

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACT*, BEING CHAPTER H-7
OF THE REVISED STATUTES OF ALBERTA, 2000**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A TRIBUNAL HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF KEVIN BLAIR, A
REGULATED MEMBER OF THE ALBERTA COLLEGE OF PARAMEDICS**

**DECISION OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL OF THE
ALBERTA COLLEGE OF PARAMEDICS – FILE #23-43**

The hearing of the Hearing Tribunal was held on January 16 & March 19, 2025 via videoconference.

Present were:

The members of the Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Paramedics (the “College”):

S. Wolfe, Chair, Regulated Member;
T. Cranston, Regulated Member;
I. Nazir, Public Member; and
T. Engen, Public Member.

Also present were:

J. Kirk, Complaints Director for the College;
T. Maxston, Legal Counsel for the Complaints Director;

K. Blair, Regulated Member¹

A. Reid, Independent Legal Counsel for the Hearing Tribunal;
A. Ben Khaled, Hearing Facilitator; and
S. Murphy, Court Reporter.

Opening of the Hearing

1. The hearing opened on January 16, 2025 and all participants present introduced themselves. Mr. Blair was present on January 16, 2025. The parties advised there were no objections to the members of the Hearing Tribunal.

¹ Mr. Blair attended on January 16, 2025. He was not present on March 19, 2025.

Preliminary Issues

Application for an Adjournment on January 16, 2025

2. Mr. Blair requested that the hearing be adjourned to allow him an opportunity to seek legal counsel and to collect and submit documentary evidence.
3. The Complaints Director agreed to the adjournment on two conditions:
 - a. The rescheduled hearing dates were peremptory dates, meaning that no further adjournments would be granted; and
 - b. If Mr. Blair failed to respond to the Hearings Director's communications to reschedule, the Hearings Director could set the hearing date without confirmation from Mr. Blair as to his availability.
4. Mr. Maxston made submissions as to the necessity of the conditions. He advised that the College had not received any communications from Mr. Blair as to any witnesses or evidence he intended to present until 4 am on January 16, 2025. Mr. Maxston expressed concern that further adjournments would prejudice of the Complaints Director's case.
5. Mr. Blair agreed to the Complaints Director's proposed conditions.
6. The Hearing Tribunal adjourned briefly to consider Mr. Blair's application. The Hearing Tribunal determined that it would be appropriate to give him an opportunity to obtain legal counsel and to collect documentary evidence for his case. It was also appropriate to make the rescheduled dates peremptory dates given Mr. Blair's agreement to the Complaints Director's proposed conditions and to ensure the hearing completed in a timely manner.
7. When the Hearing Tribunal returned to the hearing, it advised the parties that it would grant the adjournment subject to the agreed upon conditions.

Application to Proceed in the Absence of the Member on March 19, 2025

8. The Hearing Tribunal reconvened the hearing on March 19, 2025. Mr. Blair did not attend the hearing nor did any representative attend on his behalf. Mr. Maxston made an application under section 79(6) of the *Health Professions Act* (the "HPA") to proceed in Mr. Blair's absence.
9. Mr. Maxston referred the Hearing Tribunal to section 79(6), which allows the hearing to proceed in the absence of an investigated person if there is proof that an investigated person has been given a notice to attend the hearing. He advised that a notice can be served by way of

personal service, certified or registered mail in accordance with section 120(3), or through other methods such as email delivery.

10. Mr. Maxston called Ms. Holly Rose, the Acting Hearings Director, as a witness to support the application. The Acting Hearings Director spoke to several written communications she sent to Mr. Blair, which were marked as Exhibits 1 – 12. The evidence showed:

- a. The Acting Hearings Director sent a Notice of Hearing, Notice to Attend, and Notice to Produce for a hearing on October 22, 2024 to Mr. Blair by registered mail and by email on August 1, 2024 (the “August Notice”).
- b. The Acting Hearings Director testified that the mailing address and email address on the August Notice were the same as those in the College’s records. She confirmed that regulated members are required to ensure that their contact information with the College remains current.
- c. The August Notice sent by registered mail was confirmed delivered on August 9, 2024. The signed Canada Post delivery confirmation was marked as an Exhibit. The Acting Hearings Director was unsure who had signed for the delivery.
- d. The Acting Hearings Director sent an Amended Notice of Hearing, Notice to Attend and Notice to Produce for a hearing on January 16, 2025 to Mr. Blair by email on October 25, 2024 (the “October Notice”). The email address was the same as that used for the August Notice.
- e. On January 15, the Acting Hearings Director emailed Mr. Blair at the same email address. Mr. Blair responded to her email on January 16 at 4:22 a.m.
- f. Mr. Blair attended the hearing on January 16, which was ultimately adjourned. That day, the Acting Hearings Director emailed Mr. Blair with proposed dates for the rescheduled hearing. On January 17, she emailed him confirming the only mutually available hearing date was March 19. She requested he advise of any concerns by January 30. She did not receive a response from Mr. Blair by January 30.
- g. The Acting Hearings Director sent an Amended Notice of Hearing, Notice to Attend and Notice to Produce for a hearing on March 19 to Mr. Blair by email and by registered mail on February 3 (the “February Notice”). She used the same mailing address and email address, which remained the up-to-date addresses in the College’s records.

- h. The Acting Hearings Director received an Outlook delivery confirmation on February 3 that her email to Mr. Blair enclosing the February Notice was delivered.
 - i. The February Notice sent by registered mail was returned undeliverable, and it had a reason of “moved” stamped on the front. The Acting Hearings Director emailed Mr. Blair on February 14 to request that he provide a new mailing address. She advised him that the hearing would proceed on March 19. Mr. Blair did not provide a new mailing address.
 - j. The Acting Hearings Director emailed Mr. Blair the videoconference link for the hearing one week before March 19. Ms. Rose had no reason to believe that her email was not delivered.
11. Mr. Maxston submitted that the evidence was sufficient to allow the Hearing Tribunal to proceed with the hearing in Mr. Blair’s absence.
12. The Hearing Tribunal adjourned to consider the application. The Hearing Tribunal was satisfied that Mr. Blair received the February Notice of the hearing on March 19 via email. The Acting Hearings Director had previously sent the October Notice to Mr. Blair by email only, following which Mr. Blair corresponded with the Acting Hearings Director from the same email, and attended the hearing on January 16. The Acting Hearings Director sent the February Notice to the same email address and received an Outlook delivery confirmation.
13. The Hearing Tribunal was not aware of any circumstances that would suggest Mr. Blair could not attend the hearing. On January 16, 2025, he had agreed to a conditional adjournment requiring the rescheduled dates to be peremptory dates. It is also a regulated member’s responsibility to keep their mailing address and contact information with the College current.
14. The Hearing Tribunal granted the Complaints Director’s application and the hearing proceeded on March 19, 2025 in the absence of Mr. Blair.

