

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *College of Physicians and Surgeons of  
British Columbia v. Ezzati*,  
2020 BCSC 339

Date: 20200309  
Docket: S176363  
Registry: Vancouver

In the Matter of the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c 183

Between:

**College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia**

Petitioner

And

**Maria Ezzati**

Respondent

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Gropper

## **Reasons for Judgment**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

T. Bant

The Respondent appearing in person:

M. Ezzati

Place and Date of Hearing:

Vancouver, B.C.  
January 13, 2020

Place and Date of Judgment:

Vancouver, B.C.  
March 9, 2020

**Introduction**

[1] Ms. Ezzati has been found in contempt of court for breaching orders made by Madam Justice Russell on July 6, 2017 (the first order) and by Mr. Justice Bowden on October 13, 2017 (the second order). These reasons address the penalty to be imposed.

[2] The College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia (the College) seeks a fine of \$22,000 to be paid to the Attorney General of British Columbia for her civil contempt and its costs of the application as special costs.

[3] On August 24, 2018, I pronounced judgment in the contempt application in reasons indexed at 2018 BCSC 2006.

[4] On August 22, 2019, appeal by the College was allowed in part, in reasons indexed at 2019 BCCA 306.

**Background**

[5] The responsibility of the College and the applicable standards of practice is described in para. 1 of the Court of Appeal decision:

The College of Physicians and Surgeons is responsible under the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 183, for superintending the practice of the medical profession in British Columbia. Among other things, it is authorized to establish conditions under which persons may become registrants authorized to practise medicine, and to establish, maintain and enforce standards of practice in the Province. (S. 16.) In 2014, the College adopted a professional standard dealing with the injection of botulinum toxin (often referred to by the brand name “Botox”) and dermal fillers. The standard states that only licensed physicians with appropriate medical education and training, or registered nurses or licensed practical nurses authorized by such physicians, may provide such injections and that unlicensed persons may not do so.

[6] Maria Ezzati is not and has never been a registrant of the College.

**Injunctions**

[7] The College commenced the petition in this proceeding on July 6, 2017. It applied to the court without notice to Ms. Ezzati. Russell J. pronounced the first order. The order enjoins Ms. Ezzati from practising medicine (at para. 14) and from

using reserved titles contrary to s. 12.1(1) of the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 183 (the *Act*), or using misleading titles contrary to section 12.1(3) of the *Act*.

[8] The first order explicitly provides (para. 15):

The Respondent Maria Ezzati is hereby enjoined and restrained, until the hearing or other disposition of this Petition or until further order of this Court, from:

- (a) using any titles reserved exclusively to registrants of the College, any abbreviations of such titles, or any equivalents of the titles or abbreviations in another language:
  - i. to describe her work;
  - ii. in association with or as part of another title describing her work;
  - or
  - iii. in association with a description of her work;
- (b) using any name, title, description or abbreviation of a name or title, or an equivalent of a name or title in another language, in any manner that expresses that she is a registrant of or associated with the College.

[9] The first order also permitted certain persons on behalf of the College to enter the premises being used by Ms. Ezzati at 817 – 938 Howe Street in Vancouver and search for and seize items associated with the practice of medicine.

[10] The College executed the search and seizure provisions on July 10, 2017 and seized a number of items.

[11] On July 24, 2017, Ms. Ezzati represented, through a letter from her then counsel, that she would by 5:00 p.m. that day:

- (a) delete any references in the “services” portion of her website relating to injecting Botox or other fillers;
- (b) delete any reference to her as “Dr.” or “physician” from her website, Instagram account, and any other social media account; and
- (c) destroy any business cards, letterhead and other documents that...may hold her out as someone qualified or entitled to provide services amounting to the practice of medicine.

[12] On September 6, 2017, the College became aware of certain information and began to investigate whether Ms. Ezzati was continuing to practice medicine and

use reserved titles in contempt of the first order in her office at 800 - 440 Hazelbridge Way in Richmond.

[13] The College applied and was granted the second order. The second order continued the injunctions in the first order. It also permitted certain persons representing the College to enter Ms. Ezzati's Richmond office.

[14] The College executed the search and seizure provisions of the second order on October 17, 2017. Several items were seized.

