

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS OF ALBERTA

IN THE MATTER OF
A HEARING UNDER THE *HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACT*,
RSA 2000, c. H-7

AND IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING
THE CONDUCT OF DR. PETER IGLINSKI

**DECISION OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL OF
THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS
& SURGEONS OF ALBERTA
January 21, 2026**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Hearing Tribunal held a hearing into the conduct of Dr. Peter Iglinski on September 4, 2025. The members of the Hearing Tribunal were:

Dr. Goldees Liaghati-Nasseri as Chair;

Dr. Dennis Kunimoto;

Ms. Barbara Boyer (public member);

Mr. Peter Sherstan (public member).

2. Mr. Gregory Sim acted as independent legal counsel for the Hearing Tribunal.

3. The following persons were also in attendance:

Mr. Amin Ben Khaled, legal counsel for the Complaints Director.

4. Dr. Peter Iglinski did not attend the hearing.

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

5. There were no objections to the composition of the Hearing Tribunal or its jurisdiction to proceed with the hearing.
6. The hearing was open to the public pursuant to section 78 of the *Health Professions Act*, RSA 2000, c H-7 (HPA). There was no application to close the hearing.
7. Noting that Dr. Iglinski was not present, counsel for the Complaints Director applied to proceed with the hearing in Dr. Iglinski's absence.
8. Although section 72(1) of the HPA requires an investigated member to attend the hearing, section 79(6) grants the Hearing Tribunal the authority to proceed with the hearing in the investigated member's absence if there is proof the investigated member has been given a notice to attend the hearing in accordance with the HPA.
9. Section 120(3) of the HPA stipulates that a notice may be given to an investigated member by sending it via certified or registered mail to the address listed on the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta (CPSA) Register.
10. In support of the Complaints Director's application to proceed in Dr. Iglinski's absence, the Complaints Director relied on a statutory declaration by J [REDACTED] W [REDACTED], Hearings Coordinator for the CPSA (Exhibit 1). In her statutory declaration, Ms. W [REDACTED] confirmed the steps taken to notify Dr. Iglinski of this hearing, after a hearing was requested on March 26, 2025 (Exhibit 1A). These steps included the following:

- A letter sent by Ms. W■■■■ to Dr. Iglinski on May 6, 2025, seeking his availability for a hearing in August-September 2025 (Exhibit 1B). The letter was sent via registered mail using the address provided by Dr. Iglinski in the 2025 Renewal Information Form (RIF) (Exhibit 1C). Canada Post records confirmed the letter was successfully delivered on May 9, 2025, but Ms. W■■■■ could not confirm who signed for it.
 - A letter sent by Ms. W■■■■ to Dr. Iglinski on June 9, 2025, enclosing the Notice of Hearing, which informed Dr. Iglinski of the charges against him and included the hearing date set for September 4, 2025 (Exhibit 1D). The letter was sent via registered mail using the address in Dr. Iglinski's 2025 RIF. Canada Post records confirmed the letter was successfully delivered on June 11, 2025, but Ms. W■■■■ could not confirm who signed for it (Exhibit 1E).
11. In her statutory declaration, Ms. W■■■■ confirmed she did not receive any response from Dr. Iglinski to these letters.
 12. Further, both letters were also posted to Dr. Iglinski's account on the CPSA Physician Portal (the "Portal"), which generated emails that were sent to Dr. Iglinski at the email address he provided in the 2025 RIF. In her statutory declaration, Ms. W■■■■ confirmed that the correspondence in the Portal had not been accessed.
 13. On this basis, counsel for the Complaints Director submitted that the requirements of section 120(3) of the HPA were satisfied, and the Hearing Tribunal could and should proceed in Dr. Iglinski's absence.
 14. The Hearing Tribunal asked whether any attempts were made to contact Dr. Iglinski by other methods such as phone or pager. Counsel for the Complaints Director indicated that no such attempts were made because sending registered mail to the address provided in the RIF is the "gold standard" that is required in the HPA.
 15. The Hearing Tribunal also inquired about Dr. Iglinski's current registration status and whether the CPSA had received any information that Dr. Iglinski was ill or away from practice since submitting the RIF. Counsel for the Complaints Director advised that Dr. Iglinski was still active on the CPSA Physician Directory and the CPSA had not received any information regarding any illness or changes to his practice status since December 2024.
 16. Although the Hearing Tribunal would have preferred for the CPSA to make additional efforts to contact Dr. Iglinski, such as by telephone, the Hearing Tribunal nevertheless concluded that the evidence presented by the Complaints Director fulfilled the requirements of the HPA to proceed in Dr. Iglinski's absence, and that it was appropriate to do so. Regulated members are required to provide the CPSA with current mailing and email addresses, and the CPSA must be able to rely on these addresses to notify investigated

members of hearings such as this one. As a result, the Hearing Tribunal decided to proceed with the hearing in Dr. Iglinski's absence.

