

**Discipline Committee of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario**

**Citation: ONCRPO v. GHOSHAL, 2021 ONCRPO 6**

**Date of written reasons: November 9, 2021**

**Docket: C1920-32**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, S.O. 1991, c. 18*, as amended, and the regulations thereunder, as amended;

**IN THE MATTER OF** the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007, S.O. 2007, c. 10, Sched. R*, as amended and the regulations thereunder, as amended;

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** a discipline proceeding against Asim Ghoshal, a Registrant of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario.

**Between:** **COLLEGE OF REGISTERED PSYCHOTHERAPISTS AND REGISTERED MENTAL HEALTH THERAPISTS OF ONTARIO**

**- and -**

**ASIM GHOSHAL (REGISTRATION #001847)**

**Before: Panel**

**Shelley Briscoe-Dimock (Chair)  
Kenneth Lomp  
Carol Cowan-Levine  
David Keast  
Steven Boychyn**

**Date of hearing:**

**October 6, 2021**

**Appearances:**

**Rebecca Durcan,**

**Counsel for College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario**

**Jennifer Hunter,**

**Independent Legal Counsel**

**Asim Ghoshal, Registrant/Member**

**Self-represented**

## **DECISION AND REASONS**

This matter came before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the "Panel") of the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (the "College") on October 6, 2021. The hearing proceeded via videoconference on consent of the parties.

The hearing was uncontested with respect to the allegations of professional misconduct and proceeded by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF"). The parties were not agreed with respect to the appropriate order on penalty and costs and the panel heard submissions from each.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Panel delivered its finding and penalty order orally, with written reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

### **THE ALLEGATIONS**

The allegations of professional misconduct against the Registrant were listed on the Notice of Hearing, dated February 11, 2021, which was filed as Exhibit 1, and read as follows:

#### *The Registrant*

1. Asim Ghoshal (the "Registrant") has been a registrant of the College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario (the College") since on or about April 7, 2015.

#### *The Clients*

2. It is alleged that the Registrant provided couples' therapy to Client #1 and her partner at their marital home from approximately November 2015 to in and around June 2019. It is alleged that the Registrant had a former professional and/or personal relationship with the partner of Client #1.
3. It is alleged that the Registrant treated Client #2 and/or provided couples therapy to Client #2 and her partner during the years 2016-2017 and/or 2017-2018.

#### *Conduct by the Registrant*

4. It is alleged that the Registrant engaged in the following with Client #1 and/or Client #2:
  - a. Influenced Client #1 to remain in an abusive relationship including using guilt and/or their religious beliefs;
  - b. Influenced Client #2 to remain in an abusive relationship;
  - c. Advised Client #1 and/or Client #2 that their children may become involved in drugs and/or gangs if they left their marriages;

- d. Advised Client #1 and/or Client #2 that their karma could be impacted if they left their marriages;
  - e. Read the contents of a personal and/or confidential letter written about and/or from Client #2 to Client #1 and her partner; and/or
  - f. Asked Client #1 questions about Client #2 and/or discussed Client #2 with Client #1.
5. It is also alleged that the Registrant engaged in the following with Client #1:
    - a. Blurred the roles between couples' therapist, spiritual advisor and/or family friends;
    - b. Made misleading promises to her and/or her son by telling them he would always be there for them and/or would fix her marriage;
    - c. Saw other clients at her home;
    - d. Accepted meals and/or gifts; and/or
    - e. Shared personal information with her and introduced her to his family.
  6. It is alleged that in or around June 2019, the Registrant abruptly discontinued services with Client #1 and/or did not respond to her requests for assistance and/or provide her with a referral to another healthcare practitioner.
  7. It is alleged that following his termination of therapy to Client #1, the Registrant refused to communicate with and/or respond to Client #1's requests for assistance, while he remained in contact with her ex-partner.
  8. It is alleged that the Registrant inappropriately disclosed information to Client #1's partner about Client #1's complaint to the College.
  9. It is alleged that the Client felt abandoned after the Registrant terminated their relationship which has had a significant impact on her well-being.
  10. It is alleged that the Registrant did not maintain treatment records for his sessions with Client #1 and/or Client #2.

