

IN THE MATTER OF: *The Regulated Health Professions Act, C.C.S.M. c. R117*
(the “RHPA”)

AND IN THE MATTER OF: SARU CHAHAL, a member of the College of Paramedics of
Manitoba (the “College”)

AND IN THE MATTER OF: A professional conduct inquiry before an Inquiry Committee Panel
of the College pursuant to Part 8 of the RHPA

DECISION AND REASONS

The College of Paramedics of Manitoba
610 – 1445 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, MB R3G 3P4

4. The initial return date for the hearing was adjourned based on the Registrant's Waiver signed June 13, 2024. A subsequent return date, as agreed by all parties, was set for December 19, 2025
5. On December 19, 2025, the Panel held a hearing with respect to the charges.
6. At the commencement of the hearing, counsel for the Complaints Investigation Committee (the "CIC"), Ms. Schade, requested an Order, pursuant to subsection 122(2)(b) of *The Regulated Health Professions Act, C.C.S.M., c.R117* (the "RHPA"), that the names of the complainants are only to be published by reference to their initials. The Registrant's counsel, Mr. Bartel, consented. The Order was granted as the Panel was satisfied that, in light of the nature of the concerns identified in the complaints, it was desirable that there not be public disclosure of the complainants' names.
7. It was established that the Amended Notice of Hearing dated December 11, 2025 (the "Amended Notice"), had been properly served and the jurisdictional requirements set forth in subsections 102(3), 116(2), and 116(4) of the RHPA had been met.
8. The parties raised no objections to the composition of the Panel.
9. The parties agreed on a number of matters and filed an Agreed Statement of Facts (the "ASF") as an exhibit to the proceedings.
10. The ASF explicitly provides that where there are conflicting versions of events it is open to the Panel to make a determination on which version to accept, and to consider any additional evidence which either party may adduce, in order to make a finding.
11. The Amended Notice alleged that the Registrant has breached the College's *Code of Ethics* (the "Code of Ethics"), the *Standards of Practice for the Paramedic Profession* (the "Standards"), the College's *Practice Direction on Registrant and Employer Responsibilities* (the "Practice Direction"), the College's *Practice Expectation: Social Media/Social Networking* (the "Practice Expectation") and is guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a member.
12. The Registrant indicated their intention to enter a plea of guilty to all counts in the Amended Notice (the "Charges").

II. Plea

13. At the direction of the Chair, counsel to the Panel conducted a plea inquiry. The Panel was satisfied that the Registrant: was voluntarily pleading guilty; understood that by pleading guilty: they gave up the right to contest the factual accuracy of the allegations made against them in the Charges; acknowledged the breaches alleged in the Charges and that they constituted professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a member; and that even though a joint recommendation may be made with respect to the appropriate sanction, subject to the law applying to joint recommendations, the Panel is not bound to follow the joint recommendation, and that the Panel will determine the appropriate penalty after considering the evidence and the submissions of counsel.

14. The Registrant entered a plea of guilty to the Charges and admitted that they breached the Code of Ethics, the Standards, the Practice Direction, and the Practice Expectation, and is guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a member.

III. Joint Recommendation

15. The parties requested that the Panel resolve the Charges on the following basis:
- (a) The Registrant be issued a reprimand;
 - (b) The Decision and Reasons of the Panel will be published and made available to the public;
 - (c) The Registrant will complete the following remedial education courses within three months of the date of the Decision and Reasons, with any costs associated with these courses to be borne entirely by the Registrant:
 - (i) “Professionalism in Paramedicine” at <https://www.jcollinsconsulting.com/index.php/coursesmodules/paramedic>; and
 - (ii) The module “pause before you post” on the College’s website: <https://collegeparamb.ca/professional-practice/program-for-continuing-competency/lms-training/>
 - (d) The Registrant will pay the costs of the investigation and hearing in the amount of \$6,000.00.

(collectively, the “Joint Recommendation”)

16. The Panel heard submissions from Ms. Schade and Mr. Bartel in support of the Joint Recommendation.
17. The Panel accepted the Joint Recommendation on December 19, 2025 and advised it would issue a written Decision and Reasons. These are those reasons.

IV. Facts

18. The Registrant has been working as a Primary Care Paramedic for the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service since 2013. They have been a member of the College since the College came into force on December 1, 2020, and are therefore subject to the College’s standards and processes as set out in the RHPA and Regulations.
19. In 2021, a complaint was made to the College by a former patient of the Registrant, alleging they displayed a lack of empathy and compassion. The Registrant signed an Undertaking with the College dated May 20, 2022, whereby they agreed to complete empathy training and written exercises. The CIC provided a letter of guidance to the Registrant outlining the CIC’s concern that the Registrant’s written responses demonstrated an inability to apply their learnings to the specific complaint and reminded the Registrant of their obligations pursuant to the Code of Ethics.
20. The Registrant has no formal discipline history with the College.
21. In 2023, the College received two separate complaints about the Registrant’s conduct.