III. CHARGES

20. The Notice of Hearing listed the following allegation with three particulars:
1. You did fail or refuse to cooperate with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta (CPSA) in the investigation into the complaint that you had failed or refused to report and provide records to the Workers Compensation Board (WCB) regarding your patient, [REDACTED], particulars of which include one or more of the following:
 - a. Taking approximately six months to respond to the CPSA's initial and subsequent requests for a response to the complaint against you;
 - b. Failing to confirm to the CPSA since its original request in December 2023 to clarify if you had any additional chart notes concerning your patient's musculoskeletal system for visits since December 12, 2022;
 - c. Failing to confirm to the CPSA since its original request in December 2023 if you had provided to the WCB any additional chart notes concerning your patient's musculoskeletal system for visits since December 12, 2022.
21. Because Dr. Iglinski was not present, the Hearing Tribunal proceeded on the basis that Dr. Iglinski did not admit any of the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing. The Complaints Director bore the onus to prove each particular on a balance of probabilities standard.

IV. EVIDENCE

22. The Complaints Director entered the following Exhibits into evidence during the hearing:

Exhibit 1: Statutory Declaration signed by J. W [REDACTED] on August 27, 2025

1A: Email from T. D [REDACTED] to J. W [REDACTED] dated March 26, 2025, enclosing the Notice of Hearing

1B: Letter from D. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated May 6, 2025

1C: 2025 Renewal Information Form

1D: Letter from Dr. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated June 9, 2025, sent by registered mail and email

1E: Canada Post delivery confirmation dated June 12, 2025

Exhibit 2: Notice of Hearing dated May 28, 2025

Exhibit 3: 2024 Renewal Information Form

- Exhibit 4:** Letter from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated March 27, 2023
- Exhibit 5:** Email from D. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated March 27, 2023
- Exhibit 6:** Letter from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated April 27, 2023
- Exhibit 7:** Email from D. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated April 27, 2023
- Exhibit 8:** Letter from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated May 8, 2023
- Exhibit 9:** Email from D. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated May 8, 2023
- Exhibit 10:** Email from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated May 30, 2023
- Exhibit 11:** Letter from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated August 31, 2023
- Exhibit 12:** Email from D. H [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated September 1, 2023
- Exhibit 13:** Letter from Dr. Iglinski to K. D [REDACTED] dated September 14, 2023
- Exhibit 14:** Letter from K. D [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated September 22, 2023
- Exhibit 15:** Letter from Dr. Iglinski to K. D [REDACTED] dated October 12, 2023
- Exhibit 16:** Email from H. B [REDACTED] to Dr. S [REDACTED] dated February 28, 2024
- Exhibit 17:** Email from H. B [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated June 18, 2024
- Exhibit 18:** Email chain between Dr. S [REDACTED] and K. A [REDACTED] dated October 15, 2024
- Exhibit 19:** Email from K. A [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated October 16, 2024
- Exhibit 20:** Letter from K. A [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated November 4, 2024
- Exhibit 21:** Emails from K. A [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated November 14, 2024
- Exhibit 22:** Letter from K. A [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski dated November 25, 2024
23. The Complaints Director called only one witness: Ms. K [REDACTED] A [REDACTED], Assistant Complaints Director for the CPSA.
24. Ms. A [REDACTED] outlined her background and explained that her role involves supervising the CPSA's investigations team to ensure investigations are conducted fairly and within legislative timeframes, providing support to the Director of Professional Conduct and the Complaints Director, and conducting investigations assigned to her.

