

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

Peterson (Re), 2025 SKREC 15

Date: September 29, 2025
Commission File: 2025-24

**IN THE MATTER OF
THE REAL ESTATE ACT, C. R-1.3 AND
IN THE MATTER OF COREY PETERSON**

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

Jeffrey P. Reimer - Chairperson

Lori Patrick

Tyler Badinski

CHARGE and ADMISSION OF MISCONDUCT:

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

Count 1:

- That, Mr. Peterson breached section 39(1)(c) of the *Act* by breaching Commission Bylaw 723(c), by failing to notify the Commission of commencement of civil proceedings against him no later than 5 days after the commencement.

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(c) of *the Commission Bylaws* 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 Mr. Peterson’s Statement of Facts and Admissions, which includes the following relevant points:
- [5] Mr. Peterson has been continuously registered as a salesperson under the provisions of *The Real Estate Act* in the Province of Saskatchewan with the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission since October 1, 2008.
- [6] Mr. Peterson has taken the following real estate courses:
- Phase 1 – Real Estate as a Professional Career
 - Commercial Real Estate as a Professional Career
- [7] Mr. Peterson has completed the continuing professional development seminars each registration year since 2008-2009.
- [8] Mr. Peterson is presently registered under the provisions of *The Real Estate Act* as a salesperson with ICR Commercial Real Estate (“ICR”).
- [9] Broker A is the registered broker of ICR.
- [10] In or around early 2023, ICR listed a commercial property for lease (the “Property”).
- [11] In or around April 2023, Lessor B viewed the Property and then engaged the services of ICR to lease the Property, working directly with Mr. Peterson.
- [12] On July 1, 2023, Lessor B took possession of the Property and shortly thereafter commenced operation of her business.
- [13] Lessor B was subsequently advised by the City of Saskatoon that her business operations did not comply with the zoning bylaw.
- [14] On March 30, 2024, Lessor B vacated the Property as a result of being unable to secure a business license.

- [15] On October 10, 2024, Lessor B issued a Statement of Claim against Mr. Peterson and ICR, stating that she relied on Mr. Peterson's representations that her intended use of the Property complied with all zoning requirements and she alleged:
- a) fraudulent misrepresentation as defined in the *Act*;
 - b) negligent misrepresentation; and
 - c) breach of fiduciary duty
- [16] In the same Statement of Claim, Lessor B alleged that ICR was vicariously liable for the actions of Mr. Peterson as its employee.
- [17] On October 15, 2024, ICR and Mr. Peterson were served with Lessor B's Statement of Claim.
- [18] On November 15, 2024, counsel for ICR and Mr. Peterson signed a Statement of Defence. The date of filing is unclear from the Clerk's stamp.
- [19] Mediation took place on February 3, 2025.
- [20] On March 5, 2025, Commission staff received email from Broker A that stated "[f]orgot to send to you" with the Statement of Claim attached.
- [21] Broker A did not, at any time prior to March 5, 2025, advise the Commission of the civil proceeding commenced against ICR and Mr. Peterson.
- [22] Mr. Peterson did not advise the Commission of the civil proceeding against him until March 18, 2025, when he sent the Commission a copy of the Statement of Claim and Statement of Defence.
- [23] On March 18, 2025, Lessor B filed a complete discontinuance of her claim without any admission of liability by ICR, Broker A or Mr. Peterson.
- [24] On March 20, 2025, Broker A emailed a copy of the discontinuance of claim to the Commission.

REASONS:

Mitigating Factors

- [25] Mr. Peterson has been a registrant continuously registered as a salesperson since October 15, 2008.
- [26] Mr. Peterson has no previous sanction history.
- [27] Mr. Peterson was cooperative with the investigation and acknowledged his error.

Aggravating Factors

[28] Mr. Peterson only acknowledged his error after he had received a letter from the Commission regarding the investigation.

Prior Decisions & Other Considerations

[29] 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.

[30] 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.

[31] Mr. Peterson failed to notify the Commission of the commencement of civil proceedings against him within the time prescribed by the legislation. Mr. Peterson only reached out to the Commission after he received a letter from the Commission regarding the investigation.

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

[32] Civil proceedings were commenced against both Mr. Peterson and his brokerage. Both Mr. Peterson and his brokerage failed to notify the Commission of the commencement of the civil proceedings within the time prescribed by Bylaw 723

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

[33] There is no indication that Mr. Peterson suffered loss or enjoyed a benefit as a result of his breach of bylaw 723.

4. *The impact of the breaches on complainants or others.*
- [34] The Plaintiff filed a discontinuance of her claim and there is no evidence of consumer harm. However, Mr. Peterson's failure to notify the Commission challenges the ability of the Commission to regulate the industry and protect the public.
5. *The need for specific deterrence to protect the public.*
- [35] Mr. Peterson 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 their 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.*
- [36] 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.*
- [37] 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.*
- [38] Mr. Peterson'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 Mr. Peterson's breach of 723(c)?

- [39] In *Matharu (Re)*, [2025 SKREC 6](#), Mr. Matharu was issued an order of reprimand and a \$6,000 fine when he failed to notify the Commission of the commencement of civil proceedings against him.
- [40] 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.