22. On or about November 3, 2023, the College received a detailed complaint from a complainant (“Complainant #1”) with respect to the Registrant’s public and personal Instagram account with the handle “@thedappersikh” (the “Instagram Account”).

23. This complaint set out that:

- (a) Complainant #1 was not a patient of the Registrant, but was a member of the public and a member of the Jewish community;
- (b) On October 7, 2023, the terrorist group Hamas invaded Israel;
- (c) Since on or around October 7, 2023, Complainant #1 observed the Registrant’s Instagram Account, which indicated the Registrant’s name and contained the Registrant’s profile picture;
- (d) At the time of the complaint, the Instagram Account did not have any privacy settings, and was accessible to any member of the public;
- (e) Complainant #1 provided various screenshots of posts and stories from the Instagram Account since October 7, 2023 which show, among other things:
 - (i) Reference to Hamas as “resistance fighters”;
 - (ii) Text that states “I will never condemn Hamas. They are fighting for the Palestinians whether you want to believe that or not.”;
 - (iii) A photo of the Registrant attending a rally outside the Manitoba legislature on October 18, 2023;
 - (iv) A post that included the statement that Israelis have “hatred embedded in their DNA since birth”;
 - (v) A post depicting a damaged Palestinian medic vehicle, with a caption that states:
 - 1. “Going to work these last 3 weeks has been really hard. It’s been difficult enough to concentrate on the most mundane tasks right now as it is”; and
 - 2. “While driving I’ve missed streets or hospitals I should be turning into. My partners try to talk to me but my mind is somewhere else and I don’t hear them”;(the “Medic Post”); and
 - (vi) An image depicting military action where a Star of David is overlaid with a swastika.

24. Complainant #1 maintained that the Registrant’s social media posts connected the Registrant to their professional designation as a paramedic regulated by the College.

25. From their periodic monitoring of the Registrant’s Instagram Account, Complainant #1 stated that the Registrant made the Instagram Account private upon being notified of the complaint submitted to the College.

26. On or about November 16, 2023, the College received another detailed complaint from a second complainant (“Complainant #2”) with respect to the Registrant’s Instagram Account.

27. Complainant #2 stated:

- (a) The Registrant had been posting antisemitic hate speech, misinformation, bias, anti-Israel propaganda and inciting hate against Jewish people and the Jewish community;
- (b) The content the Registrant was sharing is dangerous, divisive and false and the Registrant had been posting information that is dangerous to the Jewish community and is pure propaganda that incites hate against the Jewish people;
- (c) As a paramedic, the Registrant has to follow a code of ethics, and a code of conduct, which the Registrant had violated by their behaviour online and in the community; and
- (d) Any member of the public and future patient who is a minority should be concerned for their safety to be in the care of the Registrant as they have not been hiding their undoubted bias, hate, and antisemitism.

28. The Registrant admits that the Instagram Account is their personal account and that they posted the social media posts at issue to the Instagram Account.

29. The Registrant acknowledged that, by the caption referred to on the Medic Post, specifically with respect to “hospitals”, “partners”, and “driving”, it was discernible that they were a paramedic.

30. Shortly after posting the Medic Post, the Registrant recognized and understood this was not appropriate, and removed the post within 24 hours of it being posted.

31. The Registrant admitted that the content of the Medic Post, specifically the expressions of being distracted, that they have “missed streets and hospitals”, and that they cannot focus when their partners are talking to them, could create a perception with certain members of the public that they were unfit to practice, which itself can also raise concerns about patient safety and the Registrant’s professional practice.

32. The Registrant stated that they understood how some of the social media posts could be perceived negatively by members of the general public, which could in turn negatively impact the College and have a negative impact on the profession.

33. On January 15, 2024, the Registrant was interviewed by the appointed College investigator.

34. On February 22, 2024, the appointed investigator completed their Investigation Report and provided it to the Registrant on or about February 27, 2024.

35. On April 5, 2024, the Registrant provided a written response to the Investigation Report which indicated, among other things:

I take this complaint very seriously and accept that some of my posts included strong wording on the current issues that may have caused confusion and alarm to some members of the public. If it was not clear in my interview with the Investigator or in my [original response], I wish to make it clear now that I take full responsibility for my posts and understand some disciplinary action will be

taken by the College. My hope is that I have at the very least made my views clear, in that my posts were not religious or culturally motivated and I hold no biases towards Jewish people or any minority group.