25. Ms. A [REDACTED] was the investigator assigned to this complaint file, which she received in September 2024 following an intake process. Ms. A [REDACTED] outlined the CPSA's complaint process as follows: complaints are initially reviewed by the intake team, which then sends a letter to the regulated member containing details of the complaint and requesting a response. Complaints are subsequently triaged to determine the possibility of dismissal, early resolution, or referral for expert opinion.
26. In this case, the intake team followed the standard protocol by requesting Dr. Iglinski's response and attempting to resolve the matter early on. However, this effort failed and the case was subsequently referred for investigation due to Dr. Iglinski's lack of response.
27. The original complaint came from a WCB physician (the "Complainant") who had been trying to obtain medical records from Dr. Iglinski related to a patient's claim. The original complaint was eventually resolved when the Complainant chose not to pursue further involvement. Instead, Dr. Iglinski's lack of responsiveness during the CPSA investigation became the focus of the investigation and these proceedings.
28. Dr. Iglinski is presently a regulated member of the CPSA, practicing family medicine. The professional address and email address submitted by Dr. Iglinski for the 2024 RIF on December 31, 2023 (Exhibit 3) are the same as those used in the 2025 RIF.
29. Ms. A [REDACTED] gave evidence about the CPSA's communications with Dr. Iglinski about the complaint, starting on March 27, 2023, when K [REDACTED] D [REDACTED], the CPSA's Physician Response Coordinator, sent a letter to Dr. Iglinski via the Portal, informing him of the complaint and asking for his response by April 24, 2023 (Exhibit 4). On the same day, CPSA's administrative staff also sent an email to Dr. Iglinski with the subject line "Physician Response", to prompt him to check the Portal for the letter (Exhibit 5).
30. Dr. Iglinski did not reply. On April 27, 2023, Ms. D [REDACTED] sent a follow up letter via the Portal, setting a new deadline of May 4, 2023 for Dr. Iglinski to respond (Exhibit 6). On the same day, an email was also sent to Dr. Iglinski advising him there was a document in the Portal that needed his attention (Exhibit 7).
31. Still, there was no response from Dr. Iglinski. On May 8, 2023, Ms. D [REDACTED] sent a final notice about the missed deadline through the Portal, offering a final extension of the deadline to May 11, 2023, and warning that if Dr. Iglinski did not respond by that date, additional professional conduct violations would be added to the complaint in respect of his failure to respond (Exhibit 8). On the same day, an email was also sent to Dr Iglinski reminding him of the notice in the Portal (Exhibit 9). Still, Dr. Iglinski did not respond.

32. On May 30, 2023, Ms. D [REDACTED] reached out to Dr. Iglinski via email to ensure Dr. Iglinski was aware of the previous attempts to contact him. She urged him to log in to the Portal to read the correspondence and respond (Exhibit 10). However, no response was received.
33. On August 31, 2023, Ms. D [REDACTED] sent a letter to Dr. Iglinski by registered mail, email, and via the Portal, reiterating the previous attempts to contact Dr. Iglinski with no response, and requesting a response by the new deadline of September 14, 2023 (Exhibit 11). Additionally, an email was sent to Dr. Iglinski on September 1, 2023, advising him there was an important document for him in the Portal (Exhibit 12).
34. On September 14, 2023, Dr. Iglinski finally responded to Ms. D [REDACTED] in a letter sent by email, attaching 61 pages of medical records and documentation, which he advised were pertinent to WCB's request that had led to the complaint (Exhibit 13). He apologized for the delays in responding to the complainant, WCB, and the CPSA. He did not offer any reason for the delays.
35. Ms. D [REDACTED] responded on September 22, 2023, in a letter sent by email and via the Portal, asking Dr. Iglinski to provide a more thorough explanation by October 13, 2023 (Exhibit 14). Dr. Iglinski responded on October 12, 2023, apologizing again and clarifying that the delay in providing medical records was due to him not having a strong understanding of the patient's initial injury and, as a result, feeling his records would not be relevant to her WCB case (Exhibit 15).
36. On December 12, 2023, a member of the CPSA's intake team, H [REDACTED] B [REDACTED], emailed the Complainant regarding medical records the Complainant still required from Dr. Iglinski. As part of the same email chain (Exhibit 16), the Complainant responded, explaining that the original request was for "chart notes, DI/investigation/consult results from Sept 1, 2021 to present that pertain to the musculoskeletal system" and that the last clinical reporting the clinic had received from Dr. Iglinski was for December 16, 2022. As such, the Complainant made the following request:

"Please ask Dr. Iglinski to confirm that either 1- the last clinic visit was on Dec 16/22 and then we know we have all of the requested reporting, or 2- please send requested documents as above from December 16, 2022 to present."
37. On December 14, 2023, Ms. B [REDACTED] emailed Dr. Iglinski conveying the Complainant's request as set out above and providing Dr. Iglinski with the Complainant's fax number to send the response or records directly to the Complainant. In a follow up email on January 18, 2024, having received no response from Dr. Iglinski, Ms. B [REDACTED] set a response deadline for January 23, 2024. Dr. Iglinski replied by email on January 23, 2024, indicating his office would send the remaining notes to the Complainant that afternoon (Exhibit 17).