*Allegations of professional misconduct*

11. It is alleged that the above constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to subsection 51(1)(c) of the *Health Professions Procedural Code*, being Schedule 2 to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 (the "Code") as set out in one or more of the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007*:
  - a. **Paragraph 1** - Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, including but not limited to:
    - i. 1.5 – General Conduct;

- ii. [Withdrawn]
  - iii. 1.7 – Dual or Multiple Relationships;
  - iv. [Withdrawn]
  - b. [Withdrawn]
  - c. **Paragraph 5** – Giving information about a client to a person other than the client;
  - d. [Withdrawn]
  - e. [Withdrawn]
  - f. **Paragraph 25** – Failing to keep written records in accordance with the standards of the profession;
  - g. [Withdrawn]
  - h. **Paragraph 52** - Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional; and/or
  - i. **Paragraph 53** - Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.
12. It is also alleged that the above constitutes incompetence pursuant to section 52 of the Code as the Registrant’s professional care of Client #1 and/or Client #2 displayed a lack of knowledge, skill or judgment of a nature or to an extent that demonstrates that the Registrant is unfit to continue to practise or that the Registrant’s practice should be restricted.

At the outset of the hearing, counsel for the College advised the panel that the College sought to withdraw the following paragraphs of the Notice of Hearing (Exhibit 1): 11 (a) (ii), 11 (a) (iv), 11(b), 11 (d), 11 (e) and 11 (g). The Registrant advised the panel that he consented to the College’s request to withdraw the noted allegations.

Following its deliberations on the evidence and findings with respect to the remaining allegations, the panel made an order at the hearing, orally, granting leave for the allegations contained in paragraphs 11 (a) (ii), 11 (a) (iv), 11(b), 11 (d), 11 (e) and 11 (g) to be withdrawn.

### **AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The Agreed Statement of Facts was filed as Exhibit 2 and provides (without attachments) as follows:

#### *The Registrant*

1. Asim Ghoshal (the “Registrant”) has been registered with the College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario (the “College”) since April 7, 2015. Attached at **Tab “A”** is a copy of the Registrant’s section of the College Register. Prior to registering with the College, the Registrant practised as a psychiatrist in India.

#### *Client #1*

2. The Registrant had a prior professional and personal relationship with Client #1's husband.
3. In or around November 2015, Client #1 and her husband ran into the Registrant. Client #1 and her husband told the Registrant about their marriage difficulties. Client #1 knew the Registrant was a psychotherapist.
4. The Registrant agreed to assist Client #1 and her husband to resolve their marriage difficulties. The Registrant told Client #1 that it was karma that they had run into each other and there could be karma-debts if Client #1 and her husband separated.
5. The Registrant did not believe that he was entering into a psychotherapist-client relationship with Client #1. He did not ask Client #1 or her husband to sign any forms. He did not maintain any client records. If he were to testify, the Registrant would state that he was simply providing a helpful ear and providing spiritual guidance or counselling only. However, the Registrant admits that he ought to have known that his provision of "spiritual guidance" and/or "friendly assistance", and/or "counselling" as a registered psychotherapist, could be confusing to Client #1 and that she could reasonably assume he was acting as a registrant of the College. It is agreed that the Registrant, although unintentionally, blurred his roles.
6. Between in or around November 2015 and June 2019, the Registrant attended Client #1's marital home to meet with Client #1 and her husband approximately once a week, during which time Client #1 and her husband sought the Registrant's advice in an attempt to resolve their marital difficulties.
7. These were not formally scheduled appointments. The Registrant would communicate via WhatsApp when he could come over and then a mutually convenient time would be discussed. Some of these visits were purely personal. Some of these visits involved discussion of the marital difficulties of Client #1 and her husband where the Registrant would provide advice.
8. The Registrant never asked for payment or provided an invoice. However, the husband of Client #1 would periodically send money to the Registrant. Client #1 also sent money to the Registrant on three occasions. If he were to testify, the Registrant would state that these payments were not for therapy but gifts from Client #1 and her husband.
9. If he were to testify, the Registrant would state that he eventually told Client #1 that he was a therapist – but not *her* therapist.
10. Over time, the Registrant introduced his family to Client #1 and her husband.
11. The Registrant provided therapy for other clients in the home of Client #1 and her husband.

