. Specifically, the Panel was concerned that the joint proposal may be too lenient in light of the fact that a person had died as a result of the Member's conduct.
39. Accordingly, both parties made further written submissions and presented legal precedents to the Panel demonstrating that the penalties set out in Exhibit 3 were appropriate in light of the findings of professional misconduct.
40. In order to assess whether the Panel should accept the proposed penalty, Independent Legal Counsel advised the Panel to consider whether the penalty fell within an appropriate range. Finally, the Panel was urged to consider the mitigating and aggravating factors in this case, as well as the four principles of sentencing in its assessment, namely specific deterrence; general deterrence; remediation; and serving and protecting the public interest.

#### **PENALTY DECISION**

41. After considering the submissions of the parties, the Panel accepted the joint submission on penalty and ordered the following:
  1. The Registrar shall be directed to suspend the Member's Certificate of Qualification in the trade of 313D for a period of fifteen (15) months, commencing on the date of the order, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(2) of the Act;
  2. The Member shall pay, within fifteen (15) months of the order, a fine in the amount of \$1,000 to the Minister of Finance for payment to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(2) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act* (the "Act")
  3. The Registrar shall be directed to impose terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's

313D Certificate of Qualification for a period of fifteen (15) months, commencing on the date of the order, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(3) of the Act. The specified terms, conditions and limitations to be imposed shall be as follows:

- a) "The Member may apply for, and the College will not oppose, the registration of Registered Training Agreement (RTA) in the trade of 313A";
  - b) "Should the member pursue an apprenticeship in the 313A trade, the Member shall:
    - iii. Provide all the information requested by the College in respect of his apprenticeship; and
    - iv. Obtain the approval of the proposed RTA sponsor, by the College, before the RTA's registration with the Ministry of Training College and Universities";
  - c) "The Member may not pursue a Trade Equivalency Application in the trade of 313A";
  - d) "The Member may only engage in the Scope of Practice of the trade of 313A while under the direct supervision of a sponsor who is a journeyman in the trade of 313A and carrying on business in the trade";
  - e) "For the purposes of paragraph (d), "direct supervision" means the sponsor must physically be present at the work site with the Member while the work is being performed";
  - f) "The Member may not engage or perform any tasks that involve the installation, maintenance or repair of any electrical connections on any HVAC equipment".
4. The Member shall not apply for variation of suspension or the terms, conditions and limitation thereof until the expiry of fifteen (15) month period from the date of the order;
  5. The Member shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Panel at the conclusion of the hearing and the fact of the reprimand shall be recorded on the Public Register for a period of fifteen (15) months, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(3) of the Act;
  6. The finding and the order of the Panel shall be published in summary, with the name of the Member, in the official publication of the College and on the website of the Ontario College of Trades, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(3) of the Act; and
  7. The Member shall pay to the College, within fifteen (15) months of the order, costs in the

amount of \$2,000, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(4) of the Act.

42. Paragraph 1(d) of the joint submission on penalty was amended in wording to reflect the Panel's concern that during the term of the suspension, the Member not be permitted to engage in practice within the province of Ontario unless he was under direct supervision. As such, the Panel deleted the reference to Chatam-Kent and Essex County. The Panel advised both parties of this concern at the hearing and the amendment was made on consent of both parties.

#### **REASONS FOR PENALTY DECISION**

43. As noted above, during the penalty submissions in this matter, the Panel expressed a concern about the proposed joint submission on penalty as to the range of penalties that may be applicable to this matter. To date, the College has not developed its own range of penalties in similar cases where there has been a fatality. Accordingly, it is open to the Panel to consider penalties imposed in other regulated professions for similar conduct.
44. The Panel accepts the cases provided to it by Counsel for the College with respect to discipline cases arising from fatalities. A review of cases from other regulated professions involving misconduct arising from fatalities indicates that the penalties imposed range from a suspension to a revocation of a license.
45. The Act does not prescribe a fixed penalty for the conduct that is the subject matter of this case. Rather, the available penalties for professional misconduct range from a reprimand to a revocation, including a fine.
46. In determining an appropriate penalty for misconduct, the Panel takes into consideration the following principles: protection of the public, maintaining the reputation and the integrity of the profession, general deterrence, specific deterrence, and rehabilitation. The Panel must also consider aggravating and mitigating factors and may look to prior decisions in similar cases, noting that prior cases are rarely identical in their facts (see *Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons v. Gale*, 2002 ONCPSD 13). Discipline proceedings are not intended to be penal. Rather, the purpose of such discipline proceedings is to maintain professional discipline by deciding allegations of professional misconduct and incompetence thereby protecting the public (see *Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons v. Jain*, 2012 ONCPSD 30 (CanLII)).