38. On February 6, 2024, after receiving confirmation that the Complainant still had not received any documents from Dr. Iglinski's office, Ms. B [REDACTED] sent a follow up email to Dr. Iglinski, establishing a new deadline for the end of that week. As of February 28, 2024, the Complainant still had not received the requested documents. Ms. B [REDACTED] sent a further email to Dr. Iglinski, asking him to respond to the Complainant by March 1, 2024, and stating: "Once you provide the complainant with the documents or notify the complainant that there are no further documents to provide, we can close this complaint."
39. The next email from Ms. B [REDACTED] to Dr. Iglinski was dated June 18, 2024. In this email, Ms. B [REDACTED] thanked Dr. Iglinski for speaking with her that day, and asked him to either notify the Complainant if there were no further clinic visits or to provide the documents to the Complainant by June 19, 2024 (Exhibit 17).
40. On October 15, 2024, the Complainant confirmed to Ms. A [REDACTED] by email that the records were never received (Exhibit 18). The next day, Ms. A [REDACTED] emailed Dr. Iglinski, noting the complaint had been directed to investigations and, in an attempt to resolve the file, asking Dr. Iglinski to "please confirm that there were no further clinic visits regarding the MSK system since December 16, 2022" (Exhibit 19).
41. Dr. Iglinski did not respond to the October 16, 2024 email or to a voicemail message Ms. A [REDACTED] left on October 24, 2024. As such, on November 4, 2024, Ms. A [REDACTED] sent a letter to Dr. Iglinski via the Portal, asking for his response and advising that if the CPSA did not receive his response by November 11, 2024, then the scope of the complaint may be expanded to include the issue of failure to respond to the CPSA, contrary to s. 1(1)(pp)(vii)(B) of the HPA (Exhibit 20).
42. Attempts to engage Dr. Iglinski continued. Ms. A [REDACTED] left a second voicemail message for him and then, on November 14, 2024, spoke to Dr. Iglinski by telephone. During this conversation, Dr. Iglinski confirmed he had additional records and stated he would provide them to the Complainant before November 18, 2024. Dr. Iglinski also confirmed he had received the CPSA's multiple attempts to contact him. Ms. A [REDACTED] followed up with an email reiterating the November 18th deadline for Dr. Iglinski to provide the additional medical records to the Complainant (Exhibit 21). However, Dr. Iglinski still failed to provide the records.
43. On November 25, 2024, Ms. A [REDACTED] sent another letter to Dr. Iglinski via the Portal, summarizing the CPSA's attempts to contact him, confirming that the scope of the investigation was being expanded to consider the issue of "failing or refusing to comply with a request of or cooperate with an investigator", and requesting a response by December 9, 2024, to avoid further action being taken (Exhibit 22). Dr. Iglinski did not respond.
44. Ms. A [REDACTED] confirmed there had been no communication from Dr. Iglinski since the telephone conversation on November 14, 2024. Accordingly, Ms.

A [REDACTED] discussed the case with the professional conduct team and prepared it for referral for a hearing after the December 9, 2024, deadline passed with no response from Dr. Iglinski.

45. Ms. A [REDACTED] then addressed questions from the Hearing Tribunal.
46. When asked about the information that the CPSA obtains when a physician accesses the Portal, Ms. A [REDACTED] explained that access is tracked, allowing the CPSA to see when documents are viewed. However, when the CPSA sends an email to a regulated member, it is not possible to determine whether the email has been opened.
47. In relation to Exhibit 11, which Ms. A [REDACTED] testified was sent by registered mail, Ms. A [REDACTED] noted that the signature should be documented on the signature card. However, she did not have the signature card in front of her during the hearing, so she was unable to confirm the identity of the signer.
48. Regarding whether Dr. Iglinski had viewed the documents in the Portal, Ms. A [REDACTED] confirmed that the first access following March 2023 occurred on September 14, 2023. Other significant access dates included September 22, 2023, October 12, 2023, October 18, 2023, November 28, 2023, December 30, 2023, and December 31, 2024. Ms. A [REDACTED] did not have any information about when Dr. Iglinski accessed the Portal in 2025.