12. The Registrant asked Client #1 for information about Client #2 and discussed Client 2's situation with Client #1.
13. The Registrant told Client #1 that she was like his little sister or daughter, and told the Client #1 and her husband to reach out to him if they needed help because they were "family friends" and "would always be there for each other."
14. The Registrant had been dealing with his own personal difficulties for some time. His son died in September 2018 and other family members died in succession shortly thereafter. At some point around May 2019, the Registrant told Client #1 that he could no longer help her.

*Client #2*

15. In or around 2015 or 2016, Client #1 recommended the Registrant to Client #2, a friend of hers living in the United States who was experiencing marital difficulties. In or around 2016, Client #2 reached out to the Registrant, who identified himself to her as a "psychotherapist" and told her his specialty included working with abusive people, relationship issues, and addictions. He offered to provide counselling to Client #2 and her husband.
16. The Registrant did not believe that he was entering into a psychotherapist-client relationship with Client #2. He did not ask Client #2 or her husband to sign any forms. He did not maintain any client records. If he were to testify, the Registrant would state that he was simply providing a helpful ear and providing spiritual guidance or counselling only. However, the Registrant admits that he ought to have known that his provision of "spiritual guidance" and/or "friendly assistance", and/or "counselling" as a registered psychotherapist, could be confusing to Client #2 and that she could reasonably assume he was acting as a registrant of the College. It is agreed that the Registrant, although unintentionally, blurred his roles.
17. Client #2 and her husband participated in counselling sessions with the Registrant during 2016-2017, which took place over the telephone. Client #2 paid the Registrant \$150.00 CAD per session.
18. The Registrant encouraged Client #2 and her husband to discuss their major disagreements via group chat with him over WhatsApp, and asked them each to send him detailed information explaining their personal issues and feelings, so that he could use that information to work with the other.
19. After approximately one-and-a-half years of couples' therapy, Client #2 moved out of her marital home after her husband assaulted her while she was holding their child. Client #2's husband had been physically abusive on previous occasions, which Client #2 had disclosed to

the Registrant. On at least one occasion Client #2's husband assaulted her while they were on the phone with the Registrant, and the Registrant advised them to give each other space.

*Standards of the College*

20. The College has published *Professional Practice Standards for Registered Psychotherapists* that states the following:

- a. **1.5 – General Conduct** – Registrants at all times refrain from conduct that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional, or unbecoming a member of the profession; and
- b. **1.7 – Dual and Multiple Relationships** – Except in extenuating circumstances where relevant circumstances have been considered, registrants avoid dual or multiple relationships with clients.

Attached at **Tab “B”** are copies of the relevant Standards.

21. The Registrant breached these standards of practice of the profession by engaging in the conduct described in this Agreed Statement of Facts.

*Admission of Professional Misconduct*

22. It is agreed that the above conduct constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to section 51(1)(c) of the *Health Professions Procedural Code*, being Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991* (the “Code”) as set out in the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007*:

- a. **Paragraph 1** - Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, namely,
  - i. 1.5 – General Conduct; and
  - ii. 1.7 – Dual and Multiple Relationships.
- b. **Paragraph 5** – Giving information about a client to a person other than the client;
- c. **Paragraph 25** – Failing to keep written records in accordance with the standards of the profession;
- d. **Paragraph 52**- Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional; and
- e. **Paragraph 53** – Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.

*Admission of Facts*

23. By this document, the Registrant admits to the truth of the facts referred to in paragraphs 1 to 21 above (the "Agreed Facts").

24. By this document, the Registrant states that:

- a. he understands that by signing this document he is consenting to the evidence as set out in the Agreed Facts being presented to the Discipline Committee;
- b. he understands that any decision of the Discipline Committee and a summary of its reasons, including reference to his name, will be published in the College's annual report and any other publication or website of the College;
- c. he understands that any agreement between him and the College with respect to any penalty proposed does not bind the Discipline Committee; and
- d. he understands and acknowledges that he is executing this document voluntarily, unequivocally, free of duress, free of bribe, and that he has been advised of his right to seek legal advice.

**REGISTRANT'S PLEA**

The Registrant admitted the acts of professional misconduct as set out in the Agreed Statement of Fact.

The Panel conducted an oral plea inquiry and was satisfied that the Registrant's admissions were voluntary, informed, and unequivocal.

**SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES ON FINDING**

Counsel for the College submitted that the facts and admissions contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts made out all of the acts of professional misconduct admitted to by the Registrant.

The Registrant provided a statement which echoed College Counsel's submissions, namely that the facts admitted in the Agreed Statement of Facts support a finding of professional misconduct as set out therein.

**DECISION**



On reading the Notice of Hearing, considering the Agreed Statement of Facts, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the College and of the Registrant. The Panel finds that the Registrant has committed acts of professional misconduct pursuant to:

1. Subsection 51(1)(c) of the *Health Professions Procedural Code*, being Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991* (the "Code") as set out in the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007*:
  - a. **Paragraph 1** - Contravening, by act or omission, a standard of practice of the profession or failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, namely, i. 1.5 – General Conduct; ii. 1.7 – Dual and Multiple Relationships; and
  - b. **Paragraph 5** – Giving information about a client to a person other than the client;
  - c. **Paragraph 25** – Failing to keep written records in accordance with the standards of the profession;
  - d. **Paragraph 52**- Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional; and
  - e. **Paragraph 53** – Engaging in conduct that would reasonably be regarded by members as conduct unbecoming a member of the profession.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

Having considered the Registrant's conduct set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Panel accepted the Registrant's admission and found him guilty of professional misconduct as alleged in the Agreed Statement of Facts and the Notice of Hearing.

The Panel finds that the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing, specifically contained in paragraphs 11 (a) (i), 11 (a) (iii), 11 (c), 11 (f), 11 (h), and 11 (i), are supported by the facts contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts presented by the parties. The Panel finds that the College met its onus and established that it was more likely than not that the Registrant engaged in the acts of misconduct as alleged. The Panel was satisfied the Registrant's admission was voluntary, informed, and unequivocal.

### **THE COLLEGE SUBMISSIONS ON ORDER**

The College submitted that the Panel ought to order a penalty that included the following penalty and costs:

1. Requiring the Registrant to appear before the panel to be reprimanded immediately following the hearing of this matter.

2. Directing the Registrar to suspend the Registrant's certificate of registration for a period of one month, on a date to be selected by the Registrar, which shall be suspended if the Registrant successfully completes the terms, conditions and limitations as set out in paragraph 3(a) and (3b) within four months of the date of this Order.
3. Directing the Registrar to immediately impose the following specified terms, conditions and limitations on the Registrant's certificate of registration, to be fulfilled at the Registrant's expense, to the satisfaction of the Registrar:
  - a. Requiring the Registrant to successfully complete an ethics course pre-approved by the Registrar within six months of the date of this Order;
  - b. Requiring the Registrant to successfully complete the College's Professional Practice & Jurisprudence (JRP) e-Learning Module, within six months of the date of this Order; and
  - c. Requiring the Registrant to meet with a clinical supervisor pre-approved by the Registrar, on at least three occasions within twelve (12) months of the date of this Order, to discuss ethics and boundaries in relation to the conduct at issue.
4. For greater certainty, the Registrant's obligation to comply with the proposed terms, conditions and limitations on his certificate of registration contained in paragraph 3 is not relieved by serving the entire suspension referred to in paragraph 2 above.
5. The Registrant shall pay the College's costs fixed in the amount of \$6,827.00 payable on a schedule determined by the Registrar.

College Counsel presented the Panel with a Brief of Authorities citing cases in support of the proposed penalty (College of Nurses of Ontario and MacDonald, 2017; Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Marangwanda, 2019; Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Goulard, 2020).

College Counsel submitted that seeking a reprimand is appropriate as it is common College practice as well as a remedial opportunity and a specific and general deterrent.

College Counsel submitted that a one-month suspension is lower than what the College has sought out in other matters because the Registrant's individual personal circumstances were an important factor in this case. College Counsel stated that a one-month suspension is appropriate in this matter and that it addresses both the public's confidence in the College's proceedings and protection of the public.

The College also submitted that terms, conditions, and limitations requiring the Registrant to complete the specified courses are necessary for the Registrant's remediation.