[15] In the College's contempt application, heard before me on March 2, 2018 and July 20, 2018, the College alleged that Ms. Ezzati had engaged in deliberate conduct violating the first and second orders by:

- a) performing 44 botulinum toxin or dermal filler procedures on 38 different individuals between July 16, 2017, and October 5, 2017, for which she billed in excess of \$22,000;
- b) holding herself out to those 38 individuals as being qualified to diagnose when botulinum toxin or dermal fillers may be appropriate for cosmetic purposes and purporting to offer such diagnoses;
- c) examining a bump on the lip of client K.G. whom she had injected with dermal fillers before the injunction, purporting to diagnose the bump as a cold sore or canker, and purporting to advise the client as to its proper treatment on July 22, 2017;
- d) advertising medical procedures and holding herself out as being qualified to practice medicine on her website and Instagram profile until at least as late as February 14, 2018; and
- e) referring to herself as Doctor in conversation with prospective clients, on her website, and on printed promotional materials with the text, "Dr. Maria Ezzati, Cosmetic Procedures."

[16] In support of their contempt application, the College tendered evidence of signed consent forms indicating Ms. Ezzati had advised clients of the risks of botulinum toxin and dermal fillers. They also showed Ms. Ezzati referred to herself as "Dr." on her website and in promotional materials.

[17] I found that Ms. Ezzati had violated the orders by engaging in the conduct in paras. d and e.

[18] On appeal, the Court of Appeal concluded that Ms. Ezzati had also engaged in the conduct in para. b. The Court of Appeal found that she had discussed with and advised clients of the risks and benefits of botulinum toxin injections or dermal fillers for cosmetic purposes. In doing so, she held herself out to 38 individuals as being qualified to diagnose when botulinum toxin or dermal fillers might be appropriate for cosmetic purposes and purported to offer such diagnoses.

[19] The combined effects of the orders is that Ms. Ezzati has been cited in contempt of the injunctions for having:

- a) advertised medical procedures and held herself out as being qualified to practice medicine on her website and Instagram until at least February 14, 2018;
- b) referred to herself as “Dr.” on her website, on printed promotional materials with the text “Dr. Maria Ezzati Cosmetic Procedures” and on consent forms she signed as “Dr. Maria Ezzati”; and,
- c) discussed with and advised clients of the risks and benefits of the injection of botulinum toxin or dermal fillers for cosmetic purposes.

[20] In regard to para. c, the Court of Appeal held at paras. 48 and 49:

...the fact that “Dr. Maria Ezzati” signed the bottom of the consent forms, *expressly stating* that she was “the treating doctor/healthcare professional” and had “discussed the above risks, benefits and alternatives with the patient”, negatives any inference that she signed merely as an ordinary witness. “Dr. Ezzati” signed as the “treating doctor/healthcare professional”. She acknowledged having advised the patient and having “discussed” with him or her the risks and benefits of the material to be injected. In my view, this constituted the “assessment” of a “physical . . . condition of an individual” within the meaning of the *Medical Practitioners Regulation* and advising on, or diagnosing, such condition within the meaning of s. 81(2) of the former *Medical Practitioners Act*. The giving of such advice, in the context of this case, is a role reserved for medical practitioners.

...Ms. Ezzati held herself out as being qualified, in order to appear competent to provide the advice she had concerning the “risks and complications”, to answer the patients' questions, and to provide reassurance that she would be able to address any “concerns” arising after the procedure.

**Reserved Titles**

[21] As noted, the first and second orders included an injunction enjoining Ms. Ezzati from using reserved titles contrary to s. 12.1(1) of the *Act*. The constitutionality of s. 12.1(1) of the *Act* was recently at issue in *College of Midwives of British Columbia v. MaryMoon*, 2019 BCSC 1670. In that case, Madam Justice Sharma declared s. 12.1(1) of the *Act* was unconstitutional and of no force or effect, effective immediately. Section 12.1(3) of the *Act* was not declared unconstitutional. Sharma J.'s decision is currently under appeal.

[22] Section 12.1(1) of the *Act* provides that if the minister has enacted a regulation prescribing a title to be used exclusively by registrants of a college, non-registrants must not use the title, an abbreviation of the title or an equivalent of the title or abbreviation in another language:

- (a) to describe the person's work,
- (b) in association with or as part of another title describing the person's work;  
or
- (c) in association with a description of the person's work.