36. The Registrant admitted that, from the complainants' perspectives, the posts were insensitive, derogatory, and hostile to those members of the public who identify as Jewish, Israeli, or those who appear sympathetic to those who are Jewish or Israeli; that the posts had the potential to cause distress for such individuals; and that the posts could have been perceived in such a way by members of the public other than the Complainants who viewed the posts.

37. The Registrant admitted that by making these public social media posts, they have displayed a lack of respect and understanding for a subset of the population, demonstrated behaviour and conduct that is unbecoming of a member of the College, and constitutes professional misconduct.

V. Position of the Parties

V.1 Submission of the CIC

38. Counsel for the CIC submitted that the facts, along with the Registrant's admissions, demonstrate that the Registrant has contravened the Code of Ethics, the Standards, the Practice Direction, and the Practice Expectation, and is guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a member. Ms. Schade asked the Panel to make these findings.

39. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the applicable provisions of the Code of Ethics:

It is the responsibility of all paramedics in Manitoba to understand and comply with the code of ethics and be accountable, regardless of roles or practice settings...

A paramedic must comply with the Code of Ethics as amended by council from time to time. Any paramedic in contravention of the Act, regulation, by-laws, code of ethics, standards or practice directions is subject to the investigation and complaints process as set out in the Act...

Responsibility to the Patient and Others

The paramedic must:

- Practice in accordance with the scope of practice, standards of practice, and reserved acts as specified by regulation and the College of Paramedics of Manitoba Standards of Practice...

Responsibility to the Profession

The paramedic must:

Practice in accordance with The Regulated Health Professions Act, College of Paramedics of Manitoba General Regulation, the Practice of Paramedicine Regulation, and other relevant legislation...

Responsibility to Self

The paramedic must:

Maintain and demonstrate professional accountability, integrity, good character and reputation...

40. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the applicable provisions of the Standards:

Compliance with standards of practice is required; these expectations also serve as a legal reference to describe reasonable and prudent paramedic practice.

It is the responsibility of all paramedics in Manitoba to understand and comply with all standards of practice and be accountable, regardless of roles or practice settings.

A paramedic must comply with the Standards of Practice for the Paramedic Profession as amended by council from time to time. Any paramedic in contravention with the act, regulation, by-laws, code of ethics, standards or practice directions is subject to the investigations and complaints process as set out in the Act.

Professionalism

Paramedics demonstrate accountability for professional practice by:

5. Ensuring knowledge of relevant legislation, regulations, code of ethics, standards of practice and understanding how to interpret and apply them to your practice of paramedicine.

41. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the applicable provision of the College's Practice Direction:

Professional Conduct

The College measures a paramedic's practice against what would be expected from a competent paramedic within the same sub-register, with similar practice background and experience. Practice expectations, reserved acts, standards of care, and the code of ethics provide a guide by which to determine if the paramedic is demonstrating, or not completely demonstrating standards, ethical values and competencies.

42. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the entirety of the Practice Expectation which sets out the boundaries to which registrants must adhere while utilizing social media and social networking sites.

43. Ms. Schade directed the Panel to a frequently cited definition of professional misconduct in the decision of *Davidson v. Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario*, 1925 CarswellOnt 254, where the Ontario Court of Appeal stated that:

If it is shown that a member of the college in pursuit of their profession has done something with respect to which it would be reasonably regarded as improper by their professional colleagues of good repute and competency, then it is open to the board of directors of the college to decide that they have been guilty of improper conduct in a professional respect.

44. With respect to the charge of conduct unbecoming of a member, counsel noted the December 11, 2023 Law Society of Manitoba Discipline Committee decision in the matter of Ryan William Fawcett (“*Fawcett*”) at paragraphs 24-27, which sets out criteria for behaviour that would constitute conduct unbecoming:

In order for the personal or private conduct to amount to conduct unbecoming, it must tend to bring discredit upon the profession.

Integrity is the fundamental quality of any person who seeks to practice as a member of the legal profession. If personal integrity is lacking, the usefulness of the lawyer to the client and reputation within the profession will be destroyed regardless of how competent the lawyer may be.

Dishonourable or questionable conduct on the part of a lawyer in either private life or professional practice will reflect adversely upon the integrity of the profession. Whether within or outside the professional sphere, if the conduct is such that knowledge of it would be likely to impair the trust of the client in the lawyer, the Society may be justified in taking disciplinary action.

45. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to its legislative authority to issue an Order containing the components of the Joint Recommendation (subsections 124(2), 126(1), 127(1), and 129(1) of the RHPA) and urged the Panel to accept the proposed disposition.

46. Citing James T. Casey’s text, the *Regulation of Professions in Canada*, counsel submitted that sentencing principles in regulated professions are well-established and that regulatory bodies such as the College require that this Panel’s disposition must, to the extent possible, consider the following principles in determining an appropriate penalty:

- (a) Adequately provide for specific deterrence of the member;
- (b) Adequately provide for general deterrence to dissuade members of the profession from partaking in similar conduct;
- (c) Serve as a denunciation of the misconduct;
- (d) Serve as a punishment to the member;
- (e) Recognize and provide for the potential rehabilitation of the member;
and
- (f) The need to maintain the public’s confidence in the integrity of a profession’s ability to properly supervise the conduct of its members.

47. Counsel pointed out that the parties’ Joint Recommendation achieves each of the main principles of sentencing, including denunciation, punishment, and specific deterrence for the Registrant, while also addressing the principle of general deterrence to dissuade other members from committing similar acts.

48. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the factors set out in *Jaswal v. Medical Board (Nfld.)*, 1996 CanLII 11630 (NL SC) (“*Jaswal*”) to determine whether a proposed sentence is appropriate in the circumstances, including:

- (a) the nature and gravity of the proven allegations;

- (b) the age and experience of the offending [professional];
- (c) the previous character of the [professional] and in particular the presence or absence of any prior complaints or convictions;
- (d) the role of the [professional] in acknowledging what had occurred;
- (e) whether the offending [professional] had already suffered other serious financial or other penalties as a result of the allegations having been made;
- (f) the presence or absence of any mitigating circumstances;
- (g) the need to promote specific and general deterrence and, thereby, to protect the public and ensure the safe and proper practice of [the regulated profession];
- (h) the need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the [regulated] profession;
- (i) the degree to which the offensive conduct that was found to have occurred was clearly regarded, by consensus, as being the type of conduct that would fall outside the range of permitted conduct; and
- (j) the range of sentence in other similar cases.

49. Counsel for the CIC submitted these factors applied to the Registrant in the following ways:

- (a) Nature and gravity of the proven allegations: The posts at issue were perceived as insensitive, derogatory and hostile towards certain members of the public, demonstrating a lack of respect and understanding. The posts were serious enough to cause distress and ultimately warrant two separate complaints to be brought forward by members of the Jewish community who saw these posts. The posts also had the effect of impairing the Complainants', and potentially the more general public's, confidence in the profession. The conduct at issue is therefore serious and should be treated as such. Notwithstanding, there is no indication that any patient care provided is at issue;
- (b) Age and experience of the offending [professional]: The Registrant has been a licensed and registered paramedic for 13 years. They have been a member of the College since the College came into force on December 1, 2020;
- (c) Previous character and past complaints: In 2021, a complaint was made to the College by a former patient of the Registrant, alleging that they displayed a lack of empathy and compassion. The Registrant signed an Undertaking with the College, whereby they agreed to complete empathy training and written exercises. The CIC provided a letter of guidance indicating that the Registrant demonstrated an inability to apply their learnings to the specific complaint, and reminded the Registrant of their obligations pursuant to the Code of Ethics. No discipline flowed from this event;
- (d) The role of the [professional] in acknowledging what had occurred: The Registrant has acknowledged that their conduct was not in accordance with the standards prescribed by the profession and has pleaded guilty to the charges;

- (e) Whether the offending [professional] has suffered financial or other penalties as a result of the allegations: As of the hearing date, the Registrant had not suffered any other penalties as a result of the allegations. However, the penalties if imposed, specifically publication along with costs, are not insignificant;
- (f) Whether there are mitigating circumstances: The Registrant has taken accountability and accepted responsibility for the content of the posts and how they were perceived by the complainants, and how they could be perceived by other members of the public. The Registrant acknowledged their faults and has pleaded guilty to the charges, saving the parties and the Panel time and costs of a discipline hearing;
- (g) The need to promote specific and general deterrence and to protect the public: There is a need to deter the Registrant from engaging in the same conduct in the future. There is also a pressing need to send a message to other members that conduct such as this will be investigated, reviewed, and punished if it rises to the same level;
- (h) The need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the profession: The publication of the Decision and Reasons will demonstrate that the College is prepared to and does consider unacceptable social media conduct such as this a serious matter that warrants investigation and discipline, and that the College has fulfilled its regulatory mandate by taking these issues seriously; and
- (i) The degree to which the impugned conduct fell outside the range of permitted conduct: The charges relate to professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming of a member and therefore fall well outside the range of permitted conduct.

