

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

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

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

Ann Corbold, Chair

BETWEEN:	)	
	)	
	)	Bogdan Andronesi
<b>ONTARIO COLLEGE OF TRADES</b>	)	College Counsel
	)	
-and-	)	
	)	
<b>HUTTON PEARCE</b>	)	Hutton Pearce, Self-Represented
(Member # 13244095)	)	
	)	
	)	Rebecca Durcan,
	)	Independent Legal Counsel
	)	
	)	Heard: May 17, 2019

**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 May 17, 2019 at Victory Verbatim, Court Reporting Services, 222 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario. An Amended Notice of Hearing ("*Amended Notice of Hearing*") (Exhibit 1) issued February 21, 2019 was served on Hutton Pearce (the "Member"), with the Original Notice of Hearing issued on May 2018. A First Appearance in this matter took place by teleconference on June 18, 2018; Pre-Hearing Conferences were held on August 14, 2018, December 3, 2018 and March 25, 2019; with

the hearing of this matter on its merits subsequently heard on May 17, 2019. Note that the hearing was originally scheduled to occur on February 4, 2019. However, shortly before the hearing date it was adjourned to May 17, 2019.

2. At the Pre-Hearing Conference on March 25, 2019, the Panel confirmed the parties' consent that any agreement on the facts in this matter could be filed with the Panel in advance of the hearing. The Panel also obtained the parties' consent that the hearing may proceed before a one-member panel in accordance with section 4.2.1(2) of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

## THE ALLEGATIONS

1. College Counsel advised that the College intended to proceed with allegations (c) and (d) in the *Amended Notice of Hearing*, and proceeded to make submissions on the allegations.
2. Allegations (c) and (d) in the *Amended Notice of Hearing*, along with particulars, were as follows:

**"IT IS ALLEGED** that Hutton Pearce 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:

(c) failed to maintain the standards of a trade (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(10));

\* \* \* \*

(d) acted or failed to act, in respect to the practice of a trade, in a manner that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(11)).

\* \* \* \*

## PARTICULARS OF THE ALLEGATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

### The Member

1. Hutton Pearce, Membership No. 13244095 (the "Member"), is a member of the Ontario College of Trades (the "College").

2. At all material times, the Member held a Certificate of Qualification in the trade of Plumber (306A), Journeyperson class.
3. At all material times, the Member owned, and carried on business as, Pearce Plumbing – a Brampton, Ontario-based business offering plumbing services to the public (the “Business”).

#### **Member is hired to perform plumbing work**

4. At all material times, [NAME] (the “Complainant”) was the owner of a residential property located at [ADDRESS] in Toronto, Ontario (the “Property”).
5. On or about January 3, 2017, the Member was hired by the Complainant or his agent to resolve a venting problem that was causing a ‘sewer gas’ odour in the upstairs washroom of the Property (the “Original Venting Issue”). The Member received a deposit upfront.
6. At the time the Member was hired, both the upstairs washroom and the main floor kitchen were draining through a common drain leading outside to the backyard of the Property (the “Old Drain”).
7. While investigating the Original Venting Issue, the Member further suggested to the Complainant that the Member sever the Old Drain and replace it with a new drain that would allow both the upstairs washroom and the main floor kitchen to drain into the existing basement waste drain (the “New Drain”). The Complainant agreed.

#### **Member performs inadequate plumbing work**

8. On or about January 5, 2017, the Member severed and abandoned the Old Drain; and installed the New Drain, but failed to ensure that it was connected to the existing basement waste drain. The Member allowed the New Drain he installed to terminate and discharge waste water in the wall cavity between the main floor and the basement ceiling.

#### **Member re-attends the Property and is paid in full, but problems remain**

9. On or about January 9, 2017, the Complainant discovered flooding in the basement,

apparently from the recent plumbing installation. The waste water had already caused damage to the Property. The Complainant called and communicated the above to the Member.