As part of the proposed Order, the College sought costs in the amount of \$6,827.00 to be paid on a schedule to be determined by the Registrar. Counsel noted the panel's jurisdiction to order costs pursuant to Section 53.1 of the Code and further stated that, pursuant to Rule 13.04(3) of the Discipline Committee's Rules of Procedure, evidence need not be tendered in support of an order for costs if the College is only seeking the costs in the amount of \$6,827.00 per day of hearing. College Counsel emphasized that this cost was not intended to punish the Registrant, but was a mechanism by which the College could recover some of the costs and expenses incurred in conducting a hearing.

#### **THE REGISTRANT'S SUBMISSIONS ON ORDER**

Mr. Ghoshal made submissions that he is not in agreement with the terms and costs due to his financial and personal circumstances. He stated that no costs should be ordered. He submitted that at the time of the events, he had been dealing with his own personal difficulties. He stated that his son had died in 2018 and that other family members died in succession shortly thereafter. He stated that he is currently in debt and does not have the ability of making any payments to undergo courses and/or training. As well, he stated that he is currently going through illness.

#### **DECISION ON ORDER**

Having considered the findings of professional misconduct, the relevant evidence and the submissions of the parties, the Panel made an order as follows:

1. Requiring the Registrant to appear before the panel of a discipline committee to be reprimanded as written by this discipline panel.
2. Directing the Registrar to suspend the Registrant's certificate of registration for a period of one month, on a date to be selected by the Registrar, which shall be not be required if the Registrant successfully completes the terms, conditions and limitations as set out in paragraph 3(a) and (3b) within four months of the date of this Order.
3. Directing the Registrar to immediately impose the following specified terms, conditions and limitations on the Registrant's certificate of registration, to be fulfilled at the Registrant's expense, to the satisfaction of the Registrar:

- a. Requiring the Registrant to successfully complete an ethics course pre-approved by the Registrar i.e., Probe within six months of the date of this Order;
  - b. Requiring the Registrant to successfully complete the College's Professional Practice & Jurisprudence (JRP) e-Learning Module, within six months of the date of this Order; and
  - c. Requiring the Registrant to meet with a clinical supervisor pre-approved by the Registrar on a monthly basis on at least twelve occasions within twelve (12) months of the date of this Order, to discuss ethics and boundaries and Safe and Effective Use of Self in relation to the conduct as well as all clinical practise matters.
4. For greater certainty, the Registrant's obligation to comply with the proposed terms, conditions and limitations on his certificate of registration contained in paragraph 3 is not relieved by serving the entire suspension referred to in paragraph 2 above.
  5. The Registrant shall pay the College's costs fixed in the amount of \$6,827.00 payable on a schedule determined by the Registrar.

#### **REASONS FOR DECISION ON ORDER**

The Panel carefully considered the College's Submissions on Order. It also considered the Registrant's Submissions on Order. The Panel recognizes the Registrant did admit to his actions as set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts, therefore sparing the College resources required for a contested hearing. However, he did not agree with the College's Counsel's submissions on penalty and costs. The panel considered the Registrant's stated personal circumstances he was going through at the time and his oral attempts to contextually defend his actions and plead with the Panel to not consider costs in their entirety. His submission was concerning for the Panel given the nature of the Registrant's admitted unprofessional conduct. His unwillingness to consider the costs of remediation and the hearing bring into question his sense of professional responsibility and accountability for his actions which required him to appear before the Panel. Given these concerns, the Panel believes that the order set out above satisfies the objectives of a discipline order of public protection, general and specific deterrence, remediation, and public confidence in the College's proceedings and that they are balanced to the misconduct committed by the Registrant. The penalty is also within a reasonable range, based on the case law presented by College Counsel.

The Panel finds that the Member's conduct warrants a reprimand as this will demonstrate to the public that the unprofessional conduct for which the Registrant appeared before the Panel will not be tolerated. As a specific deterrent, the reprimand will address the Registrant's specific actions that led to the Panel's decision.

The Panel finds that the ethics course, Professional Practice and Jurisprudence e-module and clinical supervision will address issues with respect to professional standards, and specifically ethics of working with couples in therapy, dual and multiple relationships, conflict of interest, and role confusion. Completion of this coursework will allow the Registrant to remediate his practise and support the College's mandate of public protection.