Application to Hold a Portion of the Hearing in Private on March 16, 2025

15. Mr. Maxston made an application under section 78(1) of the HPA to request that
- a. the full name of a witness be redacted from the hearing transcripts and exhibits, such that she only be referred to as “NF”, and
 - b. the testimony of NF and Mike Kohut be held in private.
16. Mr. Maxston outlined the authority to hold part of a hearing in private. Section 78(1)(a) allows a private hearing if a person’s confidential health information outweighs the desirability of

an open hearing. Mr. Maxston advised that the evidence, including Mr. Kohut's testimony, was expected to include NF's confidential health information. Mr. Maxston submitted that the interest in maintaining NF's confidential health information outweighed the interest in an open hearing.

17. Mr. Maxston also submitted that section 78(1)(a) allowed the hearing to be held in private if the presence of the public could compromise the ability of a witness to testify at the hearing. He advised that NF is a vulnerable individual with a lengthy history in the health care system. Mr. Maxston indicated that the presence of the public could impact NF's ability to recall information and would impact her ability to give thorough and and truthful evidence.

18. The Hearing Tribunal adjourned to consider the Complaints Director's application. When the hearing reconvened, the Hearing Tribunal decided to grant the application. Given the sensitivity of the circumstances that gave rise to NF's interactions with Mr. Blair on July 7, 2023, which included circumstances concerning her health condition, the Hearing Tribunal found that the interest in maintaining the confidentiality of her health information supported the directions sought by the Complaints Director. The Hearing Tribunal agreed it was appropriate to hold the entirety of Mr. Kohut's testimony in private, considering that the evidence from Mr. Kohut would contain NF's confidential health information and appreciating that attempting to hold portions of his testimony in private with the rest open to the public would risk disclosure of NF's health information.

Allegations

19. At the hearing, the Allegations against Mr. Blair were as follows:

1. On or about July 8, 2023, you allowed [NF], a patient treated by you on July 7, 2023, to attend at your personal residence without any clinical reason.

Which constitutes unprofessional conduct under section 1(1)(pp)(ii) and/or (xii) of the HPA including breaching Alberta College of Paramedics Code of Ethics section 1.1 (Act Respectfully), section 1.5 (Ensure Appropriate Professional Boundaries) and/or section 3.3 (Maintain Good Character and Reputation).

2. On or about 2023 and any dates to be determined, you misappropriated one or more of the following medical supplies and/or documents from your employer (Alberta Health Services):
 - 10 – ampules of dimenhydrinate (Gravol)
 - 1 – vial of Lidocaine
 - 19 – vials of Ketorolac (Toradol)
 - 2 – Naloxone kits
 - Full and partially full bags of saline

- Numerous used and unused syringes, catheters, intra-venous lines, sterile wipes, and tape
- Two ECG printouts with some patient identifying information (no names)

and/or stored the above medical supplies and/or documents at your personal residence.

Which constitutes unprofessional conduct under section 1(1)(pp)(ii) and/or (xii) of the HPA including breaching Alberta College of Paramedics Code of Ethics section 3.2 (Practice in Accordance with the Legislation) and/or 3.3 (Maintain Good Character and Reputation); and/or breaching the Alberta Health Services Code of Conduct.

3. On or about June of 2023 you failed to self-report the following criminal charges against you to the College:
 - Assault – Contravening section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*.

Which constitutes unprofessional conduct under section 1(1)(pp)(ii), (iii) and/or (xii) of the *Health Professions Act* including breaching Alberta College of Paramedics Standard of Practice 1.4(3) – Self-Reporting and/or Alberta College of Paramedics Code of Ethics section 3.2 (Practice in Accordance with the Legislation) and/or section 3.3 (Maintain Good Character and Reputation).

Evidence Before the Hearing Tribunal

20. The Complaints Director entered the following documents as exhibits:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Exhibit 1: | Letter and Notice to Attend and Produce, dated August 1, 2024 |
| Exhibit 2: | Registered Mail Receipt for the letter and Notice to Attend and Produce sent August 1, 2024 |
| Exhibit 3: | Canada Post Registered Mail Tracking Confirmation, dated August 29, 2024 |
| Exhibit 4: | Email to K. Blair with Notice to Attend and Produce, dated August 1, 2024 |
| Exhibit 5: | Letter and Amended Notice to Attend and Produce to K. Blair, dated October 25, 2024 |
| Exhibit 6: | Email to K. Blair with Amended Notice to Attend and Produce, dated October 25, 2024 |
| Exhibit 7: | Email from K. Blair to Acting Hearings Director dated January 16, 2025 |
| Exhibit 8: | Letter and Amended Notice to Attend and Produce to K. Blair, dated February 3, 2025 |
| Exhibit 9: | Email to K. Blair with Amended Notice to Attend and Produce, dated February 3, 2025 |

- Exhibit 10: Outlook delivery confirmation, dated February 3, 2025
- Exhibit 11: Registered Mail Receipt for the letter and Amended Notice to Attend and Produce sent February 3, 2025
- Exhibit 12: Email to K. Blair dated February 14, 2025
- Exhibit 13: Amended Notice of Attend and Produce, dated February 3, 2025 (the "Notice of Hearing")
- Exhibit 14: Notification of Unprofessional Conduct by S. Darby dated July 19, 2023, enclosing two letters dated July 13 and 19, 2023
- Exhibit 15: Notification of Unprofessional Conduct by M. Kohut dated August 14, 2023 enclosing two letters dated August 11 and 14, 2023
- Exhibit 16: AHS investigation report, dated August 7, 2023
- Exhibit 17: Patient Care Report for NF, dated July 7, 2023 (the "PCR")
- Exhibit 18: Screen shots of text messages dated July 7 – 9, 2023
- Exhibit 19: AHS Code of Conduct, dated March 2023

21. The Complaints Director called the following witnesses over the course of the hearing:
- a. Mike Kohut,
 - b. NF, and
 - c. Tim Ford, Registrar of the College.