10. The Member re-attended the Property on January 10, 2017. He provided the Complainant with an invoice from the Member's Business (the "Invoice"), and demanded immediate payment of the outstanding amount.
11. The Member told the Complainant that he would shut off the Property's water supply, and would not address the cause of the flooding, if the Complainant did not forthwith pay the Member's Invoice.
12. Between January 10 and January 13, 2017, the Complainant paid the Invoice in full to the Member.

#### **Member demands additional payment to rectify problem**

13. On or about January 16, 2017, the Member re-attended the Property and inspected the plumbing work he had previously performed.
14. Immediately thereafter, the Member demanded that the Complainant pay him an *additional* \$2,000 in order for the Member to remedy the issues caused by the Member's own previous plumbing work.

#### **Another plumber inspects and rectifies the issues**

15. On or about January 17, 2017, the Complainant hired another plumber, [NAME] (the "Second Plumber"), to investigate and then remediate the Member's previous plumbing work, as required.
16. On that day, the Second Plumber investigated and reported on the plumbing issues with the severed Old Drain and the improperly connected New Drain.
17. On or about January 18, 2017, the Second Plumber remedied the defects in the plumbing work the Member had performed, including connecting the New Drain to the waste drain in the basement. This resolved the issue.

**Member obstructs a College Investigator and fails to cooperate with the College inquiry into the Complaint**

18. On or about January 26, 2017, the Complainant filed a written complaint with the College concerning the Member's conduct, as already particularized above (the "Complaint")—triggering the College's statutory duty to inquire and investigate, as appropriate.
19. On or about March 15, 2017, pursuant to section 53 of the Act, the Registrar appointed College inspector Mary Kontopidis (the "Investigator") to inquire into and examine the Member's conduct and actions in relation to the Complaint.
20. On or about March 31, 2017, the Investigator first spoke with the Member by phone and made a request for an in-person meeting for her to inquire into, and discuss, the Complaint with the Member. The Member agreed to schedule it, but failed to attend that meeting and all other subsequent meetings requested by the Investigator over the course of approximately nine months.
21. Between at least January and July 2017, the Member failed to provide the Registrar and the College with a current home and/or business address, despite the Member's obligation to do so.
22. Between March and November 2017, the Member repeatedly obstructed the Investigator in the course of her duties to inquire into the Complaint, including but not limited to refusing to address the Investigator's communications; and purposefully providing her with false, incorrect or out-of-date addresses for physical delivery of documents. On at least two occasions, the Member directed the Investigator to cause written correspondence about the Complaint to be delivered to him at an address that was no longer associated with the Member and/or where the Member would not receive it.

**MEMBER'S PLEA**

3. Both verbally at the hearing and in an *Agreed Statement of Facts* signed in counterparts on December 31, 2018 and again on March 25, 2019 (Exhibit 2), the Member admitted the professional misconduct set out in allegations (c) and (d) of the *Amended Notice of Hearing*.

4. 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.

#### **THE EVIDENCE – AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS**

5. College Counsel tendered evidence in support of paragraphs by way of the *Agreed Statement of Facts* (Exhibit 2). Exhibit 2 stated the following:

#### **FACTS**

##### **The Member**

1. Hutton Pearce, Membership No. 13244095 (the “Member”), is a member of the Ontario College of Trades (the “College”).
2. At all material times, the Member held a Certificate of Qualification in the trade of Plumber (306A), Journeyman class. The Member first qualified as a Journeyman in this trade in 2007.
3. At all material times, the Member carried on business as Pearce Plumbing – a Brampton, Ontario based business offering plumbing services to the public.

##### **Member is hired to perform plumbing work**

4. At all material times, [NAME] (the “Complainant”) was the owner of a residential property located at ADDRESS (the “Property”).
5. On or about January 3, 2017, the Member was hired by the Complainant to resolve a venting problem that was causing a ‘sewer gas’ odour in the upstairs washroom of the Property (the “Original Venting issue”). The Member received a deposit upfront.

