

**DECISION OF  
THE SASKATCHEWAN REAL ESTATE COMMISSION  
AND CONSENT ORDER**

Paul (*Re*), 2026 SKREC 6

Date: June 10, 2026  
Commission File: 2025-113

**IN THE MATTER OF  
THE REAL ESTATE ACT, C. R-1.3 AND  
IN THE MATTER OF DONNA PAUL**

Before: A Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission Hearing Committee  
comprised of the following:

Christopher Boychuk - Chairperson  
Dean Staff  
Alberta Mak

**CHARGE and ADMISSION OF MISCONDUCT:**

[1] The registrant is charged with and is admitting to professional misconduct as follows:

**Count 1:**

That, contrary to section 39(1)(c) of *The Real Estate Act*, Ms. Paul breached Commission Bylaw 723(c), by failing to notify the Commission within the prescribed time limit of the commencement of civil proceedings against her with respect to misrepresentation and trade in real estate.

**LEGISLATION:**

[2] Section 39(1)(c) of *The Real Estate Act* states:

*“Professional misconduct is a question of fact, but any matter, conduct or thing, whether or not disgraceful or dishonourable, is professional misconduct within the meaning of this Act, if...it is a breach of this Act, the regulations or the bylaws or any terms or restrictions to which the registration is subject.”*

[3] Bylaw 723 states:

*In addition to the requirements set out in section 33 of the Act and subsection 54(2) of the Act, and subject to Bylaw 724, a registrant shall notify the Commission in writing no later than five (5) days after the occurrence of any of the following:*

*(c) commencement of civil proceedings against the registrant with respect to: i. a trade in real estate; ii. fraud; iii. misrepresentation; iv. undue influence; or v. breach of trust; and any settlement entered into by the registrant or judgment issued against the registrant as a result of those civil proceedings;*

#### **FACTS:**

[4] In accordance with subsection 9(4) of The Real Estate Regulations (“the Regulations”), the Hearing Committee accepts Ms. Paul’s Statement of Facts and Admissions, which includes the following relevant points:

[5] Ms. Paul was continuously registered as a salesperson under the provisions of *The Real Estate Brokers Act, 1987* and *The Real Estate Act* in the Province of Saskatchewan with the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission from November 1, 2018, to June 30, 2023.

[6] Ms. Paul was continuously registered as an associate broker under the provisions of *The Real Estate Brokers Act, 1987* and *The Real Estate Act* in the Province of Saskatchewan with the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission from July 1, 2023, to November 9, 2023.

[7] Ms. Paul has been continuously registered as a broker under the provisions of *The Real Estate Brokers Act, 1987* and *The Real Estate Act* in the Province of Saskatchewan with the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission since November 16, 2023.

[8] Ms. Paul has taken the following real estate courses:

- Phase 1 - Real Estate as a Professional Career;
- Residential Real Estate as a Professional Career;
- Farm Real Estate as a Professional Career;
- Commercial Real Estate as a Professional Career; and
- Real Estate Office Management & Brokerage.

[9] Ms. Paul has completed the continuing professional development seminars each registration year since 2018 - 2019.

[10] Ms. Paul is presently registered under the provisions of *The Real Estate Act* as a broker with Royal LePage Landmart.

[11] Ms. Paul was the listing agent for a property in Moose Jaw (the “**Property**”).

- [12] Buyer A, the public complainant, is the buyer of the Property.
- [13] Registrant B represented Buyer A in his purchase of the Property.
- [14] The Property had a tenant that had been renting the Property for 16 years at the time of the listing.
- [15] On October 7, 2024, Ms. Paul entered into a Seller's MLS® Brokerage Contract with the sellers, to sell the Property, with a list price of \$199,000.
- [16] On December 27, 2024, Registrant B showed the Property to Buyer A.
- [17] On December 28, 2024, Registrant B wrote an offer to purchase for Buyer A for \$135,000 with no conditions (the "Offer").
- [18] Registrant B sent the Offer to Ms. Paul and followed up with a courtesy call to let Ms. Paul know why Buyer A came in so low.
- [19] Ms. Paul relayed this information to the sellers, who consist of three elderly individuals residing in different cities in British Columbia.
- [20] On December 28, 2024, Ms. Paul forwarded the Offer to the sellers via email, stating in part "It is a cash offer with no conditions which is nice. One of the reasons the buyer gave for his low offer was that the electrical panel needs work as well as some electrical. I attached a photo below of the electrical panel."
- [21] The sellers declined the Offer and subsequent negotiations occurred.
- [22] On December 31, 2024, Buyer A signed an unconditional offer for \$152,000 with a possession date of February 3, 2025 (the "Final Offer").
- [23] On December 31, 2024, the sellers signed acceptance of the Final Offer.
- [24] On December 31, 2024, the sellers provided notice to the tenant to vacate the Property on or before February 2, 2025.
- [25] On February 10, 2025, Registrant B sent an email to Ms. Paul stating "After taking possession of the Property [Buyer A] saw that the electrical panel is 100 amp. Your listing states that the building has a single phase 200 amp panel. He is willing to give you and your Seller the opportunity to upgrade this panel. This will save both you and your Seller legal fees. If you choose not to upgrade the panel to a single phase 200 amp he will be taking legal action."
- [26] On June 17, 2025, Buyer A filed a Statement of Claim in Small Claims in the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan, Moose Jaw.