[23] The minister has reserved “doctor”, “physician”, “surgeon” and “medical practitioner” for exclusive use by the registrants of the College in accordance with s. 2(1) of the *Medical Practitioners Regulation*, B.C. Reg. 416/2008.

[24] Section 12.1(3) of the *Act* provides that a non-registrant of a designated college “must not use a name, title, description or abbreviation of a name or title, or an equivalent of a name or title in another language, in any matter that expresses or implies that he or she is a registrant or associated with the College”.

[25] I agree with the College that the effect of the decision of *MaryMoon*, if upheld on appeal, is that the first and second orders in respect of s. 12.1(1) of the *Act* will fall away. Regardless of the outcome of that appeal, Ms. Ezzati’s conduct remains contrary to the first and second orders, since it contravenes the orders’ injunction in respect of s. 12.1(3) of the *Act*.

**Positions of the Parties**

**The College**

[26] The College asserts that the Court should find that Ms. Ezzati's contempt occurred before each client decided to have an injection and was causally significant in the client's decision to have the injection. The College argues that this is implicit in the Court of Appeal's statement at para. 49 (reproduced for ease of reference):

Ms. Ezzati held herself out as being qualified, in order to appear competent to provide the advice she had concerning the "risks and complications", to answer the patients' questions, and to provide reassurance that she would be able to address any "concerns" arising after the procedure.

[27] Ms. Ezzati held herself out as being qualified, in order to appear competent to provide the advice she had concerning the "risks and complications", to answer the patients' questions, and to provide reassurance that she would be able to address any "concerns" arising after the procedure. The College refers to the significant number of victims. Ms. Ezzati exposed 38 individuals to risk of harm by depriving them of the opportunity to make an informed decision as to whether to receive injections of botulinum toxin or dermal fillers.

[28] The College points out that botulinum toxin and dermal fillers are powerful and potentially dangerous drugs that are regulated under the *Drug Schedules Regulation*, B.C. Reg. 9/98, made under the *Pharmacy Operations and Drug Scheduling Act*, S.B.C. 2003, c. 77. Thus, persons who are considering a botulinum toxin or dermal filler procedure should be entitled to conclude that a person who described herself as a "Dr." and advised them on the procedure is in fact a doctor qualified to provide sound medical advice. Ms. Ezzati's victims were entitled to make an informed decision.

[29] The College argues that Ms. Ezzati's use of the title "Dr." in the circumstances implied she was entitled to practice medicine. Consequently, her holding herself out as being qualified to practice medicine was wilful and flagrant contempt that requires a measure of specific deterrence.

[30] The College asserts that Mr. Ezzati had actual knowledge that the injunctions prohibited her from holding herself out as being qualified to practice medicine and referring to herself as “Dr.” As evidence, they point to the false representation made through her then counsel on July 24, 2017 to the College that she would stop doing so.

[31] The College says that the letter from her counsel included additional false representations on ceasing several activities, which further indicates she understood the orders. In particular, the College points out that Ms. Ezzati represented in the letter that she would:

- a) “delete references in the “services” portion of her website relating to injecting Botox and other fillers”;
- b) “delete any reference to her as “Dr.” or “physician” from her website, Instagram account and any other social media account”; and
- c) “destroy any business cards, letterhead or other documents that...hold her out as someone qualified and entitled to provide services amounting to the practice of medicine”.

[32] The College argues that these representations are false, since Ms. Ezzati persisted in behaviour she knew was contemptuous. This includes maintaining promotional materials for “Dr. Maria Ezzati Cosmetic Procedures” on the reception desk at her Richmond office, continuing to refer to herself as a “Dr.” on her website and holding herself out as being qualified to practice medicine at least until February 2018.

[33] The College acknowledges Ms. Ezzati’s assertion that she did not know that the injunctions prohibited her from purporting to explain botulinum toxin and dermal filler procedures to persons, ostensibly so they could make an informed decision about whether to have such a procedure. Nevertheless, they claim Ms. Ezzati engaged in misconduct in her Richmond office after the first order and in her communications with the College. She did not attempt to communicate with the

College to inquire whether the conduct would be in breach of the injunction. However, the College's counsel invited her to do so after the first injunction.