6. At the time the Member was hired, both the upstairs washroom and the main floor kitchen were draining through a common drain leading outside to the backyard of the Property (the "Old Drain").
7. The Member investigated the plumbing configuration in relation to the Original Venting issue and the loose Old Drain. The Member observed that the Property had many sub-standard plumbing installations, including a lack of proper venting for the plumbing fixtures in the upstairs washroom, and loose drain pipes in a few observable locations.
8. While proposing solutions for the Original Venting Issue, the Member brought up at his initiative the issue of the loose Old Drain. He suggested to the Complainant that the Member sever the Old Drain and replace it with the new drain (the "New Drain") that would allow the upstairs washroom to drain into the existing basement waste drain, with proper venting, and would take care of the loose piping. The Complainant agreed and asked for the lowest cost, least invasive plumbing solution.

**Member performs the plumbing work he recommended**

9. On or about January 5, 2017, the Member severed and abandoned the Old Drain; and installed the New Drain, ensuring proper venting for the upstairs washroom.
10. Unbeknown to the Complainant or to the Member, the severed Old Drain had also provided draining for some plumbing fixtures in the main floor kitchen.
11. While the Member resolved the Original Venting Issue, he did not take reasonable precaution to ensure that all the fixtures connected or through the Old Drain were subsequently tied into the New Drain, to allow for them to ultimately connect to the existing basement waste drain.

**Member re-attends the Property and is paid in full, but problems remain**

12. On or about January 9, 2017, the Complainant discovered some flooding in the basement, apparently caused by the recent plumbing installation performed by the Member. The waste water had already caused some damage to the finished basement of the Property. The Complainant called and communicated the above to the Member.

13. The Member re-attended the Property on or about January 10, 2017. He first provided the Complainant with an invoice for the services already provided (the "Invoice"). Further, the Member would not address the cause of flooding unless the Complainant paid the invoice forthwith.

14. Between January 10 and January 13, 2017, the Complainant paid the invoice in full to the Member.

**Member demands additional payment to rectify related problem he discovered upon re-inspection**

15. On or about January 16, 2017, the Member re-attended the Property and inspected the plumbing work he had previously performed, as well as the source of the resultant plumbing problems and water leak.

16. As a result, the Member demanded that the Complainant pay him an additional amount, in order for the Member to remedy the issues uncovered by the Member's more thorough January 16 inspection into the plumbing connected to the Old Drain, which the Member himself severed. The Complainant wanted the remedy work done free of charge.

**Another plumber inspects and rectifies the issues**

17. On or about January 17, 2017, the Complainant hired another plumber [NAME] (the "Second Plumber"), to investigate, and then remedy as required, those issues caused or exacerbated by the Member's plumbing work. On that day, the Second Plumber, an expert in his field, investigated and reported on the plumbing issues with the severed Old Drain, whose severance had allowed some plumbing fixtures at the Property to remain unconnected to any active drain (the "Defects").

18. On or about January 18, 2017, the Second Plumber remedied the Defects, including ensuring all plumbing fixtures which had previously tied into the Old Drain were connected to the waste drain in the basement. This resolved the issue.

## **ADMISSIONS**

19. The Member admits that a reasonably diligent plumber, aware of the substandard plumbing installation already existing at the Property, would have investigated the draining issue further than done originally, before recommending a solution.
20. The Member admits that he allowed himself to be pressured into finding and recommending the lowest-cost solution, without having been able to fully ascertain if his proposed solution could work with the remainder of the sub-standard plumbing installation already existing at the property.
21. The Member admits that had he investigated the problem more thoroughly, he would have identified and likely proposed to the Complainant a different solution upfront – which would have required more work by the Member, and more expense for the Complainant. Had the Complainant failed to authorise the fuller work, the Member admits he should not have performed any lesser work, other than with the Complainant’s informed consent, after the Member made sure the Complainant was fully appraised of the potential for undesirable results and the possible unforeseen problems with the plumbing pipes behind the finished walls of the Property.
22. The Member admits that the above facts as true; and that the facts and the admissions constitute the professional misconduct set out in particulars (c) and (d) of the Notice of Hearing (File No. DC201803).