- [27] Ms. Paul was served with the Statement of Claim in early August 2025.
- [28] Ms. Paul did not notify the Commission that civil proceedings had been commenced.
- [29] The Commission became aware of the civil proceedings against Ms. Paul on January 6, 2026, when Ms. Paul responded to the complaint Buyer A filed with the Commission.

## **REASONS:**

- [30] The Investigation Committee and Ms. Paul considered the following as relevant in agreeing to the within consent order:

### Mitigating Factors

- [31] Ms. Paul does not have a previous sanction history.
- [32] Ms. Paul was co-operative with the investigation.

### Aggravating Factors

- [33] Ms. Paul is a broker. As the people responsible for ensuring that registrants of the brokerage are complying with the requirements set out in the legislation, brokers are held to a higher standard.

### Prior Decisions & Other Considerations

- [34] In May of 2012, the Appeals Committee of the Real Estate Council of Ontario rendered a decision [\*In the Matter of Suzette Thompson\*](#) (“*Thompson*”). The Appeals Committee in *Thompson* set out a series of factors to be considered when determining the appropriate sanction for a registrant found in breach of the legislation. The factors are as follows:
1. The nature and gravity of the breaches of the Code of Ethics.
  2. The role of the offending member in the breaches.
  3. Whether the offending member suffered or gained as a result of the breaches.
  4. The impact of the breaches on complainants or others.
  5. The need for specific deterrence to protect the public.
  6. The need for general deterrence to protect the public.
  7. The need to maintain the public’s confidence in the integrity of the profession.
  8. The degree to which the breaches are regarded as being outside the range of acceptable conduct.
  9. The range of sanction in similar cases.

[35] These factors are reasonable considerations and can offer guidance to members of a Hearing Committee tasked with crafting an appropriate sanction for a registrant found to have committed professional misconduct. These factors have been consistently applied in Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission consent orders since September 2016.

*1. The nature and gravity of the breaches of the Code of Ethics.*

[36] Ms. Paul failed to notify the Commission when civil proceedings in relation to misrepresentation and trade in real estate were commenced against her. The Commission only became aware of the civil proceedings when the plaintiff filed a complaint with the Commission.

*2. The role of the offending member in the breaches.*

[37] Ms. Paul was the only registrant involved in her breach of the legislation.

*3. Whether the offending member suffered or gained as a result of the breaches.*

[38] There is no evidence to suggest that Ms. Paul suffered a loss or enjoyed a benefit as a result of her breach of the legislation, however the civil proceedings remain ongoing.

*4. The impact of the breaches on complainants or others.*

[39] Failure to provide notice of specific events as required by the legislation challenges the Commission's ability to provide oversight and regulate the real estate industry.

*5. The need for specific deterrence to protect the public.*

[40] Ms. Paul must be made aware of the notice requirements of the legislation and the importance of notifying the Commission of relevant civil proceedings within the time prescribed. For the Commission to properly fulfill its obligations of protecting the public the Commission must be kept up to date with certain civil proceedings against registrants.

*6. The need for general deterrence to protect the public.*

[41] All registrants must be reminded of the notice requirements of the legislation and the importance of notifying the Commission of certain civil proceedings within the time prescribed.

*7. The need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the profession.*

[42] The public interest is best served when the Commission is aware of and able to track the progress of certain civil proceedings against registrants. Registrants that fail to comply with the notification requirements of the legislation can hinder the ability of the Commission to protect the public. The public should be confident that the Commission is aware of relevant legal proceedings against registrants.