- [41] 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.
- [42] 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.
- [43] Mr. Matharu's breach of Bylaw 723(c) is more severe than the breach of Mr. Peterson. Mr. Matharu breached Bylaw 723(c) on 3 separate occasions, while Mr. Peterson only breached Bylaw 723(c) once. Similarly, both Mr. Peterson and Mr. Matharu failed to inform the Commission of the civil proceedings against them until after the Commission had contacted them. Both Mr. Peterson and Mr. Matharu had no previous sanction history. Though a mitigating factor in Mr. Matharu's decision was the fact that he was primary care giver for his sick wife at the time of the breach.

- [44] In *Pederson (Re)*, [2024 SKREC 15](#), Mr. Pederson was issued an order of reprimand and a \$2,500 fine when he failed to notify the Commission of the discontinuance of a Claim against his brokerage.
- [45] 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.
- [46] 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 have been posted on the Commission's website.
- [47] Mr. Pederson had a previous sanction history. Mr. Pederson was not cooperative with the investigation and did not acknowledge any error on this part.
- [48] Mr. Peterson's breach was similarly serious to that of Mr. Pederson. Mr. Pederson is a broker and was not cooperative with the investigation. Mr. Peterson cooperated with the investigation and does not have a previous sanction history.
- [49] In *Zareh (Re)*, [2024 SKREC 12](#), Mr. Zareh was issued an order of reprimand and a \$3,000 fine for his breach of bylaw 723(e).
- [50] In December 2023, Mr. Zareh transferred his registration from one brokerage to another and, as part of the transfer process, was required to fill out a New Application of Re-Instatement or Renewal form, which was sworn before a Notary Public and subsequently submitted to the Commission. In the Personal Declaration and Affidavit of Agent section of the form, Mr. Zareh answered "yes" to question 6, which asks Have you or has any business you owned or participated in as a Director or Officer been in bankruptcy or the subject of any bankruptcy proceedings or a compromise with creditors?
- [51] Mr. Zareh had filed for personal bankruptcy on April 29, 2021 and subsequently received a discharge on January 31, 2022. Mr. Zareh did not advise the Commission as required, the Commission only became aware of this through the transfer process.
- [52] Mr. Zareh was cooperative with the investigation. Mr. Zareh had a previous sanction history.
- [53] Mr. Peterson's breach of bylaw 723(c) was of similar severity as Mr. Zareh's breach of bylaw 723(e). Both Mr. Peterson and Mr. Zareh did not notify the Commission until the Commission was made aware of the proceedings.

Additionally, both Mr. Zareh and Mr. Peterson were cooperative with the investigation.

- [54] In *Ackerman (Re)*, [2019 SKREC 20](#), Mr. Ackerman was issued an order of reprimand and a \$1,000 fine when he failed to notify the Commission both that a civil action was initiated against him and that it had been settled.
- [55] The Plaintiff filed an amended Statement of Claim against several defendants, including Mr. Ackerman, at the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan. The claim arose out of the Plaintiff's purchase of the property, with respect to which Mr. Ackerman had acted as the listing agent. Mr. Ackerman did not notify the Commission of the Statement of Claim.
- [56] On February 8, 2018, Commission staff sent Mr. Ackerman an email advising that the Commission had learned of the Plaintiff's claim. Commission staff sent Mr. Ackerman another email that included a reminder that Bylaw 723 also requires a registrant to notify the Commission within five days of a claim settling, judgment being issued, or other termination of the claim. On October 23, 2018, Mr. Ackerman entered into a settlement agreement with the Plaintiff. He did not notify the Commission of having entered into a settlement with the Plaintiff or the discontinuance of the Plaintiff's claim.
- [57] Mr. Ackerman was co-operative with the investigation.
- [58] Mr. Peterson's breach was of similar severity to the breach of Mr. Ackerman. Both Mr. Ackerman and Mr. Peterson were cooperative with the investigation. Additionally, in both investigations the registrant failed to notify the Commission that the claim had been initiated.
- [59] It must be noted that, the decision in *Ackerman (Re)* was rendered prior to May of 2020. In May of 2020, the provincial legislature amended section 38 of *The Real Estate Act* to increase the maximum fines that can be ordered against registrants found guilty of professional misconduct or professional incompetence. The previous iteration of the legislation capped fines at \$5,000 for each finding up to a maximum of \$15,000 in the aggregate for all findings. The new maximum fine for each finding of professional misconduct or professional incompetence was increased from \$25,000 up to \$100,000 in the aggregate for all findings. While this legislative change does not invalidate the precedents to be found in previous hearing decisions, it must be taken as a strong signal from lawmakers that the fines ordered against registrants should be increased so as to ensure the protection of the public.
- [60] An order of reprimand and a fine of \$3,000 are appropriate sanctions for Mr. Peterson's breach of bylaw 723(c).

CONSENT ORDER:

- [61] In accordance with *The Real Estate Act*, its Regulations, and the Commission Bylaws, and with the consent of Mr. Peterson and the Investigation Committee of the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission, the Hearing Committee hereby orders:
- [62] With respect to Count 1, the charge of professional misconduct contrary to section 39(1)(c) of *The Real Estate Act*:
- a. Mr. Peterson shall receive an order of reprimand for the violation of Bylaw 723(c) of *The Real Estate Act*;
 - b. Mr. Peterson shall, within 30 days of the date of this order, pay to the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission a \$3,000.00 fine for the said violation of the *Act*; and,
 - c. Mr. Peterson's registration shall be terminated if he fails to make payment as set out above.
- [63] There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated at Regina, Saskatchewan this 29th day of September, 2025.

Jeffrey P. Reimer
Hearing Committee Chairperson