50. With respect to the range of sentences in previous decisions, the College submits that the Joint Recommendation is in line with past decisions involving health care professionals and their professional duties.

51. Ms. Schade submitted that, while there is no case that is directly analogous to the facts at issue in this matter, the Joint Recommendation is in line with penalties that have been imposed in past, similar cases.

52. In *College of Registered Nurses of Alberta Re: Conduct of Tina Fodor*, a decision of the Hearing Tribunal dated June 10, 2022, the nurse was charged with, among other things, inappropriately expressing personal opinions about Indigenous persons in the presence of patients, which caused lasting emotional distress to an Indigenous patient. The registrant accepted responsibility for the statements made in her testimony and expressed regret for stating personal opinions while providing nursing services. The Hearing Tribunal found that the registrant breached the Code of Ethics, and the conduct was "clear and serious" such that it constituted unprofessional conduct. The Hearing Tribunal also commented that:

The Hearing Tribunal also considered that the Registrant apologized during the hearing and stated how she would do things differently proceeding forward. However, this does not excuse the Registrant making those comments at the time. The Registrant should have recognized at the time that the comments were not appropriate. Such comments erode the trust a patient would have towards nurses.

53. The Hearing Tribunal ultimately ordered that the registrant receive: (a) a reprimand for unprofessional conduct; (b) the registrant was ordered to complete courses on boundaries, communication, and documentation; (c) a fine of \$1,000.00; and (d) the registrant was to pay costs for the hearing in the amount of \$5,000.00.

54. In *Kempling v. British Columbia College of Teachers*, 2005 BCCA 327, a teacher was cited for professional misconduct arising out of an article and letters to the editor he wrote expressing his views on homosexuality, which were published in a local newspaper, in which he associated homosexuals with immorality, abnormality, perversion and promiscuity. The citation was heard by a Hearing Panel of the Disciplinary Committee of the British Columbia College of Teachers, and it concluded the teacher was guilty of conduct unbecoming of a member. Mr. Kempling chose not to appear at the disciplinary hearing. The Panel concluded that the following penalty should be ordered: (a) a suspension for one month; (b) that notice of such be given to various licensing authorities; and (c) that his name and a summary of the case be published. These findings were upheld on appeal.

55. In their reasons for decision, the British Columbia Court of Appeal noted:

[45] These statements demonstrated that Mr. Kempling is committed to fulfilling his public and professional responsibilities in an intolerant and discriminatory manner. Proof that he had actually discriminated against a particular student, or evidence of a poisoned school environment, was not required to prove that the school system had sustained harm. Mr. Kempling's statements damaged the integrity of the school system as a whole. They undermined the core value of non-discrimination by denying homosexual students an education environment accepting of them.

[46] In the result, I consider that there was sufficient evidence to support a finding that Mr. Kempling's off-duty statements caused harm to the integrity of the school system. Accordingly, subject only to the *Charter* considerations Mr. Kempling raises, the Panel's findings of conduct unbecoming was reasonable and was properly upheld.

56. Counsel for the CIC reviewed the applicable case law with respect to joint submissions and submitted that if the prosecution and defence are jointly submitting a consequence or penalty, the decision maker must accept that joint submission unless it would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

57. Ms. Schade referred the Panel to the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Anthony-Cook v. Her Majesty the Queen*, 2016 SCC 43, ("*Anthony-Cook*") which describes the "public-interest test" which a discipline panel must apply when considering a joint submission made by the prosecution and defence. The Supreme Court stated at paragraph 32 that a trial judge "should not depart from a joint submission on sentence 'unless the proposed sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest.'" Moreover, for a joint submission to bring the administration of justice into disrepute, it must be "so markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the case that they would view it as a breakdown in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system." (paragraph 33).

58. The Supreme Court, at paragraph 34, elaborated that a rejection of a joint submission should only occur if the submission is "so unhinged from the circumstances of the offence and the offender that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the justice system had broken down."

59. Counsel noted that regulatory bodies in various jurisdictions and circumstances have accepted that the *Anthony-Cook* requirements apply to them and often cite this case when presented with a joint recommendation from the parties in this jurisdiction and others (*Re Pillay (College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba)*).