Testimony of Mike Kohut

22. Mr. Kohut testified that in July 2023, he was working for AHS as an Operations Manager with oversight of EMS staff in the Edmonton zone. His role included supervising day-to-day operations and investigating issues that arose in the normal course of operations.

23. Mr. Kohut confirmed that on July 19, 2023, his boss, S. Darby, submitted a complaint about Mr. Blair to the College on Mr. Kohut's behalf. Mr. Kohut testified that AHS conducted an internal investigation into the events involving Mr. Blair, which occurred on July 7, 2023. The AHS investigation remained ongoing when the College complaint was submitted.

24. Mr. Kohut testified that he participated in the AHS investigation. The investigation involved interviews with all available witnesses and a review of relevant documents. Upon completion of the investigation, AHS sent a letter of termination to Mr. Blair on August 11, 2023. They also sent him a letter on August 14, 2023, which summarized the outcome of the investigation.

25. Mr. Kohut confirmed that the AHS investigation was summarized in an investigation report dated August 7, 2023. He testified that the report accurately detailed the investigation findings. Mr. Kohut reviewed the investigation findings in the executive summary of the report.

26. Mr. Kohut reviewed the records of the events that occurred on July 7, 2023 involving Mr. Blair. Mr. Kohut confirmed that the PCR indicated that Mr. Blair was dispatched to NF's residence in response to a reported overdose at approximately 12:40 am on July 7, 2023. Mr. Blair and his partner transported NF to the University of Alberta Hospital (the "Hospital") at 2 am and transferred care at approximately 2:20 am. Mr. Kohut clarified that the transfer of care indicated that NF was no longer under Mr. Blair's care.

27. Mr. Kohut then reviewed a screenshot of text messages exchanged between NF and an individual saved in NF's cell phone contact as "Paramedic Blair", who was believed to be Mr. Blair. The screenshots start on July 7, 2023 at 1:32 am to the last text exchanged on July 9, 2023. Mr. Kohut confirmed that the text messages were reviewed during the AHS investigation.

28. Mr. Kohut testified that over the text exchanges, NF requested the address to Mr. Blair's residence on the evening of July 8, 2023, which Mr. Blair provided. He also provided directions to his residence. Mr. Kohut confirmed that Mr. Blair was not on active duty as a paramedic at the time. Mr. Kohut reviewed the text message from NF on July 9, 2023, and testified that he believed NF attended Mr. Blair's residence on July 8, 2023.

29. Mr. Kohut confirmed that AHS was later informed that NF had contacted the police following her attendance at Mr. Blair's residence and that the police subsequently executed a search warrant at Mr. Blair's residence on July 12, 2023. Mr. Kohut indicated that police provided documents and photographs to AHS including photographs of the items seized in Mr. Blair's residence. Mr. Kohut testified that items included medical supplies and documentation, including an unredacted electrocardiogram ("ECG") printout.

30. Mr. Kohut confirmed that AHS personnel reviewed lot numbers on several of the seized medical items. They confirmed that a majority of the seized item lot numbers matched lot numbers of supplies purchased and distributed by AHS. However, Mr. Kohut acknowledged that certain lot numbers could not be exclusively linked to AHS, as they may have been used by other EMS agencies. Mr. Kohut testified that lot numbers on dimenhydrinate, lidocaine, naloxone, ketorolac (Toradol), syringes, catheters, IV lines could be assessed, but sterile wipes and adhesive tape would not have individual lot numbers as they came in boxes that would have a lot number associated with it.

31. Mr. Kohut testified that, with respect to the ECG printout, the document appeared to be generated by an AHS-affiliated contracted EMS provider. He testified that such documents are considered patient health records and should not be stored outside of AHS systems.

32. Mr. Kohut further testified that, during the AHS investigation, Mr. Blair stated that he had acquired some of the seized items for educational purposes while he was a student. However, Mr.

Kohut explained that if an ECG is used for educational purposes, patient identifying information would be redacted, which was not the case with the ECG found in Mr. Blair's residence.

33. Mr. Kohut confirmed that, at the time of the AHS investigation report, Mr. Blair had not been criminally charged in connection with the events involving NF.

34. Mr. Kohut also reviewed a court document titled "Appearance Notice" dated June 9, 2023 (the "Appearance Notice") that was appended to the AHS investigation report. The Appearance Notice indicated that Mr. Blair had been charged under the *Criminal Code of Canada*, which Mr. Kohut believed to be unrelated to the events involving NF. However, he could not confirm whether Mr. Blair signed the Appearance Notice.

35. Mr. Kohut testified that AHS had considered whether Mr. Blair's actions breached the AHS Code of Conduct dated March 2023 and in effect during the events in question. Mr. Kohut confirmed that all AHS employees, including paramedics, are required to review the AHS Code of Conduct annually or semi-annually as part of their ongoing obligations. Mr. Kohut reviewed the following sections in his testimony:

1. Our Code: It Starts With Each of Us

We each commit to

- Behave ethically, take responsibility for our actions, and learn from mistakes.
- Uphold AHS bylaws, principles, directives, policies, procedures, standards and any other applicable documents that guide our actions.
- Consider how what we say or do may impact our own reputation or that of AHS.

4. Our Code: Protecting Information & Assets

We each commit to

- Protect and be accountable with patients, clients, co-workers and AHS information and assets.
- Promptly report any privacy breaches

36. In response to questions from the Hearing Tribunal, Mr. Kohut confirmed that it would be atypical if an employee did not acknowledge receipt of and agree to the AHS Code of Conduct, as the AHS Code of Conduct forms part of standard onboarding and training requirements.

37. Mr. Kohut also testified that he was not aware of whether Mr. Blair had appeared in court on July 7, 2023, for the charges as indicated in the Appearance Notice.