[34] The College acknowledges that the most serious allegation it made was not proven. This was the allegation that Ms. Ezzati had administered injections of botulinum toxin or dermal fillers to 38 individuals following the first order. It acknowledges that a term of imprisonment is therefore not appropriate. Nevertheless, it asserts that a substantial fine is required to reflect the harm from the allegations of contempt that were proven. Ms. Ezzati's contempt consisted of 38 separate occasions of using "Dr." (implying she was entitled to practice medicine); holding herself out as being qualified to practice medicine; and purporting to explain botulinum toxin and dermal fillers to persons, ostensibly so they could make an informed decision about whether to have such a procedure.

[35] The College seeks a fine of \$22,000 for Ms. Ezzati's 38 individual instances of contempt. This figure is based on an invoice book found in her office, which shows billings in excess of that amount. They say this amount is appropriate particularly considering Ms. Ezzati's own evidence that she did not communicate with any third party professional who performed the injections, and she was paid a substantial consultation fee regarding the "advice" she gave to these individuals.

**Ms. Ezzati**

[36] Ms. Ezzati says there is no evidence that any clients who consulted her on the risks of botulinum toxin and dermal filler received injections. There is no evidence they received injections as a result of information she provided verbally or otherwise. There are no "victims": no one came forward claiming to have received any injections or suffered any harm.

[37] Ms. Ezzati says the clients were informed her educational background did not license her to practice medicine in British Columbia. She stated that she had surgical and medical degrees in Ireland and certificates in botulinum toxin and dermal fillers in British Columbia. She says that her certificates were displayed in the front of her Richmond office and contained the words "Disclaimer According to the Royal

College of Physicians and Surgeons, injection of cosmetic PRP, Botulinum Toxin (Botox), and Dermal fillers in Canada must be performed by a Canadian licensed Medical Doctor”.

[38] Ms. Ezzati says that she believed her conduct following the first order did not breach the injunction. She took steps to delete sections of her website that were offensive but apparently she missed some references describing her as “Dr.” She says she did not know that the advertising and consent forms would be the focus of a contempt proceeding.

[39] Ms. Ezzati admits that using the term “Dr.” was a mistake. If she anticipated that she would be coming to court, she would have changed the wording on the consent forms.

[40] Ms. Ezzati submits she made an identical mistake in signing the consent forms. Looking back, she would not have signed the forms or she would have changed the forms but she did not know doing so breached the orders. Even so, she notes the forms were an internal record and were not provided to potential customers.

### **Legal Framework**

[41] The principles governing the imposition of a penalty for civil contempt were set out by the Court in *Law Society of British Columbia v. Bryfogle*, 2012 BCSC 59 at para. 80:

1. the gravity of the offence;
2. the need to deter the offender;
3. the past record and character of the offender and, in particular, whether this is a first offence;
4. the need to protect the public from the offender’s misconduct;
5. the extent to which the offender is able to pay a monetary penalty; and
6. the extent to which the breach was flagrant and wilful and intended to defy the court’s authority.

[42] The court has repeatedly emphasized the need to protect the public from unlicensed medical practice: *College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia v. Khakh*, 2019 BCSC 501 (*Khakh* #1) at para. 24:

Self-regulating professions are founded upon public trust and this is perhaps especially so in the case of the health professions. Persons engaging in unauthorized practice of these professions ... do great damage not only to the individuals they claim to be treating, but to public confidence.

[43] In *College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia v. Khakh*, 2019 BCSC 1604 (*Khakh* #2), Madam Justice Iyer observed at para. 26:

The underlying purpose of a civil contempt order is not punitive. It is to ensure that the person complies with court orders. Factors to consider in determining a penalty for civil contempt include general and specific deterrence, protection of the public, the degree of intention involved, the existence and extent of harm, and whether this is a first or subsequent contempt...

[44] The College refers to three cases which deal with substantially identical injunctions against practising medicine using reserved or misleading titles.

[45] In *College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia v. Li*, 2018 BCSC 923, the contemnor performed a “double eyelid” surgery. This involved the application of a topical anaesthetic to the victim's eyelids, the use of the scalpel to make an incision across the victim's eyelids, the removal of skin from the eyelids and the stitching of the incisions in an attempt to hide the incision line in the newly created eyelid crease. The contemnor did not use the title “Dr.” After being found guilty of contempt and the hearing of the penalty phase, the contemnor was diagnosed with cancer that required chemotherapy. The Court sentenced her to three months house arrest and imposed a fine of \$6000. The College was awarded special costs.