60. Ms. Schade emphasized that joint recommendations are an important aspect of the disciplinary process and should be encouraged rather than ignored. This was a point made by the Saskatchewan Court

of Queen's Bench (as it then was) in *Pankiw v. Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan*, 2009 SKQB 268 at paragraph 34:

Joint submissions are to be encouraged, not ignored. If joint submissions are ignored, plea bargains such as occurred here will be much less likely to occur. Lengthy discipline hearings and increased costs to be borne initially by members of the profession and perhaps ultimately by the public they serve will result. Joint submissions are in the public interest and should be followed by administrative tribunals in the same fashion as is done by the Courts unless it can be clearly demonstrated they are unfit, unreasonable or contrary to the public interest.

61. Counsel acknowledged that the Registrant cooperated with the College in reaching this agreement and submitted that this outcome will both meet the need to promote public confidence and encourage members to address regulatory issues in a cooperative manner. She specifically noted that the Registrant acknowledged the seriousness of the concerns.

62. Further, counsel for the CIC argued that the Joint Recommendation illustrates the College's denunciation of the Registrant's misconduct, which will provide specific deterrence to the Registrant, as well as general deterrence to other paramedics from engaging in similar misconduct.

63. Taken together, Ms. Schade submitted that the elements of the Joint Recommendation will illustrate to the public that the College strives to uphold the highest standards of practice in the practice of paramedicine, and that steps will be taken to disclose and redress wrongs that have affected the community. She therefore requested that the Panel accept the Joint Recommendation.

V.2 Submission of the Registrant

64. Counsel for the Registrant agreed with and adopted both the CIC's statements with respect to the legal principles applicable to this case and its description of the facts relating to the Registrant's social media activity.

65. Mr. Bartel submitted that, considering the applicable legal principles, the ASF contains evidence which provides the necessary foundation for the Panel to accept the Joint Recommendation.

66. Counsel pointed to the Registrant's admissions of not only the facts but also that their conduct constituted a breach of the College's Code of Ethics, the Standards, the Practice Direction, and the Practice Expectation, and that they were guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a member.

67. The Registrant read out a statement to the Panel at the hearing:

As a healthcare worker, my commitment has always been—and will always remain—in the belief that healthcare is a human right, and that every human life holds equal and immeasurable value. As is likely evident from the material in front of you, I am also a strong, and passionate advocate for the people of Palestine, and I am deeply affected by the injustices taking place there, which we see on the news everyday. At the same time, I recognize that as a paramedic regulated by this College, I have a responsibility to remain mindful of differing perspectives, including those that do not align with my own. I acknowledge that there were instances in which I did not meet that standard, and I take responsibility for those moments.

I have learned from this experience. Emotions were very high at that time. I have and will continue to be more mindful of how and what I present to the world as I understand my responsibilities to my profession, to myself, and my standard of practice as a paramedic.

68. Mr. Bartel asserted that there were mitigating factors in favour of the Registrant that the Panel ought to consider in determining whether to accept the Joint Recommendation:

- (a) Their admission that they could be identified as a paramedic by their posts;
- (b) The Registrant recognized and understood the “Medic Post” was not appropriate, and removed the post within 24 hours of it being posted;
- (c) The Registrant accepted responsibility for the words they used and how the information was presented;
- (d) The Registrant reflected on how some of their posts could be interpreted, specifically on social media where context and nuance is lost. The Registrant learned from this incident and going forward, is prepared to assure the College, they would be more diligent, and ensure they consider not only their intention when posting, but also the potential impact of the posts and how they may be viewed and interpreted by the public;
- (e) The Registrant understood that their role as a paramedic requires careful consideration regarding personal and professional conduct on social media. Upon reflection, they understood how some of their social media posts could be considered by members of the public which could in turn negatively impact the reputation of the College. This was never the Registrant’s intention;
- (f) The Registrant has already taken and would continue to take steps to ensure that any future posts will be undertaken with careful reflection;
- (g) A willingness on the Registrant’s part to engage in training in the areas of racial sensitivity or appropriate social media practices;
- (h) The Registrant accepted responsibility for creating any “misperception” of their views;
- (i) The Registrant cooperated in the complaint investigation process, demonstrating acceptance of the College’s regulatory function;
- (j) The Registrant has no disciplinary history; and
- (k) The Registrant has pleaded guilty to the Charges which demonstrates their acceptance of responsibility for their actions and has saved the time and expense of proceeding with a contested hearing and the need for the complainants to testify in a contested hearing before the Panel.