Testimony of NF

38. NF testified to events that occurred between July 7 and 9, 2023. She stated that on the morning of July 7, 2023, she had an overdose and paramedics transported her to the Hospital. She confirmed that Mr. Blair was one of the paramedics. They left her in the care of the Hospital.

39. NF testified that she was admitted overnight and discharged on July 8, 2023. She confirmed that she and Mr. Blair exchanged a series of text messages after she was admitted to the Hospital. NF stated that the initial text from Mr. Blair was sent early in the morning of July 7, 2023, following the transfer of her care.

40. NF confirmed that the screenshots of the text messages in evidence were taken from her personal cell phone and reflected an exchange between her and Mr. Blair from July 7 to July 9, 2023. She saved Mr. Blair's contact information in her phone under the name "Paramedic Blair."

41. NF testified that on Saturday, July 8, 2023, Mr. Blair texted her to invite her to his house, and she accepted. NF went to his home late that evening, but she could not recall the precise time. Mr. Blair was not on shift at that time. She saw several medical items in the house, including IV saline bags, needles, syringes, and small vials.

42. NF testified that she left Mr. Blair's residence early the next morning. She confirmed that she contacted Edmonton Police Service later that morning. She had an interview with police, and told them about the medical items she saw at Mr. Blair's home. She also provided copies of her text messages with Mr. Blair to the police.

43. In response to questions from the Hearing Tribunal, NF stated that when she was transported to the Hospital, Mr. Blair attended to her as a patient in the back of the ambulance. She also explained how she got his phone number. Her phone was on her chest and it kept ringing because her friend was calling. Mr. Blair picked up the phone, and then she hung it up. When the screen unlocked, he told her to give him the phone and said he would put his number into it. Then, he put his number into her phone. NF recalled that Mr. Blair said he wanted the best for her and that he could help her.

44. NF testified that she did not attend Mr. Blair's home for any clinical reason. NF also estimated that she contacted EPS around 10:00 am on July 9, 2023.

Testimony of Tim Ford

45. Mr. Ford is the Registrar at the College. He confirmed that the Standards of Practice are publicly available through both the regulated members' portal and the College's public website. Mr. Ford explained that the College reviews its standards annually and updates them as needed to ensure consistency with legislative and regulatory changes.

46. Mr. Ford described the College's Standard of Practice 1.4, which was in effect in May 2023. It requires regulated members to self-assess their ability to provide care and report to the College anything that might affect their ability to provide care, such as physical, cognitive, psychological, or emotional conditions, and any criminal charges, regardless of whether there is a conviction.

47. Mr. Ford explained that while regulated members are required to self-report criminal charges to the Registrar, they will often contact other College staff. Those staff members then forward the information to the Registrar. He noted that criminal charges are not a conviction. When a regulated member self-reports, he assesses whether there is a risk to the public and puts processes in place to ensure that the College will be aware of the outcome of the charge. Mr. Ford emphasized that members have a responsibility for ensuring the College is promptly informed of any criminal charges.

48. Mr. Ford confirmed that Mr. Blair had not directly self-reported any criminal charges to him. He further testified that no one within the College advised him that Mr. Blair had self-reported. To Mr. Ford's knowledge, Mr. Blair never reported any criminal charges to the College.

49. In response to questions from the Hearing Tribunal, Mr. Ford advised he was unaware of how the College became aware of Mr. Blair's charges. However, he believed that the College's conduct department became aware as a result of the complaint investigation.

Submissions of the Complaints Director

50. Mr. Maxston submitted that the Allegations were factually proven on a balance of probabilities and that the proven conduct rose to the level of unprofessional conduct.

51. Mr. Maxston reviewed the evidence related to each of the Allegations. He indicated that the conduct alleged in Allegation 1 involved a failure to maintain professional boundaries, which harms the integrity of the profession. It was inappropriate for Mr. Blair to invite a former patient that he knew was vulnerable to his personal residence without any clinical reason. Paramedics have a high level of trust and responsibility placed on them, given their role to help people who are at their most vulnerable, and Mr. Blair violated that trust and responsibility.

52. With respect to Allegation 2, Mr. Maxston submitted that the misappropriation and storage of medical supplies at Mr. Blair's residence is a serious breach of professional obligations. He stated that theft and dishonesty go to the very heart of the integrity required to be a paramedic, and that good character is essential for a regulated health professional. Mr. Maxston emphasized that stealing from an employer harms integrity of the profession.

53. With respect to Allegation 3, Mr. Maxston indicated that the obligation to self-report criminal charges is fundamental to the College's ability to fulfill its public protection mandate.

Timely and accurate reporting is essential to ensure the College has the means to prepare an appropriate and proportional response to any public risk. He concluded by saying that a failure to self-report can pose a significant threat to the public if not addressed in a timely way.

54. In response to questions from the Hearing Tribunal, Mr. Maxston confirmed that the events pertaining to Allegation 1 involved Mr. Blair's conduct while he was off-duty and not working as a paramedic. Mr. Maxston submitted that the case of *Erdmann v Complaints Inquiry Committee*, 2013 ABCA 147 ("*Erdmann*") confirms that professionals are held to a high standard even in relation to private matters, and that their off-duty conduct may lead to a finding of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Maxston also noted that the Court in *Erdmann* indicated that private behaviour that derogates from the high standard of conduct cannot be condoned.

55. Mr. Maxston advised that there must be a sufficient nexus or relationship between the off-duty conduct and the profession for a finding of unprofessional conduct. There are three factors to consider: (1) the nature of the profession, (2) the relationship of the misconduct to the work of the profession or the personal characteristics considered necessary to practice the profession, and (3) whether the person charged is identified or purported to act as a member of that profession. Mr. Maxston submitted that there is a sufficient nexus with respect to Mr. Blair's conduct described in Allegation 1. He reviewed the evidence that supported the finding.

Decision of the Hearing Tribunal on Unprofessional Conduct

56. The Hearing Tribunal carefully considered the evidence of the witnesses, the documents entered in as exhibits, and the Complaints Director's submissions.

57. The Hearing Tribunal also considered that many of the facts were uncontested because of Mr. Blair's absence from the hearing. However, the Hearing Tribunal recognizes the Complaints Director bears the burden of proving that the conduct in the Allegations occurred.