V. SUBMISSIONS

55. Counsel for the Complaints Director made submissions to the Hearing Tribunal, emphasizing the many attempts made by the CPSA to secure Dr. Iglinski's cooperation in the investigation.
56. The evidence shows the CPSA made over 20 attempts, including emails, phone calls, and letters, to resolve the matter.
57. Counsel for the Complaints Director highlighted Ms. A [REDACTED]'s evidence that she even spoke with Dr. Iglinski on November 14, 2024, during which he acknowledged receiving the CPSA's correspondence and apologized for his lack of response, promising to reply within specific time frames. However, Dr. Iglinski failed to adhere to these commitments.
58. The documentary evidence highlights Dr. Iglinski's non-cooperation. Exhibit 22 is a letter from Ms. A [REDACTED] in which she summarizes the CPSA's repeated attempts to reach Dr. Iglinski. Exhibits 13, 15, and 17 feature letters and emails from Dr. Iglinski, demonstrating that he was receiving the CPSA's correspondence yet chose not to cooperate with the investigation.
59. Many letters and emails sent to his provided address went unanswered.
60. The evidence is clear and consistent that, despite multiple reminders and direct conversations, Dr. Iglinski failed or refused to cooperate with the CPSA

in its investigation by taking approximately six months to respond to the CPSA's request to respond to the complaint. When Dr. Iglinski responded on September 14, 2023 (Exhibit 13), no good reason was provided for his lack of response, which Dr. Iglinski admitted in his October 12, 2023 letter (Exhibit 15).

61. Further, counsel for the Complaints Director submitted that Dr. Iglinski did not confirm to the CPSA whether he had any additional chart notes related to a patient's medical visit since December 12, 2022, nor whether he had provided them to the WCB, despite repeated requests (Exhibits 18-22).
62. Counsel for the Complaints Director argued that Dr. Iglinski's conduct amounts to unprofessional conduct as defined in the HPA, specifically subsection 1(1)(pp)(vii)(B), failure to comply with a request of or cooperate with an investigator, and subsection 1(1)(pp)(xii), conduct that harms the integrity of the regulated profession. When regulated members do not respond to the CPSA within a reasonable time, it undermines the CPSA's ability to manage complaints fairly and effectively and disturbs the proper functioning of critical programs such as WCB, all of which is detrimental to the profession and the public.
63. Counsel for the Complaints Director cited an Ontario Divisional Court decision (*Artinian v College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*) addressing the importance of cooperation by regulated members, and an Alberta Court of Appeal decision (*Fawcett v College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta (Complaint Review Committee)*) emphasizing the importance of timely investigation to the protection of the public.
64. On this basis, the Complaints Director submitted that there was sufficient evidence to find Dr. Iglinski guilty of unprofessional conduct as outlined in the Notice of Hearing.

VI. FINDINGS

65. For the reasons that follow, the Hearing Tribunal finds that particulars 1(a) and 1(c) are factually proven on a balance of probabilities and amount to unprofessional conduct, but particular 1(b) is not factually proven on a balance of probabilities.
66. Looking at Allegation 1 as a whole, the Hearing Tribunal concludes that Dr. Iglinski engaged in unprofessional conduct by failing to cooperate with the CPSA in the investigation into the complaint that he had failed or refused to report and provide records to the WCB regarding his patient, ■■■.

Particular 1(a)

67. Particular 1(a) alleges that Dr. Iglinski took approximately six months to respond to the CPSA's initial and subsequent requests for a response to the complaint against him.
68. Dr. Iglinski was first asked to respond to the complaint by letter dated March 27, 2023 (Exhibit 4). He did not respond until September 14, 2023 (Exhibit 13), approximately six months later. Despite multiple letters sent to Dr. Iglinski via the Portal and emails to Dr. Iglinski alerting him that there were documents waiting for him the Portal (Exhibits 6 through 12), Dr. Iglinski did not even access the Portal until September 14, 2023, the day he responded.
69. Further, the response Dr. Iglinski provided on September 14, 2023 was inadequate and required additional follow up.
70. The Hearing Tribunal finds that particular 1(a) is factually proven.