69. With reference to the applicable sentencing principles, counsel for the Registrant submitted that the Joint Recommendation serves the purposes of:

- (a) Specific deterrence to the Registrant: The Registrant has acknowledged that they must be more mindful of how their social media posts can affect others, and only post in a manner that is consistent with professional standards. The terms of the Joint Recommendation confirm for the Registrant that there are serious consequences if they fail to do so;
- (b) General deterrence to the profession: The Joint Recommendation will demonstrate to the College’s members that there can be serious consequences that flow from improper social media usage, thus deterring such conduct;

- (c) Denunciation: By imposing the Joint Recommendation, the Panel will adequately inform the profession and the public that such improper social media usage will not be tolerated by the College;
- (d) Punishment: As a result of the Joint Recommendation, the Registrant will have a formal disciplinary entry on their registration, which is significant;
- (e) Rehabilitation: A component of the Joint Recommendation is remedial education, which will support the Registrant in avoiding a repeat of the misconduct which led to the complaints in this case; and
- (f) Maintaining the integrity of the profession: The Joint Recommendation will demonstrate to the profession and the public that the College is exercising its function as the regulatory body for paramedics in Manitoba, which serves to maintain the integrity of the profession.

70. Mr. Bartel stated that the Joint Recommendation is in line with penalties that have been imposed by other regulatory bodies in similar cases, where the conduct at issue involved public expressions that breached professional standards. Counsel also directed the Panel to *Re, Hodkinson*, 2025 CarswellAlta 758, [2025] A.W.L.D. 1804 (“*Hodkinson*”), a decision from a Hearing Tribunal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta.

71. In *Hodkinson*, the conduct in that case involved statements by a physician during the COVID-19 pandemic which ran afoul of their professional standards. The penalty imposed in that case was a caution, a requirement that the member complete remedial training, and costs in the amount of \$5,000. Mr. Bartel noted that the tribunal in *Hodkinson* (at paragraph 75) also adopted the “public interest test” for joint recommendations.

72. Counsel submitted that the Joint Recommendation ought to be accepted by the Panel as it achieves the purposes of sentencing in professional discipline cases, and accordingly, serves to protect the public interest.

VI. Analysis and Decision

73. Subsection 124(1) of the RHPA authorizes the Panel to make any finding permitted under subsection 124(2) which includes that an investigated member has contravened the RHPA, a regulation, standard of practice or practice direction or code of ethics or is guilty of professional misconduct or of conduct unbecoming a member.

74. The authority of a Panel to make sentencing orders, and orders related to costs are found in sections 126 and 127 of the RHPA.

75. The parties have agreed and the Panel finds that the Registrant has contravened the College’s Code of Ethics, the Standards, the Practice Direction, and the Practice Expectation, and is guilty of professional misconduct and conduct unbecoming a paramedic.

76. The Registrant’s admissions with respect to their inappropriate use of social media clearly demonstrate conduct which would “reasonably be regarded as improper by their professional colleagues of good repute and competency”.

77. The Panel accepts that the Registrant's conduct was a marked departure from the conduct expected of a paramedic and constitutes professional misconduct, conduct unbecoming a paramedic, and a breach of, amongst others, the specific provisions of the Practice Expectation:

While social media and social networking can be beneficial to paramedical practice, there may be instances where personal posts and online communication can become a professional concern. Whenever making a post or comment online, you should be aware of protection of privacy and confidentiality towards clients and upholding the integrity and image of the profession of paramedicine...

Regardless of employer social media policy, [the College] will consider situations that fall outside the practice area if a paramedic's conduct reflects badly on the profession and denigrates the public's confidence in the profession...

Listed below is a non-exhaustive list of posts that could result in investigation by [the College]:

...

Any post that is interpreted as a breach of the Code of Ethics, Standards of Practice, Practice Directions or Practice Expectations. (emphasis added)

78. The *Practice Expectation* codifies the limits on any registrant's use of social media and the Registrant is subject to its provisions, assessed on a case-by-case basis. This case exemplifies its importance.

79. The Panel finds that much of the Registrant's social media postings and re-postings contained content that was insensitive, derogatory, and hostile to those members of the public who identify as Jewish, Israeli, or those who appear sympathetic to those who are Jewish or Israeli; and had the potential to cause distress for such individuals.

80. One of the Registrant's posts stated "The Zionists are the Nazis". Another post referred to Israelis as having "hatred [for Palestinians] "embedded in their DNA since birth". At least one of their repostings superimposed a Star of David over a swastika.

81. These posts in particular could reasonably be interpreted as hate-based. This would not have been a "misperception" on the part of the complainants.

82. The Panel emphasizes that their findings in this regard are not limited to the perspectives of the complainants but to the members of the public at large.

83. The Registrant admitted that by making these public social media posts, they have displayed a lack of respect and understanding for a subset of the population, demonstrated behaviour and conduct that is unbecoming of a member of the College, and constitutes professional misconduct.

84. The Registrant showed a lack of professional judgment by disseminating offensive comments through their use of social media and their conduct was entirely unacceptable.