58. The Hearing Tribunal also considered the applicable legal principles concerning off-duty conduct, as outlined in *Erdmann*, which provides that where the alleged conduct occurred outside of professional duties, the Hearing Tribunal must assess whether a sufficient nexus exists between the personal conduct and the professional obligations of the regulated member.

59. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the Allegations in the Notice of Hearing were factually proven on a balance of probabilities, and that the proven Allegations constitute unprofessional conduct as defined in sections 1(1)(pp)(ii), (iii), and (xii) of the HPA.

Reasons for Findings of the Hearing Tribunal

Allegation 1: On or about July 8, 2023, Mr. Blair allowed NF, a patient treated by him on July 7, 2023, to attend at his personal residence without any clinical reason

60. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Allegation 1 is proven on a balance of probabilities.

61. The Hearing Tribunal heard from NF, who confirmed that Mr. Blair was one of the paramedics who responded to her overdose on July 7, 2023. The patient records show that the paramedics arrived at the scene at 12:47 a.m. They transported NF to the Hospital, and NF testified that Mr. Blair treated her as a patient in the back of the ambulance. At some point, Mr. Blair entered his personal phone number into her cell phone and said he wanted to help her.

62. The patient records show that EMS transferred NF's care to the Hospital at 2:00 a.m. The Hearing Tribunal reviewed NF's and Mr. Blair's text messages, which began at 1:32 a.m. and continued to the next day. Around 11:13 p.m. on July 8, Mr. Blair invited NF to his home. NF testified that she attended the residence late that evening and stayed until the following morning. She stated that Mr. Blair was not on shift as a paramedic during that time.

63. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Blair's actions breached sections 1.1 and 1.5 of the College's Code of Ethics, which states a paramedic's responsibility to patients includes:

1.1 Act respectfully in a manner that upholds the patient's dignity, safety, privacy, confidentiality and decision-making; taking into account the patient's rights, needs, culture and environmental context

1.5 Ensure appropriate professional boundaries by respecting the inherent power imbalance that occurs between a patient and their healthcare provider, maintaining clear separation between professional and personal relationships

64. The Hearing Tribunal also finds that Mr. Blair's conduct further contravened section 3.3 of the College's Code of Ethics, which sets out a paramedic's responsibility to himself:

3.3 Maintain good character and reputation by fostering a professional identity, following the Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, and demonstrating honesty and integrity in all interactions

65. Mr. Blair failed to uphold NF's dignity, safety, privacy, confidentiality and decision-making. His obligation to maintain professional boundaries was especially important given NF's vulnerability at the time. Less than 48 hours before, Mr. Blair had treated NF as his patient following an overdose. He gave her his personal cell phone number while she was under EMS care. NF texted him about her mental health condition that night and into the next day and said that she was having suicidal ideations. Despite her vulnerability, Mr. Blair invited her to his

personal residence without any clinical reason. His actions clearly failed to uphold NF's dignity and safety, and did not maintain a clear separation between professional and personal relationships. The Hearing Tribunal further finds that Mr. Blair failed to demonstrate honesty and integrity when he invited NF to his residence shortly after attending to her the day prior. If he had concerns about NF's well-being, he should have directed her to other resources.

66. The Hearing Tribunal considered the decision in *Erdmann* and is satisfied that there is a sufficient nexus between Mr. Blair's off-duty conduct and his professional role. The nature of the paramedic profession involves caring for vulnerable individuals in crisis. The relationship between Mr. Blair and NF originated in the course of Mr. Blair's duty, as he was on duty when he gave his personal cell phone number to her. He subsequently invited NF to his home, which was within 48 hours of his response to NF's overdose. NF continued to text Mr. Blair about her mental health condition even though he was off duty. The Hearing Tribunal recognizes that the conduct directly undermines the public's trust in the profession.

67. Based on the evidence, the Hearing Tribunal finds that the conduct in Allegation 1 constitutes unprofessional conduct under sections 1(1)(pp)(ii) and (xii) of the HPA.

Allegation 2: On or about 2023 and any dates to be determined, Mr. Blair misappropriated one or more of the medical supplies and/or documents detailed in the Notice of Hearing from his employer, AHS, and/or stored the medical supplies and/or documents at his personal residence.

68. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Allegation 2 is proven on a balance of probabilities.

69. The Hearing Tribunal heard evidence from Mr. Kohut who described the outcome of the AHS investigation and the involvement of EPS. Photographs and an exhibit log prepared by the EPS provided alongside the AHS investigation report were entered into evidence, confirming that numerous medical items and a patient ECG report were seized from Mr. Blair's residence.

70. Mr. Kohut explained that AHS personnel reviewed the lot numbers on a majority of the seized items and determined that they were consistent with items purchased and distributed by AHS. The Hearing Tribunal accepts that, on a balance of probabilities, these items belonged to AHS.

71. The ECG document was found to contain patient-identifying information. Mr. Kohut testified that there was no justifiable reason for such a document to be retained unredacted by a paramedic in their personal residence, even if it was for educational purposes.

72. The Hearing Tribunal gave particular consideration to the fact that, during the AHS investigation, Mr. Blair did not contradict that at least some of the supplies and documents were from AHS.

73. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Blair's conduct breached the College's Code of Ethics section 3.3 in that he failed to maintain good character and reputation, but also section 3.2, which sets out a paramedic's responsibility to:

3.2 Practice in accordance with legislation including the Health Professions Act of Alberta, Paramedic Professions Regulation, Code of Ethics, Standards of Practice and all other documents and policies used to govern the paramedic profession

74. The Hearing Tribunal also accepts that Mr. Blair's conduct contravened the AHS Code of Conduct. The AHS letter to Mr. Blair dated August 11, 2023 indicated that his theft of AHS equipment and drugs did not align with AHS's Code of Ethics.

75. The Hearing Tribunal carefully considered the evidence before it and determined that there was insufficient evidence to establish another reason why Mr. Blair should have the items detailed in Allegation 2 in his residence.

76. Based on the evidence, the Hearing Tribunal finds that the conduct in Allegation 2 constitutes unprofessional conduct under section 1(1)(pp)(ii) and (xii) of the HPA.