*8. The degree to which the breaches are regarded as being outside the range of acceptable conduct.*

[43] Ms. Paul's conduct falls below the standard expected of registrants, but it was not egregious.

9. *The range of sanction in similar cases.*

**A. What is an appropriate sanction for Ms. Paul's breach of Bylaw 723(c)?**

- [44] In *Peterson* (Re), [2025 SKREC 15](#) (file 2025-24) ("*Peterson*"), Corey Peterson was issued an order of reprimand and \$3,000 fine for breaching Commission Bylaw 723(c) by failing to notify the Commission of the commencement of civil proceedings against him no later than 5 days after the commencement of the civil proceedings.
- [45] In or around early 2023 ICR Brokerage Inc. listed a commercial property for lease. In or around April 2023, the lessor viewed the property and then engaged the services of ICR to lease the property working directly with Mr. Peterson. On July 1, 2023, the lessor took possession of the property and shortly thereafter commenced operation of her business. The lessor was subsequently advised by the City of Saskatoon that her business operations did not comply with the zoning bylaw. On March 30, 2024, the lessor vacated the property as a result of being unable to secure a business license. On October 10, 2024, the lessor issued a Statement of Claim against Mr. Peterson and ICR. On March 5, 2025, the broker of ICR sent an email to the Commission stating "[f]orgot to send to you" with the Statement of Claim attached. Mr. Peterson did not at any time prior to March 5, 2025, notify the Commission of the civil proceedings against him.
- [46] Mr. Peterson was continuously registered as a salesperson since October 15, 2008, with no previous sanction history. While Mr. Peterson was co-operative with the investigation and acknowledged his error, he only acknowledged his error after he received a letter from the Commission regarding the investigation.
- [47] Ms. Paul's breach of the legislation is more serious than that of the registrant in *Peterson*. Both Ms. Paul and Mr. Peterson were co-operative with the investigation, and neither had a previous sanction history. While both registrants failed to notify the Commission within the prescribed time that civil proceedings had been commenced against them, Ms. Paul is a broker and as the people responsible for ensuring registrants comply with the legislation, brokers are held to a higher standard.
- [48] In *Matharu* (Re), [2025 SKREC 6](#) (file 2024-02) ("*Matharu*"), Ajit Matharu was issued an order of reprimand and a \$6,000 fine.
- [49] On December 22, 2015, Corporation A and Plaintiff B issued a Statement of Claim against multiple defendants, including Mr. Matharu and his professional corporation, in the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan ("Claim 1"). Claim 1 arose out of a real estate transaction in which Mr. Matharu represented Corporation C for the sale of an apartment building property located in Regina, Saskatchewan. Mr. Matharu did not notify the Commission of Claim 1, and the Commission first became aware of Claim 1 on October 10, 2023, as a result of the

CanLII publication of the decision from the Court of King's Bench. Commission staff contacted Mr. Matharu regarding his failure to comply with the Bylaw 723 notice requirements and specifically noted his obligations regarding both the commencement of civil proceedings and regarding the issuance of a judgment against him.