[46] In *Khakh* #1, the victim received injections of botulinum toxin from the contemnor. She used the title “Dr.” The victim believed the contemnor was licensed and entitled to practice medicine. The contemnor forged a college certificate and was given a formal written undertaking to the College to cease practising medicine. The Court imposed a sentence of 30 days imprisonment but suspended the

sentence for a two-year term of probation and imposed a fine of \$5000. The College received special costs.

[47] In *Khakh #2*, the contemnor, despite having been found in contempt the first time, administered injections of botulinum toxin to a separate victim and again used the title “Dr.” The second victim had the same belief that the contemnor was licensed and entitled to practice medicine. The Court lifted the earlier suspension of 30 days of imprisonment and sentenced her to another 30 days imprisonment consecutive and imposed a fine of \$7500. The College received an award of special costs.

### **Discussion and Analysis**

[48] I begin with a discussion of the factors listed in *Bryfogle* at para. 80.

[49] The first factor is the gravity of the offence. In respect of her breaches of the orders, Ms. Ezzati’s conduct is very serious. She continued to advertise medical procedures and held herself out as being qualified to practice medicine on her website and Instagram until at least February 14, 2018; she referred to herself as “Dr.” on her website, on printed promotional materials with the text “Dr. Maria Ezzati Cosmetic Procedures” and on consent forms she signed as “Dr. Maria Ezzati”. She was fully aware of the terms of the first order, as indicated by the representations that she made through her then counsel on July 24, 2018. She did not “delete any references in the “services” portion of her website relating to injecting Botox or other fillers”; she did not “delete any reference to her as “Dr.” or “physician” from her website, Instagram account, and any other social media account”; and she did not “destroy any business cards, letterhead and other documents that...may hold her out as someone qualified or entitled to provide services amounting to the practice of medicine”.

[50] Ms. Ezzati attributes her continuing breach of the orders and her failure to live up to her representations as mistakes. She maintains that she simply missed instances where she referred to herself as “Dr.” and she failed to understand the orders.

[51] I do not accept those explanations: Ms. Ezzati must have been aware of the seriousness of these breaches. She is well-educated and she is able to communicate effectively. She also had legal advice. In spite of that, she did not heed the orders. She did not attempt to contact the College to determine if her conduct continued to be in breach of the orders.

[52] Ms. Ezzati's breach of the orders in discussing and advising clients of the risks and benefits of the injection of botulinum toxin or dermal fillers for cosmetic purposes is particularly grave, for the reasons expressed by the Court of Appeal, explicitly and implicitly. The Court of Appeal found Ms. Ezzati used the term "Dr." and referred to herself as the "treating physician" so that she appeared competent to provide advice about the risks and complications of the injections, to answer her clients' questions, and to provide reassurance that she would be able to address any "concerns" arising after the procedures.

[53] I make the same observations as the Court of Appeal about Ms. Ezzati's claim that she was not aware that this conduct offended court orders.

[54] The second factor is the need to deter the offender. The orders were intended to deter Ms. Ezzati from engaging in certain conduct. They did not do so: Ms. Ezzati continued to engage in a pattern of conduct in breach of the order. However, I do note that the most serious conduct alleged, that of administering injections, has not been proven. In that regard, Ms. Ezzati's continuing conduct was in accordance with the orders.

[55] The third factor is the past record and character of the offender and, in particular, whether this is a first offence. I refer again to Ms. Ezzati's knowledge and understanding of the orders, as demonstrated by her representations made through her then counsel in July 2018, and her failure to seek advice from the College about the scope of the injunctions. Her conduct after the orders were made is particularly egregious.

[56] The need to protect the public from the offender's misconduct is the fourth factor. The orders were made for that very purpose. Breaching the orders obviously does not protect the public.

[57] The fifth factor is the extent to which the offender is able to pay a monetary penalty. I have only Ms. Ezzati's evidence in this regard. She says that she has no money to pay. Her plan is to become licenced to practice medicine in British Columbia and that the process is costly.