Allegation 3: On or about June of 2023, Mr. Blair failed to self-report the criminal charge of Assault – Contravening section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada* against him to the College.

77. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Allegation 3 is proven on a balance of probabilities.

78. The Hearing Tribunal heard from Mr. Ford, as Registrar of the College, who testified that the College's Standard of Practice 1.4(3) requires all regulated members to report any criminal charges directly to the Registrar. Mr. Ford confirmed that Mr. Blair never reported the charge to him nor any College staff. Furthermore, the Appearance Notice, naming Mr. Blair as the accused, supports that Mr. Blair was charged with assault as of June 9, 2023.

79. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Blair clearly failed to appropriately report the June 2023 charge as he was obligated to do. The Hearing Tribunal acknowledged that it heard detailed evidence from Mr. Ford concerning the College's process for self-reporting.

80. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Blair's conduct breached Standard of Practice 1.4(3) concerning self-reporting, which states:

A regulated member is required to self-assess their own ability to provide patient care. Factors that may impact a regulated member's ability to provide care may include any physical, cognitive, psychological and/or emotional condition; new or updated criminal

charges against them; a relationship with a patient. A regulated member must immediately self report to the Registrar the following:

[...]

3. New or updated criminal charges brought against them.

81. Furthermore, the conduct in Allegation 3 also contravened section 3.2 and section 3.3 of the College's Code of Ethics.

82. The Hearing Tribunal acknowledges that this failure to self-report undermines the College's ability to protect the public and violates the public trust in the profession, particularly as paramedics are tasked with working with vulnerable patients and must be held to a higher standard both inside and outside of their work. The Hearing Tribunal finds that Mr. Blair's conduct puts the integrity of the profession in jeopardy.

83. Based on the evidence, the Hearing Tribunal finds that the conduct in Allegation 3 constitutes unprofessional conduct under sections 1(1)(pp)(ii), (iii), and (xii) of the HPA.

CONCLUSION

84. For the reasons set out above, the Hearing Tribunal finds all the Allegations in the Notice of Hearing are proven, and Mr. Blair's proven conduct is unprofessional conduct under the HPA.

85. The Hearing Tribunal is prepared to receive the parties' written submissions on sanctions. If either the Complaints Director or Mr. Blair object to proceeding by written submissions and would like to proceed by oral submissions via videoconference, they may make a request within 2 weeks of receipt of this written decision. The Hearing Tribunal will consider the request, and if it agrees to proceed with oral submissions, the Hearings Director will schedule a hearing date.

[Intentionally left blank]

86. In the absence of a request for a hearing date, the Hearing Tribunal directs that the parties provide their written submissions to each other and to the Hearings Director as follows:

- a. The Complaints Director will provide their written submissions three weeks from the date they receive the Hearing Tribunal's written decision;
- b. Mr. Blair will provide his written submissions within one week of the Complaints Director's written submissions;
- c. The Complaints Director may submit a written reply within one week of Mr. Blair's written submissions.

For the Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Paramedics

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'SW', written over a horizontal line.

Sarah Wolfe, Chair

Dated May 23, 2025

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACT*, BEING CHAPTER H-7
OF THE REVISED STATUTES OF ALBERTA, 2000**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A TRIBUNAL HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF KEVIN BLAIR, A
REGULATED MEMBER OF THE ALBERTA COLLEGE OF PARAMEDICS**

**DECISION ON SANCTIONS OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL OF THE
ALBERTA COLLEGE OF PARAMEDICS – FILE #23-43**

A Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Paramedics (the “College”) met on July 15 and August 8, 2025 via videoconference.

Present were:

The members of the Hearing Tribunal:

S. Wolfe, Chair, Regulated Member;
T. Cranston, Regulated Member;
I. Nazir, Public Member; and
T. Engen, Public Member

A. Reid, Independent Legal Counsel for the Hearing Tribunal.

Introduction

1. The Hearing Tribunal issued a decision on May 23, 2025 regarding the conduct of Kevin Blair. The Hearing Tribunal found that the following allegations against Mr. Blair were proven and amounted to unprofessional conduct under the *Health Professions Act* (“HPA”):

- 1) On or about July 8, 2023, you allowed [NF], a patient treated by you on July 7, 2023, to attend at your personal residence without any clinical reason.
- 2) On or about 2023 and any dates to be determined, you misappropriated one or more of the following medical supplies and/or documents from your employer (Alberta Health Services):
 - 10 – ampules of dimenhydrinate (Gravol)
 - 1 – vial of Lidocaine
 - 19 – vials of Ketorolac (Toradol)
 - 2 – Naloxone kits
 - Full and partially full bags of saline
 - Numerous used and unused syringes, catheters, intra-venous lines, sterile wipes, and tape
 - Two ECG printouts with some patient identifying information (no names)

and/or stored the above medical supplies and/or documents at your personal residence.

3) On or about June of 2023 you failed to self-report the following criminal charges against you to the College:

- Assault – Contravening section 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*

2. The Hearing Tribunal directed the Complaints Director and Mr. Blair to make written submissions as to any appropriate orders, or to request a further hearing date for oral submissions. The Complaints Director provided written submissions dated June 11, 2025, and supplemental written submissions dated July 25, 2025. The Hearings Director advised that Mr. Blair did not respond to the Hearing Tribunal's request.

The Complaints Director's Submissions

3. The Complaints Director began by noting the Hearing Tribunal's authority to make orders under section 82 of the HPA. The Complaints Director submitted that the following orders were appropriate considering the circumstances of the case:

- a. Mr. Blair will be reprimanded. The Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision will constitute the reprimand.
- b. Mr. Blair must successfully complete the "PROBE: Ethics & Boundaries Program" two-day ethics course (the "Course") and must provide evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director within six months from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision. Mr. Blair will be responsible for all of the costs associated with the Course and the Course will not count towards his continuing education requirements with the College.
- c. If Mr. Blair fails to provide evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director within the six months, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until he provides evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director.
- d. Mr. Blair will pay fines in the amount of \$1,500.
- e. The fines are payable over a period of two years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision, provided that if Mr. Blair fails to pay the fines within that time period, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until the entire balance of the fines is paid in full.
- f. Mr. Blair will pay costs in the amount of \$4,500, representing a portion of the costs of the investigation and hearing.