47. Specifically, the Act protects the public by ensuring skilled labour supply and regulation of trades through enforcement and discipline (see section 11 of the Act which sets out the objects of the College). The public interest consideration in the context of this College must also consider the standard of practice for the specific trade in question.
48. It is important to note that even when examining cases of fatalities in other regulated professions such as in the College of Nurses of Ontario or in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, where their members are directly in situations where fatalities occur more regularly, revocation is not mandated in every case of a fatality. Rather, the range of penalties vary significantly and the revocation remedy was reserved for cases of more egregious conduct such as indifference or where the facts showed that the member lacked insight (see for example *Lieberman v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*, 2013 ONSC 4066).
49. There was only one case in the College's history to date where a revocation was sought and granted by a panel of the discipline committee. That was in the case of *Ontario College of Trades v. Singh* (DC 201804, September 2, 2018). However, in that case, there was a greater and admitted connection between the member's actions and omissions which caused the fatality. In that case, the member in question had signed a false Annual Inspection Certificate ("AIC") creating an immediate and ongoing hazard to all members of the public. By contrast, in the case at hand, the College does not allege a similar causal connection between the Member's conduct and the resulting fatality.
50. In arriving at these penalties, the Panel considered the factors listed above, including public protection, the need for specific deterrence with respect to the Member, as well general deterrence to the membership of the College at large and mitigating and aggravating factors.
51. While the Panel is not obligated to accept the joint submission on penalty, it can only reject it if the proposed penalty would bring the College's discipline process into disrepute (see *R. v. Anthony Cook*, 2016 SCC 43). While revocation may be a reasonable penalty, that is not the test for rejecting a joint submission.
52. The Panel finds that the joint submission on penalty meets the goals and considerations for the imposition of a penalty in a regulatory context. In accepting the joint submission on penalty, the Panel considered the following: the length of the suspension, the proposed conditions to protect the public by the Member being under supervision, the Member has accepted responsibility for his actions and omissions under three different regulatory frameworks, the plea for mercy by the deceased's wife, the Member cooperated

with the College's investigation and discipline proceedings, and the Member has no prior findings of misconduct

#### **COSTS SUBMISSIONS**

53. The parties also submitted a proposal in their *Submission on Penalty & Costs* that the Member pay costs to the College in the amount of \$ 2,000 within fifteen (15) months.

#### **COSTS DECISION**

54. The Panel considered the proposal and ordered the Member to pay what is in effect only a portion of the College's investigation and prosecution costs in the amount of \$2,000 within fifteen (15) months, pursuant to section 46(5)4 of the Act. This amount will help to offset some of the costs associated with the investigation and prosecution of this matter, and is not a penalty or sanction.

#### **REASONS FOR COSTS DECISION**

55. Although the costs represent only a portion of the College's costs incurred to date in relation to this matter, the Panel was of the view given the Member's cooperation with all aspects of the investigation and discipline process, the penalty is fair, appropriate, addresses all four principles of sanctioning, and it enhances the public's trust in the profession, the College and its discipline process.

I, Sherry Darvish, sign these Reasons for Decision as Chair of this Discipline Panel and on behalf of the members of the Discipline Panel as listed below.

Date: January 3, 2019

"Sherry Darvish"  
Sherry Darvish  
Chair, Discipline Panel

John Borlase  
Member, Discipline Panel

Vish Jadunauth  
Member, Discipline Panel

**End.**