85. To be clear, the Panel takes no issue with the Registrant's right to their opinions and beliefs, their freedom of expression, their right to attend rallies, to be engaged in social activism, or to be an advocate for a cause. However, by choosing to be a registrant of the College, the Registrant is obligated to adhere to ethical and professional standards and therefore does not have an unlimited license to express themselves on social media when they self-identify as registrants and such expression reflects badly on the profession and denigrates the public's confidence in the profession. This is precisely what occurred here and it is admitted by the Registrant.

86. Further, the Panel finds that the content of the Medic Post, specifically the expressions of the Registrant being distracted, that they have “missed streets and hospitals”, and that they cannot focus when their partners are talking to them, created a perception with the public that they were unfit to practice, and raised concerns about patient safety and the Registrant’s professional practice.

87. Following the reasoning in paragraphs 24-27 of the *Fawcett* case relied upon by the CIC, the Panel was of the view that the Registrant identifying themselves as a paramedic while posting many of the posts directly affected the public’s trust and confidence in, and regard for, the profession as a whole and discredited the profession of paramedicine.

88. In determining whether the Joint Recommendation was appropriate, the Panel considered both the aggravating and mitigating factors related to the Registrant and their misconduct.

89. The Panel noted the insensitive, derogatory, and hostile content of many of the Registrant’s posts and re-postings which were directed at Israelis and the Jewish community or those who appear sympathetic to those who are Israeli or Jewish as a specific aggravating factor. It is to be denounced unequivocally.

90. With the exception of the reference to the Registrant cooperating with the complaint investigation process (which is an obligation and not a mitigating factor), the Panel accepts the other mitigating factors noted by the Registrant’s counsel (paragraph 68 above). The Panel specifically noted the Registrant’s willingness to acknowledge the impropriety of their conduct and to plead guilty to the Charges.

91. The Panel is satisfied that the Joint Recommendation is consistent with those imposed on health care professionals in other similar cases.

92. The Panel has also taken into consideration the benefits to these specific parties and to the conduct process as a whole of a joint recommendation whereby the parties have each compromised their positions in a reasonable manner to achieve a proportionate and cost-efficient outcome which avoids a lengthy contested hearing.

93. In reaching its decision with respect to the Joint Recommendation, the Panel acknowledges the submissions of counsel to the CIC and counsel for the Registrant and was mindful of the objectives of such orders which have been articulated by various authorities.

94. In Casey’s *The Regulation of Professions in Canada*, the author describes the purpose of sentencing in professional discipline cases, citing *McKee v. College of Psychologists (British Columbia)*, [1994] 9 W.W.R. 374 (at page 376):

[W]here the legislature has entrusted the disciplinary process to a self-governing professional body, the legislative purpose is regulation of the profession in the public interest. The emphasis must clearly be upon the protection of the public interest...

95. On balance, the Panel is satisfied that the Joint Recommendation properly addresses and protects the public interest and achieves the purpose of:

- (a) providing specific deterrence to the Registrant from engaging in the same conduct;
- (b) providing general deterrence to all paramedics that this type of conduct will be investigated, reviewed, and punished; and
- (c) reassuring the public that the College is working to maintain standards and ensure continued trust in paramedics and the practice of paramedicine.

VII. Order

96. The Panel has therefore accepted the Joint Recommendation, and an Order will issue as follows:
- (a) The Registrant will be issued a reprimand;
 - (b) The Decision and Reasons of the Panel will be published and made available to the public;
 - (c) The Registrant will complete the following remedial education courses within three months of the date of the Decision and Reasons, with any costs associated with these courses to be borne entirely by the Registrant:
 - (i) “Professionalism in Paramedicine” at <https://www.jcollinsconsulting.com/index.php/coursesmodules/paramedic>; and
 - (ii) The module “pause before you post” on the College website: <https://collegeparamb.ca/professional-practice/program-for-continuing-competency/lms-training/>; and
 - (d) The Registrant will pay costs of the investigation and the hearing in the amount of \$6,000.00.

Dated at Winnipeg, Manitoba this 25th day of February, 2026.

Signed by:

Cory Parrott

1D46B5CAD9E349E

Cory Parrott (Chair/Member)

Signed by:

Michael Foote

997096E08C6549B

Michael Foote (Public Representative)

Signed by:

Janice Johnson

08F0A89703A5469

Janice Johnson (Member)

Signed by:

Cathy Kirby

7847D0522BC3428

Cathy Kozminski-Kirby (Member)

Signed by:

Kevin Toyne

3E0E9C901A84413

Kevin Toyne (Public Representative)