- g. The costs are payable over a period of two years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision, provided that if Mr. Blair fails to pay the costs within that time period, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until the entire balance of the costs is paid in full.
- h. The Hearing Tribunal decision on unprofessional conduct and sanctions decision will be published with Mr. Blair's name on the College's website for a period of five years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision.

4. The Complaints Director did not seek an order suspending Mr. Blair's practice permit. They advised that Mr. Blair's practice permit was suspended under section 65 of the HPA between July 31, 2023 and May 23, 2024. From the Complaints Director's perspective, an additional suspension would be shorter than the interim suspension Mr. Blair had already served, and Mr. Blair should receive "credit for time served." Accordingly, the Complaints Director submitted that a suspension order was not justified.

5. The Complaints Director submitted that the proposed orders were consistent with the College's mandate under section 3 of the HPA and the fundamental purposes of sanctions. The purpose of sanctions in professional regulation is to ensure that the public is protected from unprofessional conduct and to maintain the integrity of the profession. These goals are achieved by ensuring the public is not at risk of harm from continuing conduct by the member, by ensuring that the public has confidence in the profession, and by sending an appropriate message to other members regarding conduct that is found to be unacceptable.

6. The Complaints Director referred the Hearing Tribunal to *Jaswal v. Newfoundland (Medical Board)*, 1996 CanLII 11630 (NL SC) ("*Jaswal*"), which describes sanctioning factors that discipline tribunals can consider. The Complaints Director made submissions on the factors:

- The nature and gravity of the proven allegations: Mr. Blair's unprofessional conduct represents a serious departure from the standards and expectations of a member of the profession. Mr. Blair's actions failed to uphold NF's dignity and safety, and did not maintain a clear separation between professional and personal relationships. The seriousness of Mr. Blair's unprofessional conduct is exacerbated by NF's vulnerable circumstances, having been brought into EMS care following an overdose and communicating to Mr. Blair that she was experiencing suicidal ideations.

Furthermore, Mr. Blair's theft of his employer's property was highly dishonest and created the circumstances for the confidentiality of patient health information to be violated. Finally, Mr. Blair's failure to self-report criminal charges frustrates the College's ability to determine a proportionate response and employ necessary measures for public protection.

- The presence or absence of any prior complaints or convictions: Mr. Blair has no discipline history with the College before these proceedings.
- The number of times the offence occurred: The Hearing Tribunal found that Mr. Blair engaged in unprofessional conduct in respect of three allegations, each of which involved

different underlying circumstances. Collectively, the findings of unprofessional conduct demonstrate a blatant disregard for his ethical obligations as a paramedic in multiple facets of the profession, including interactions with patients, his employer, and the College.

- The role of the member in acknowledging what occurred: Mr. Blair not only largely withdrew himself from the hearing process, but also unnecessarily prolonged the hearing and increased the costs of prosecution, resulting in avoidable extra costs. He has not provided any acknowledgment of responsibility and has engaged in hearing misconduct. Mr. Blair's conduct warrants an award of costs in the amount sought by the Complaints Director.
- Whether a member had already suffered other serious financial or other penalties as a result of the allegations having been made: Mr. Blair was terminated from his employment with AHS and was subject to an interim suspension pending the outcome of the College's investigation. Mr. Blair has likely suffered some measure of financial or other penalties associated with the allegations made against him.
- The need to promote specific and general deterrence: The sanctions orders must make it abundantly clear to Mr. Blair and other members of the profession that his conduct was unacceptable. Regulated members must maintain their professional responsibilities at all times and in all facets of their practice.
- The need to maintain the public's confidence in the profession: Mr. Blair's failure to practice and act with integrity undermined public confidence in the profession. The sanctions orders must clearly demonstrate to the public that the College takes these matters seriously and convey a message that the College is committed to upholding its legal obligations under the HPA.
- The degree to which the unprofessional conduct falls outside the range of permitted conduct: Mr. Blair's conduct clearly falls outside the range of permitted conduct for members of this profession.

7. The Complaints Director provided supplemental submissions dated July 25, 2025 in response to specific questions from the Hearing Tribunal. The Complaints Director advised that in determining their initial position on sanctions, they undertook a review of judicial and administrative authorities that considered unprofessional conduct in similar situations:

- a. *Decision of the Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Paramedics – File #23-46*, dated August 23, 2024 ("ACP Donelon");
- b. *Sahi v Alberta Veterinary Medical Association*, 2023 ABCA 368;
- c. *Wright v College and Association of Registered Nurses of Alberta (Appeals Committee)*, 2012 ABCA 267;
- d. *Law Society of Alberta v Adsit*, 2022 ABLS 23; and
- e. *Law Society of Alberta v Botan*. 2021 ABLS 25.

8. Based on the authorities and the circumstances of the case, the Complaints Director's view was that it would not be appropriate to cancel Mr. Blair's registration and practice permit, as cancellation would not be proportional to the proven unprofessional conduct.

9. The Complaints Director particularly noted that they had considered the *ACP Donelon* decision, which involved a regulated member who admitted to unprofessional conduct that involved accessing a patient's personal phone number and texting the patient with no clinical purpose. The tribunal in that case accepted the parties' joint submission and ordered a reprimand, participation in the PROBE: Ethics & Boundaries Program, fines in the amount of \$1,500 payable over two years from the date of the hearing tribunal's written decision, costs in the amount of \$4,500, a practice permit suspension of six weeks, and publication of the decision in a manner that included the regulated member's name. The Complaints Director's submissions in this case noted that Mr. Blair was not found to have engaged in unprofessional conduct constituting sexual misconduct.

10. The Complaints Director also advised that their total investigation and hearing costs of this matter at the time of their supplemental submissions were approximately \$32,139.41. They submitted that the \$4,500 in costs sought against Mr. Blair represented roughly 7% of the total costs.

Mr. Blair's Submissions

11. Mr. Blair did not provide submissions on appropriate orders.

Decision of the Hearing Tribunal on Sanctions and Costs

12. The Hearing Tribunal considered the Complaints Director's submissions. After serious consideration, the Hearing Tribunal agrees that the sanctions proposed by the Complaints Director are appropriate and proportionate to Mr. Blair's proven unprofessional conduct.