Particular 1(b)

71. Particular 1(b) and 1(c) are related. Particular 1(b) alleges that Dr. Iglinski failed to confirm to the CPSA since its original request in December 2023 to clarify *if he had any additional chart notes* concerning patient ■■■'s musculoskeletal system for visits since December 12, 2022.
72. The Hearing Tribunal found this particular was not factually proven because Ms. A■■■■ testified that when she spoke to Dr. Iglinski on November 14, 2024, Dr. Iglinski confirmed that he did have additional chart notes.
73. Although it was very concerning that it took Dr. Iglinski nearly a year to provide this confirmation to the CPSA, despite repeated requests and deadline extensions, the factual allegation in particular 1(b) is not established.

Particular 1(c)

74. Particular 1(c) is subtly different from particular 1(b). It alleges that, since the CPSA's original request in December 2023, Dr. Iglinski failed to confirm to the CPSA *if he had provided to the WCB* any additional chart notes concerning ■■■'s musculoskeletal system for visits since December 12, 2022.
75. During the hearing, no explanation was provided as to why the allegation identifies December 12, 2022, whereas the Exhibits reference December 16, 2022, as the relevant date. However, the Hearing Tribunal is satisfied that this discrepancy is a typo, and has treated the allegation as if it refers to December 16, 2022.
76. Even after Dr. Iglinski confirmed to Ms. A■■■■ on November 14, 2024, that he had additional chart notes, he did not follow up with confirmation that he had sent the additional chart notes to the WCB. Although the focus of the allegation is not whether he sent the chart notes to the WCB but whether he

confirmed to CPSA having done so, the evidence supports a conclusion that he did neither.

77. The Hearing Tribunal therefore finds particular 1(c) is factually proven on a balance of probabilities. Despite the CPSA's numerous requests, attempts to contact Dr. Iglinski by various methods, and extensions of deadlines, and despite Dr. Iglinski's confirmation that he received the CPSA's numerous communications, Dr. Iglinski failed to confirm that he had provided the additional chart notes to the WCB.

The factually proven conduct amounts to unprofessional conduct

78. The Hearing Tribunal also considered whether the factually proven conduct in particulars 1(a) and 1(c) amounted to unprofessional conduct. For multiple reasons, the Hearing Tribunal finds it did.
79. Dr. Iglinski's conduct was harmful to the integrity of the medical profession. It led to delays and failures to provide records that the WCB was seeking to utilize to evaluate a patient's WCB claim. It affected the ability of a medical colleague – the Complainant – to provide treatment to her patient. Further, Dr. Iglinski's conduct was harmful to the CPSA investigation team's ability to investigate and process the complaint. By definition, failing to cooperate with an investigator is unprofessional conduct, and the Hearing Tribunal is satisfied Dr. Iglinski's failure to cooperate rose to the required level.
80. It was unacceptable for Dr. Iglinski to disregard emails from the CPSA alerting him that documents requiring his attention and response were waiting for him in the Portal. It was also unacceptable for Dr. Iglinski to tell the CPSA he would take required steps and then fail to follow up. Dr. Iglinski's failure to respond puts the profession into disrepute. His conduct was careless and suggests a lack of professionalism in his interactions with the CPSA. In keeping with these concerns, the Hearing Tribunal was dismayed by Dr. Iglinski's failure to attend the hearing to explain his conduct.

VII. SUBMISSIONS ON SANCTION

81. The Hearing Tribunal will receive submissions on sanction from the parties.
82. Dr. Iglinski should receive a copy of this decision by registered mail as well as by email and should have an opportunity to make submissions on sanction, should he choose to do so. However, this is not Dr. Iglinski's opportunity to challenge any of the Hearing Tribunal's findings set out in this decision – that opportunity has passed.
83. After this decision is sent to Dr. Iglinski by registered mail, the parties are directed to discuss the process for making submissions on sanction and write to the Hearings Director with their proposal. **If Dr. Iglinski does not respond within one week** of counsel for the Complaints Director emailing

him at his email address provided in the most recent RIF, the Complaints Director may propose a process for making submissions on sanction without input from Dr. Iglinski regarding the proposed process. In that case, the proposed process should still provide Dr. Iglinski with an opportunity to make submissions on sanction.

Signed on behalf of the Hearing Tribunal by the Chair:



Dr. Goldees Liaghati-Nasseri

Dated this 21st day of January, 2026.