- [50] On November 15, 2022, Plaintiff D and Plaintiff E issued a Statement of Claim against several defendants, including Mr. Matharu, in the Court of King's Bench for Saskatchewan ("Claim 2"). Claim 2 arose out of a real estate transaction in which Mr. Matharu represented an undisclosed purchaser and alleged that despite Mr. Matharu's repeated assurances that the undisclosed buyer had the required funds for the purchase price and that the \$50,000 deposit was held in his brokerage's trust account, it came to light that Mr. Matharu did not have the deposit in his trust account when the transaction fell through. Plaintiff D and Plaintiff E were the sellers of the property, and Claim 2 alleged that Mr. Matharu's conduct resulted in significant financial loss to Plaintiff D and Plaintiff E, including the loss of the \$50,000 deposit. Mr. Matharu did not notify the Commission of Claim 2, and the Commission first became aware of Claim 2 on March 30, 2023. Commission staff contacted Mr. Matharu regarding his failure to comply with the Bylaw 723 notice requirements and specifically noted his obligations regarding the commencement of civil proceedings against him.
- [51] On September 8, 2023, Plaintiff F and Plaintiff G initiated a Statement of Claim against Mr. Matharu in the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan ("Claim 3"). Claim 3 arose out of the same real estate transaction as Claim 2, but Plaintiff F and Plaintiff G were the agents who represented Plaintiff D and Plaintiff E in the transaction. Claim 3 alleged that Mr. Matharu's conduct resulted in Plaintiff F and Plaintiff G losing a commission of \$24,000. Mr. Matharu did not notify the Commission of Claim 3, and a Default Judgment in the amount of \$25,509.16 was issued against Mr. Matharu in favour of Plaintiff F and Plaintiff G on November 24, 2023. Mr. Matharu did not notify the Commission of this Default Judgment. On November 30, 2023, when the Commission first became aware of Claim 3, Commission staff contacted Mr. Matharu regarding Claim 3 and specifically noted his obligations regarding notice of an issuance of a Judgment against him.
- [52] The Commission proceeded to open a file against Mr. Matharu for the multiple breaches of Bylaw 723(c), and Mr. Matharu signed a Consent Order acknowledging the same.
- [53] The Hearing Committee considered as mitigating factors that Mr. Matharu had extenuating personal circumstances and was caring for his ailing wife at the time of the breaches and that Mr. Matharu believed it was his broker's responsibility to notify the Commission.
- [54] As aggravating factors, the Hearing Committee noted that Mr. Matharu has been a registrant since 1982 and has a significant history of previous sanctions. An article on the topic of a registrant's reporting obligations under Bylaw 723 was

published in the February 2015 Register, and a reminder was published in the November 2015 Register. Discipline decisions against registrant's for failing to comply with the notification requirements set out in Bylaw 723 were published in the 2015, 2019 and 2021 editions of the Register. Mr. Matharu was specifically reminded of his obligations pursuant to Bylaw 723 on three separate occasions by Commission staff, and these reminders specifically noted his obligations both regarding the commencement of civil proceedings and regarding the issuance of a judgment against him.

- [55] Ms. Paul's breach was less serious than that of the registrant in Matharu. Although Ms. Paul does not have a previous sanction history and Mr. Matharu had a significant sanction history, Ms. Paul is a broker and will be held to a higher standard. However, Ms. Paul failed to notify the Commission of civil proceedings against her once, while Mr. Matharu was charged with failure to notify the Commission of civil proceedings multiple times.
- [56] In *Pederson (Re)*, [2024 SKREC 15](#) (file 2023-59) ("*Pederson*"), Robert Pederson was issued an order of reprimand and a \$2,500 fine for breaching Bylaw 723(c). Mr. Pederson also received an order of reprimand and a \$6,000 fine for breaching section 8(4) of the Regulations for failing to respond to requests for information from the Commission.
- [57] Mr. Pederson and his brokerage were named as Third-Party Defendants in a Claim on September 19, 2014. On April 20, 2015, Mr. Pederson notified the Commission of the Claim. The Claim was discontinued on November 1, 2018. Mr. Pederson did not notify the Commission of the discontinuance.
- [58] An information bulletin on the topic of a registrant's reporting obligations under Bylaw 723 was published in the February 2015 Register, and a reminder was published in the November 2015 Register. Several discipline decisions against registrants who failed to comply with Bylaw 723 were posted on the Commission's website. Mr. Pederson had a previous sanction history.
- [59] Ms. Paul's breach is similarly serious to that of the registrant in Pederson. Although Mr. Pederson had a previous sanction history, while Ms. Paul does not, they are both brokers and will be held to a higher standard.
- [60] An order of reprimand and a \$5,000.00 fine are appropriate sanctions for Ms. Paul's breach of Bylaw 723(c).
- [61] As Ms. Paul has agreed to sign this consent order, there will be no order as to costs.

**CONSENT ORDER:**

- [62] In accordance with *The Real Estate Act*, its Regulations, and the Commission Bylaws, and with the consent of Ms. Paul, and the Investigation Committee of the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission, the Hearing Committee hereby orders:
- [63] With respect to Count 1, the charge of professional misconduct contrary to section 39(1)(c) of *The Real Estate Act* for breach of Bylaw 723(c):
- a. Ms. Paul shall receive an order of reprimand for the violation of Bylaw 723(c);
  - b. Ms. Paul shall, within 3 months of the date of this order, pay to the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission a \$5,000.00 fine for the said violation of the *Act*; and
  - c. Ms. Paul's registration shall be terminated if she fails to make payment as set out above.
- [64] There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2026.

Christopher Boychuk  
Hearing Committee Chairperson