13. Mr. Blair's conduct was serious, as he breached professional boundaries by engaging in inappropriate contact with a vulnerable patient, misappropriated medical supplies from his employer, and failed to self-report criminal charges. The totality of Mr. Blair's unprofessional conduct demonstrates a disregard for the ethical and professional obligations of a regulated member and undermines the public's confidence in the paramedic profession.

14. During the Hearing Tribunal's assessment of the severity of Mr. Blair's conduct, it recognized the scope of the evidence presented and the facts found to have occurred. The Hearing Tribunal did not make a finding of sexual misconduct. Further, the evidence was unclear about whether the criminal charges against Mr. Blair were proven and whether he was convicted. There was little to no information about the circumstances that gave rise to Mr. Blair's criminal charges.

15. Mr. Blair, the profession, and the public should understand that the conduct found in this case is completely unacceptable and compromises the public's trust in the profession. Paramedics are responsible for responding to emergent situations, often where patients are in vulnerable circumstances. Paramedics can in the course of their duties be responsible for attending a patient's home. Unprofessional conduct like Mr. Blair's conduct compromises the trust that the public has in paramedics to put aside personal motivations when treating patients and attending a patient's home.

16. The Hearing Tribunal accepts that it would not be appropriate to suspend or cancel Mr. Blair's registration and practice permit because of the mitigating factors present. Mr. Blair has already faced significant penalties for his underlying conduct. He served an interim suspension of nearly 10 months, and his employment with AHS was terminated. The Complaints Director did not seek a suspension order and asked that Mr. Blair receive credit for the interim suspension that he had served. The Hearing

Tribunal would have been open to considering a suspension or other significant sanction if Mr. Blair had not already served the interim suspension.

17. The Hearing Tribunal also agrees that the Complaints Director's proposal is consistent with other previous cases. The *ACP Donelon* case involved similar but more serious unprofessional conduct (including a finding of sexual misconduct that is not present here). The regulated member in that case admitted to having engaged in unprofessional conduct, which is a significant mitigating factor absent in Mr. Blair's case. Overall, the *ACP Donelon* case supports the Complaints Director's proposal for sanctions, including the reprimand, PROBE Course, and a \$1,500 fine.

18. The PROBE Course is also appropriate in the circumstances of the case. Mr. Blair will be educated and reflect on his ethical obligations and unprofessional conduct to complete the Course. This education will protect the public against ongoing unprofessional conduct, should Mr. Blair apply for reinstatement as a regulated member in the future.

19. The fine of \$1,500 is also appropriate. The fine will send a message of specific and general deterrence to Mr. Blair should he return to practice, as well as to other members of the profession. The fine will show that the College does not tolerate the proven conduct in this case.

20. For these reasons, the Hearing Tribunal makes the sanctions orders sought by the Complaints Director. The Hearing Tribunal went on to consider whether it would be appropriate to order Mr. Blair to pay a portion of the costs of the investigation and hearing.

21. The Hearing Tribunal can order costs under section 82(1)(j) of the HPA. The Hearing Tribunal considered whether this was an appropriate case to order costs, and whether the quantum sought was reasonable. To the first question, the Hearing Tribunal considered whether the costs of the hearing were increased due to either party's litigation conduct.

22. Mr. Blair's conduct during the hearing did increase the hearing costs, such that a costs order is appropriate. Generally, Mr. Blair did not participate in the discipline process. He attended the hearing on January 16, 2025 and requested that the hearing be adjourned to allow him an opportunity to seek legal counsel and to collect evidence for his case. He ultimately did not attend the rescheduled hearing and did not provide any written submissions.

23. An order of \$4,500 is reasonable in the circumstances of the case. It reflects approximately 7% of the Complaints Director's total costs as of July 25, 2025, and does not reflect a crushing or unduly onerous financial obligation. The Hearing Tribunal recognizes that some of these costs would likely be incurred for transcription services and legal counsel for the Complaints Director. Most of the incurred costs in this matter will not be transferred to Mr. Blair.

24. Lastly, the Complaints Director noted that the Hearing Tribunal's decision on unprofessional conduct and on sanctions would be published with Mr. Blair's name in accordance with the College's Conduct Policy "Publishing of Hearing Decisions and Complaint Resolution Agreements and Undertakings." The Hearing Tribunal agrees that publication with names is appropriate in this case, as it promotes transparency and accountability.

Orders

25. For the above reasons, the Hearing Tribunal makes the following orders:

- a. Mr. Blair will be reprimanded. The Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision will constitute the reprimand.
- b. Mr. Blair must successfully complete the "PROBE: Ethics & Boundaries Program" two-day ethics course (the "Course") and must provide evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director within six (6) months from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision. Mr. Blair will be responsible for all of the costs associated with the Course and the Course will not count towards his continuing education requirements with the College.
- c. If Mr. Blair fails to provide evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director within the six (6) months, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until he provides evidence of successful completion of the Course to the Complaints Director.
- d. Mr. Blair will pay fines in the amount of \$1,500.
- e. The fines are payable over a period of two (2) years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision, provided that if Mr. Blair fails to pay the fines within that time period, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until the entire balance of the fines is paid in full.
- f. Mr. Blair will pay costs in the amount of \$4,500, representing a portion of the costs of the investigation and hearing.
- g. The costs are payable over a period of two (2) years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision, provided that if Mr. Blair fails to pay the costs within that time period, (i) should Mr. Blair not have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair will not be eligible to obtain a practice permit; or (ii) should Mr. Blair have an active practice permit, Mr. Blair's practice permit will be automatically suspended without the necessity of any further steps. Mr. Blair will not be eligible for a practice permit or his practice permit being reinstated until the entire balance of the costs is paid in full.

[Bottom of page intentionally left blank]

- h. The Hearing Tribunal decision on unprofessional conduct and sanctions decision will be published with Mr. Blair's name on the College's website for a period of five years from the date of the Hearing Tribunal's sanctions decision.

For the Hearing Tribunal of the Alberta College of Paramedics



Sarah Wolfe, Chair

Dated October 1, 2025