## **PRIOR DISCIPLINE**

23. The Member has no prior discipline history.

## **INDEPENDENT LEGAL COUNSEL ADVICE**

9. Independent Legal Counsel advised that the only evidence before the Panel in this matter was the *Agreed Statement of Facts*. The Panel’s task was to review the evidence set out in the *Agreed Statement of Facts* and if the Panel found the evidence is not sufficient to prove allegations (c) and (d) on a balance of probabilities, to ask the parties to provide more submissions.

## DECISION

10. After hearing submissions from the College Counsel on the evidence, the Panel found that the College had proven allegations of misconduct (c) and (d) in the *Amended Notice of Hearing*, and as admitted by the Member in the *Agreed Statement of Facts*, on a balance of probabilities, accepted the *Agreed Statement of Facts*.

11. 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 10 and 11, namely that the Member:

(c) failed to maintain the standards of a trade (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1 (10));

(d) acted or failed to act, in respect to the practice of a trade, in a manner that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(11)).

## REASONS FOR DECISION

12. The Panel was satisfied that by failing to complete a full inspection of the plumbing system after he had determined it had several existing sub-standard installations and by performing inadequate plumbing work, the Member engaged in professional misconduct by contravening Ontario Regulation 97/13 as alleged in Exhibit 1 *Amended Notice of Hearing*, paragraphs (c) and (d).

13. By engaging in the conduct described in Exhibit 2 *Agreed Statement of Facts*, the Panel found that the Member failed to maintain the standards of a trade and acted, in respect to the practice of a trade, in a manner that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as unprofessional.

14. College Counsel on behalf of the College advised that the College did not intend to proceed with allegations (a), (b) and (e) of the *Amended Notice of Hearing* and requested the Panel's permission to withdraw allegations (a), (b) and (e). Permission to withdraw allegations (a), (b) and (e) was granted by the Panel.

## PENALTY SUBMISSIONS

15. College Counsel proceeded to make a joint submission with respect to penalty (Exhibit 3). College Counsel made oral submissions thereon, and asked the Panel to impose the following penalties:

1. The Member shall pay, within six (6) months of the order, a fine in the amount of \$500 to the Minister of Finance for payment into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(2) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act* (the "Act");
2. The Member shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Panel, in person, at the conclusion of the hearing and the fact of the reprimand shall be recorded on the Public Register for a period of six (6) months thereafter, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(1) of the *Act*;
3. The finding and 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*;
4. The Registrar shall be directed to impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's Certificate of Qualification, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(3) of the *Act*:

"In addition to any other related obligations imposed on the Member by the *Act*, its regulations, the College's General By-law or any other statutory framework, the Member shall:

- (i) maintain current email and postal addresses with the College and with any authority having jurisdiction over the Member's work in his trade, including but not limited to communicating any address change to the College and to such other authority within ten (10) calendar days of such change; and
- (ii) respond fully, in relation to work in the scope of practice of his trade, to any written or email communication from the College and from any authority having jurisdiction, including a municipal building department, within twenty (20) calendar days of the date such communication is sent to him at his then current email or postal address."