[58] The extent to which the breach was flagrant and wilful and intended to defy the court's authority is the sixth factor. There is no direct evidence that Ms. Ezzati had actual knowledge that the orders prohibited her from purporting to explain botulinum toxin and dermal filler procedures to persons. Ms. Ezzati says that she did not know. I do not accept Ms. Ezzati's explanation. I find Ms. Ezzati's conduct exhibits a failure to take responsibility for her engaging in this conduct. I refer again to her representation to the College and her failure to inquire with the College about whether her conduct was in breach of the orders. To that extent, I find that her conduct was wilful, but not flagrant or intended to defy the court's authority.

[59] Ms. Ezzati breached the orders in three different ways: she advertised medical procedures and held herself out as being qualified to practice medicine on her website and Instagram until at least February 14, 2018; she referred to herself as "Dr." on her website, on printed promotional materials with the text "Dr. Maria Ezzati Cosmetic Procedures" and on consent forms she signed as "Dr. Maria Ezzati"; and she discussed with and advised 38 clients of the risks and benefits of the injection of botulinum toxin or dermal fillers for cosmetic purposes. The penalty must address this contemptuous conduct.

[60] The cases cited are of some assistance. I agree with Ms. Ezzati that the breaches in the cases were of a grave nature, although there was only evidence of one breach by each contemnor. They included fraudulent acts: Ms. Khakh forged a licence to practice medicine by altering a genuine College-issued licence. Both contemnors in these cases were proven to have harmed their victims. Ms. Khakh

continued to perform injections on clients and Ms. Li continued to perform eyelid surgery. They also received penalties that included imprisonment, which is not sought by the College here.

[61] I do not accept Ms. Ezzati's position that there was no evidence her conduct caused harm. Since she referred to herself as "Dr.", despite the title being reserved for members of the College, the clients who consulted Ms. Ezzati were led to believe she had medical qualifications. As the Court of Appeal noted, this caused harm. Those clients may have proceeded to receive injections. At the very least, they deprived of the opportunity to make an informed decision on whether to have an injection.

[62] However, it was not proven that any of Ms. Ezzati's clients received injections from a non-registrant. That being the case, it cannot be assumed that the clients who consulted Ms. Ezzati proceeded to receive injections in reliance on her advice and apparent qualifications. In that regard, the safety to the public was not as compromised as it could have been if Ms. Ezzati had given the injections.

[63] I agree with the College that Ms. Ezzati's contemptuous conduct was repeated with 38 individuals and the invoice book in her office indicates that those individuals may have been billed a combined amount over \$22,000. However, it cannot be said that Ms. Ezzati billed that amount. The invoices related to the injections, not the advice that Ms. Ezzati gave the individuals about the injections.

[64] Ms. Ezzati's conduct was not flagrant. I consider the conduct of the contemnor in the cases of *Li*, *Khakh #1* and *Khakh #2* to be much more egregious, although each involved single instances of contempt with a single victim. The College acknowledges that it is not seeking a term of imprisonment. However, the quantum of the fine that it seeks to have imposed goes beyond ensuring compliance with court orders. It is punitive.

[65] In all of the circumstances, I order that Ms. Ezzati pay a fine of \$5000 to the Attorney General of British Columbia for her civil contempt of paras. 14 and 15 of the first order of Russell J. pronounced and entered on July 6, 2017.

**Special Costs**

[66] Special costs are awarded as a matter of course in civil contempt applications for two reasons: contempt of the court is reprehensible; and the applicant has incurred expenses to assist the court with the enforcement of its orders and deserves to be indemnified by the contemnor: *Bryfogle* at para. 90, citing *Law Society of B.C. v. Yehia*, 2008 BCSC 1172 at para. 59.

[67] The College is entitled to special costs.

[68] However, the College alleged five breaches of court orders, three of which were found to have occurred. The College acknowledges that the most serious allegation, injecting clients with botulinum toxin and dermal fillers, was not proven. In this case, I order that the College receive 50% of the special costs allowed by the Registrar.

**Conclusion**

[69] I order that Ms. Ezzati pay a fine of \$5000 to the Attorney General of British Columbia, as punishment for her contempt of court orders. I order that the College receive 50% of its special costs allowed by the Registrar.

“Gropper J.”