The Panel also considered College Counsel's submission of three monthly supervision sessions. Considering that the unprofessional conduct occurred with more than one client and over a significant period of time, the Panel felt that increasing the duration of supervision to twelve monthly supervision sessions would allow the Registrant sufficient opportunity to incorporate his learning from his coursework into his clinical practise and specifically with respect to this matter. Being able to reflect on his conduct that brought him before the Panel and remediate his practise will promote public confidence in the College's remediation efforts for its registrants.

The Panel carefully considered the issue of a suspension. While the Panel finds that a suspension is necessary to denunciate the Registrant's conduct and preserve public confidence it also recognizes the impact on client care and the financial impact for the Registrant as stated during his submissions on Order. The Panel accepts the College's submissions on Order to consider the Registrant's personal circumstances at the time of the misconduct. For these reasons, the Panel supports the College's submission to suspend the suspension if the Registrant completes the required terms, conditions and limitations within a four month period. The Panel believes that the completion of the required coursework and supervision will promote the Registrant's return to safe and ethical practise and preserve the public's confidence in the profession.

With respect to the costs order, the Panel is mindful that costs awarded are not intended to be punitive, but rather a mechanism to allow for the recovery of costs incurred by the College and its registrants at large. The Panel is in agreement that the costs sought are appropriate in this case.

**REPRIMAND**

Subsequent to the conclusion of the hearing and after the panel made its order as set out above, the Registrant signed an Undertaking dated November 21, 2021 to resign his membership in and certificate of registration with the CRPO and to never reapply for membership, registration, licensure or similar status with the CRPO. As such, the panel decided to issue the reprimand in writing rather than require the Registrant to attend in person. A copy of the written reprimand is attached at Schedule "A" of these reasons.

I, Shelley Briscoe-Dimock, sign this Decision and Reasons for the decision as Chairperson of this Discipline panel and on behalf of the Registrants of the Discipline panel as listed below:

Shelley Briscoe-Dimock, RP Chair, Discipline Panel

November 9, 2021

Kenneth Lomp, Professional Member  
Carol Cowan-Levine, Professional Member  
David Keast, Public Member  
Steven Boychyn, Public Member  
[7335193.1](#)

**Schedule "A"****Written Reprimand**

We, as a discipline committee panel, certainly appreciate how difficult it is for you to appear before the College today. The panel members have serious concerns about your actions that have brought your case before us. As a Registered Psychotherapist, you are required to uphold the standards of the profession. Through your actions, you have failed to do so and brought discredit to the profession and to yourself. Your conduct resulted in you blurring your roles on several occasions from personal to professional and forming dual and multiple relationships with your clients.

You explained your actions by stating that you did not believe you were entering into a psychotherapist-client relationship and did not keep records or require the clients to sign any forms. You admitted that you accepted payment from client #1 as a "gift" and from client #2 after each session. The panel believes that you ought to have known that you were acting in the role of a Registered Psychotherapist and that this role was assumed by your clients who sought your services and were advised by you of your regulated title.

The panel is concerned about your lack of judgment and insight into your conduct which resulted in the blurring of your roles from personal to professional, from family friend to counsellor, to spiritual guide, which would have confused your clients. To act in the role of a Registered Psychotherapist and guise it under another is dishonest. The panel is also concerned about your lack of acknowledgement of the seriousness of your conduct and your insistence to explain your actions. We are further concerned about your request to not consider financial costs in their entirety with respect to the Order and specifically all costs of remediation including College resources associated with the hearing.

Pleading to the panel brought into question your ability to accept responsibility for your actions which the panel decided required significant remediation efforts and demonstrates a lack of appreciation that acts of professional misconduct must have consequences. The panel strongly recommends that you engage in the required remediation to assist in reflecting on your practise and specifically the issues which brought you before the discipline panel today.

Your unprofessional and dishonourable actions have cast a shadow on the profession and bring into question your own integrity. We wish to make clear to you that, although the Order we imposed is appropriate in relation to our findings, a more significant Order will likely be imposed by another Discipline panel in the event that you are ever found to have engaged in further and/or similar professional misconduct.

Discipline Panel:

Shelley Briscoe-Dimock, Professional Member

Kenneth Lomp, Professional Member

Carol Cowan-Levine, Professional Member

David Keast, Public Member

Steven Boychyn, Public Member