16. College Counsel submitted that the proposed penalties were appropriate in light of the facts of this

case. He also submitted that the courts encourage the acceptance of agreements made between parties unless doing so would bring the administration of justice or the disciplinary process into disrepute. College Counsel relied upon the decision in *R. v. Anthony-Cook* [2016] 2 S.C.R

17. College Counsel further submitted that the proposed Terms, Conditions and Limitations to be imposed on the Member was based on aggravating factors, specifically, a lack of cooperation by the Member. This is in violation of what is set out in the Code of Conduct that all members of the College must abide by.
18. College Counsel also submitted for the Panel's consideration two previous decisions of the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Trades, i) Decision No. DC201805, dated December 3, 2018 in which the discipline panel imposed a fine of \$1,250.00 to be paid within 24 months; that the Member be reprimanded at the conclusion of the hearing and that reprimand be recorded on the public register for a period of 6 months and the finding and the order of the panel be published in summary with the name of the member in the official publication of the College and on its website ii) Decision No. DC201805 DATED February 20, 2019 in which the discipline panel imposed a fine of \$1,300.00 to be paid within 12 months; that the Member be reprimanded at the conclusion of the hearing and that reprimand be recorded on the public register for a period of 12 months and the finding and the order of the panel be published in summary with the name of the member in the official publication of the College and on its website
19. The Member confirmed that he would accept these penalties and costs, should the Panel decide to make an order accepting the parties' joint submission.

#### **INDEPENDENT LEGAL ADVICE**

20. Independent Legal Counsel reminded the panel that agreements were intended to be accepted unless in doing so, the disciplinary process would be put into disrepute. Independent Legal Counsel advised the panel that this was a very heavy threshold to meet. The courts have advised that unless the agreement results in an order that is too lenient, or too harsh, the panel must accept. Independent Legal Counsel reminded the panel that the principles of sanction (general deterrence, specific deterrence, public confidence and remediation) would have been factored into the proposed agreement as well as any mitigating and aggravating factors. The College had provided the panel with

analogous cases which reassured the panel that the proposed agreement was within an acceptable range and would not put the disciplinary process into disrepute. Independent Legal Counsel advised the panel that if there was any inclination to reject the proposal that both parties should be alerted so that further submissions could be made.

## **PENALTY DECISION**

21. After considering the joint submission on penalty, the Panel accepted the submission and made the following orders:

1. The Member shall pay, within six (6) months of the order, a fine in the amount of \$500 to the Minister of Finance for payment into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(2) of the *Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act* (the “Act”);
2. The Member shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Panel, in person, at the conclusion of the hearing and the fact of the reprimand shall be recorded on the Public Register for a period of six (6) months thereafter, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(1) of the *Act*;
3. The finding and 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*;
4. The Registrar shall be directed to impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on the Member’s Certificate of Qualification, pursuant to paragraph 46(4)(3) of the *Act*:

“In addition to any other related obligations imposed on the Member by the *Act*, its regulations, the College’s General By-law or any other statutory framework, the Member shall:

- i. maintain current email and postal addresses with the College and with any authority having jurisdiction over the Member’s work in his trade, including but not limited to communicating any address change to the College and to such other authority within ten (10) calendar days of such change; and
- ii. respond fully, in relation to work in the scope of practice of his trade, to any

written or email communication from the College and from any authority having jurisdiction, including a municipal building department, within twenty (20) calendar days of the date such communication is sent to him at his then current email or postal address.”

## **REASONS FOR PENALTY DECISION**

22. In arriving at the above penalties, the Panel considered: the College’s submission regarding the JSP; the basic principles of sanctioning including specific and general deterrence; aggravating and mitigating factors; the advice provided by ILC; and concerns for public safety. The Panel finds the penalty to be fair and appropriate.
23. As a result of the finding of guilt, and after hearing submissions on appropriate penalty, the Panel must first and foremost take into consideration the safety of the public by ensuring that a minimum standard is met by regulated trades professionals. Protecting the public’s confidence in the trades and the College’s disciplinary process is paramount. It was the view of the Panel that the JSP did that.
24. The publication of a summary of the finding, and the recording of the reprimand on the Public register, will help maintain the public’s confidence in the College’s disciplinary process. This information is readily available to the public and demonstrates the College’s commitment to ensure the standards of the professional trades are met.
25. The Panel considered the Member’s lack of cooperation with the College to be an aggravating factor. The Panel felt it important to stress the expectation that members fully cooperate with the College. The terms, conditions and limitations imposed are meant to reinforce that expectation for the individual member and for other members of the Ontario College of Trades.
26. This was the first time the Member has come before the Discipline Committee. The Panel considered this to be a mitigating factor.
27. The Member chose to proceed by way of an ASF and JSP. This, too, was considered a mitigating factor.
28. Independent Legal Counsel provided advice in relation to the Panel’s acceptance of a Joint Submission on Penalty. Additionally, the panel reviewed *R. v. Anthony-Cook* 2016 SCC 43, [2016] 2 S.C.R. 204.

The Panel believed that the fine of \$500 was considerably lower than previous penalties imposed by the College. The panel was not, however, able to determine that this penalty was unduly lenient and as such would be contrary to the public interest. College Counsel was clear in his submissions that he did not believe this particular matter was at the same level of risk to public safety as previous decisions in which a higher fine was imposed. The panel trusted that College Counsel considered all of the circumstances of this matter during his discussions with an unrepresented member and relied on those details to reach a fair joint submission on penalty.

### **COSTS SUBMISSIONS**

29. College Counsel also made a joint submission with respect to the costs of this proceeding, namely that the Member had agreed to pay costs to the College in the amount of \$3,120, pursuant to paragraph 46(5)(4) of the *Act*; and the Member shall pay the above costs in six equal instalments, payable respectively within 60, 120, 180, 240 and 300 days of the date of the order, in such manner as the Hearings Coordinator directs.

### **COSTS DECISION**

30. After considering the submissions on costs, the Panel ordered the Member to pay the College's costs in the amount of \$3,120 in six equal instalments, payable respectively within 60, 120, 180, 240 and 300 days of the date of the order, in such manner as the Hearings Coordinator directs 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 intended to be an additional penalty or sanction.

### **REASONS FOR COSTS DECISION**

31. The Panel finds that it is reasonable for the Member to defray some of the College's costs, provided that the costs are not disproportionate to the Member's current financial situation.
32. The Panel took into consideration the Member's financial situation by allowing the payments by equal instalments.
33. In ordering the amount of costs noted above, the Panel took into consideration the number of Pre-

conference Hearings required, including the scheduled Pre-Hearing Conference that the Member failed to attend, and the two scheduled main Hearings.

## **REPRIMAND**

34. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Member waived his right to appeal and, as such, an oral reprimand was delivered pursuant to section 46(5)(1) of the Act as outlined below:

*Mr. Pearce, as you know, as part of its penalty order, this Discipline Panel has ordered that you be given an oral reprimand.*

*The fact that you have received this reprimand will be recorded on the Public Register of the College for a period of six (6) months and, as such, will form part of your record.*

*Although you will be given an opportunity to make a statement at the end of the reprimand, this is not an opportunity for you to review the decision made by the Discipline Panel, nor a time for you to debate the merits of our decision.*

*You have been found to have engaged in conduct that constitutes professional misconduct, including:*

*(c) failed to maintain the standards of a trade (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(10));*

*(d) acted or failed to act, in respect to the practice of a trade, in a manner that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional (Ontario Regulation 97/13, subsection 1(11)).*

*The Panel takes this type of conduct seriously. The public needs to have confidence that the College's members are upholding high ethical and technical standards. The College also needs to have confidence in its members. Finally, employers need to be assured that their member employees are conducting themselves in accordance with the law, and employees of members need to know that they will be treated properly and fairly.*

*The Panel acknowledges that this is the first time you have appeared before the Discipline Committee of the Ontario College of Trades and that you co-operated with the investigation, as well as the prosecution of this matter, and the Panel took this into consideration when accepting the joint submission on penalty and costs today.*

35. The Panel gave the Member an opportunity to make a statement at the conclusion of the reprimand, which the Member declined.

July 23, 2019 \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

“Ann Corbold” \_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Corbold, Panel Chair  
On behalf of the Discipline Committee

**End.**