

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

Stretch (Re), 2025 SKREC 32

Date: December 18, 2025
Commission File: 2025-72

**IN THE MATTER OF
THE REAL ESTATE ACT, C. R-1.3 AND
IN THE MATTER OF DARREL STRETCH**

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

Jeffrey P. Reimer - Chairperson
Lori Patrick
Kayla McQueen

CHARGE and ADMISSION OF MISCONDUCT:

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

Count 1:

- That, Mr. Stretch breached section 39(1)(c) of the *Act* by breaching Commission Bylaw 702.1 by engaging in conduct that is disgraceful, unprofessional or unbecoming of a registrant in the course of his practice.

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] Commission Bylaw 702.1 states:

“A registrant shall not engage in conduct that is disgraceful, unprofessional or unbecoming of a registrant in the course of his or her practice.”

FACTS:

- [4] In accordance with subsection 9(4) of The Real Estate Regulations (“the Regulations”), the Hearing Committee accepts Mr. Stretch’s Statement of Facts and Admissions, which includes the following relevant points:
- [5] Mr. Stretch has been almost continuously registered as a salesperson under the provisions of *The Real Estate Brokers Act, The Real Estate Brokers Act, 1987* and *The Real Estate Act* in the Province of Saskatchewan with the Superintendent of Insurance Records and the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission since September 5, 1986.
- [6] Mr. Stretch has taken the following real estate courses:
- Real Estate 150
- [7] Mr. Stretch has completed the continuing professional development seminars each registration year since 2001-2002.
- [8] Mr. Stretch is presently registered under the provisions of *The Real Estate Act* as a salesperson with Realty Executives Saskatoon.
- [9] Mr. Stretch acted for the purchasers in a real estate transaction. Upon his clients taking possession, he was disappointed with the condition in which the property was left by the seller.
- [10] Following the transaction, Mr. Stretch posted pictures from the property and made a number of comments on a Facebook baby announcement post made by a member of the public who was unrelated to the property transaction.
- [11] Mr. Stretch’s comments were directed at the seller of the property.
- [12] Mr. Stretch posted the comment *“This is how you left your house after we paid you maximum dollar for it . You should be embarrassed!”*
- [13] Mr. Stretch posted a photo of a concrete floor with chalk writing that said *“this Place is HAUNTD – by Roseabella the goste HOO”* along with the comment *“To put this on the floor for the new owners to see is just how incredibly inconsiderate you are ! I hope your new home is haunted and the devil follows you ..”*
- [14] Mr. Stretch posted a photo of a scratch on the flooring with the comment *“Really nice that [seller] damaged a house that people paid maximum value for !!! And now she hides . But I’m sure her new property has been cleaned very well. She even left food in the fridge... how low can you go ?”*

- [15] The member of the public upon whose post he made the comments was upset by the comments.
- [16] Mr. Stretch sent a letter of apology to the seller.
- [17] The seller was further upset by Mr. Stretch's apology letter.
- [18] At the time this occurred, Mr. Stretch was struggling with a number of medical issues related to his health for which he is currently undergoing treatment.
- [19] Mr. Stretch believes that the treatment he is undergoing contributed to his conduct.
- [20] Mr. Stretch was also sanctioned by the Saskatchewan REALTORS® Association and paid a \$2,500 fine.

REASONS:

Mitigating Factors

- [21] Mr. Stretch was co-operative with the investigation.

Aggravating Factors

- [22] Mr. Stretch has a previous sanction history.
- In [2019 SKREC 30](#) Mr. Stretch was issued an order of reprimand and a \$1,000 fine for breaching Bylaw 702.1 by making extremely inappropriate comments to another registrant.
- [23] Although Mr. Stretch sent an apology to the complainant, he failed to take responsibility for his actions, instead assigning blame to the complainant.

Prior Decisions & Other Considerations

- [24] 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.

[25] 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.

[26] Mr. Stretch, acting for the buyers in a transaction, posted pictures of the property and made rude and derogatory public comments about the seller on a baby announcement posted on Facebook by a member of the public who was unrelated to the transaction.

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

[27] Mr. Stretch was the only registrant involved in his breach of the legislation.

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

[28] There is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Stretch enjoyed a benefit or suffered a loss as a result of his breach.

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

[29] The seller was distressed by Mr. Stretch's comments which she believes were defamatory and hurt her reputation. The unrelated third party was very disturbed by the comments that Mr. Stretch made on her baby announcement post.

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

[30] Specific deterrence is needed to ensure Mr. Stretch understands that he must conduct himself professionally and appropriately in the course of his practice. It must be made clear to Mr. Stretch that it is not acceptable to make rude and derogatory comments about a party to a transaction on a public forum.

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

[31] General deterrence is needed to ensure that all registrants understand that they are required to conduct themselves professionally and appropriately in the course of their practice. All registrants must understand that public social media forums are not an appropriate platform to raise concerns about a property or transaction.

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

[32] Members of the public are better served when the registrants who represent them are able to deal with concerns in a respectful manner. Public confidence in

the industry is bolstered by registrants who conduct themselves professionally and appropriately in the course of their practice.

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

[33] Mr. Stretch'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. Stretch's breach of Bylaw 702.1?

[34] While there are many decisions pursuant to Bylaw 702.1, the following are the decisions that best relate to Mr. Stretch's conduct.

[35] In *Pellegrini (Re)*, [2025 SKREC 17](#) (file 2024-117) ("*Pellegrini*"), Tyler Pellegrini was issued an order of reprimand and \$4,000 fine for breaching Commission Bylaw 702.1 by sending rude and unprofessional text messages.

[36] Mr. Pellegrini represented the lessor in the negotiation of her lease for a commercial property. After the transaction, Mr. Pellegrini sent a number of rude and unprofessional texts to a member of the operations team for the property, including: "You're a clown and a thief", "Bald loser", "drunk loser", "Your just as ugly as him". Mr. Pellegrini's intended recipient was an operator that had been harassing the lessor and making disparaging remarks about Mr. Pellegrini. Mr. Pellegrini continued to make these comments even after the recipient advised him that he was not the person Mr. Pellegrini thought he was communicating with, and sent him a picture to show that he was a different person.

[37] Mr. Stretch's breach is more serious than that of the registrant in *Pellegrini*. While both registrants made rude and disparaging comments, Mr. Stretch's comments were posted on a public forum and seen by members of the public while Mr. Pellegrini's were sent to a single recipient via text message. Although both Mr. Stretch and Mr. Pellegrini were co-operative with the investigation, Mr. Stretch has a previous sanction history and Mr. Pellegrini did not.

[38] In *Moshenko (Re)*, [2023 SKREC 7](#) (file 2023-19) ("*Moshenko*"), Ruby Moshenko was issued an order of reprimand and a \$3,500 fine for posting a negative comment about a property on social media.

[39] Registrant A had listed a property for sale and posted an advertisement for the property on the brokerage's Facebook business page. In the comments section underneath the photo, Ms. Moshenko wrote: "House is a disaster and huge slough on property." Ms. Moshenko believed that the post was a link sent to her private page and that she was communicating directly with a very discerning client who had given her a specific set of parameters in which to work. Ms. Moshenko did not see that she was on the public link. She apologized and

regretted using the word “disaster”. Ms. Moshenko’s comment was posted publicly on Facebook as a comment on the listing agent’s post advertising the property for sale.

- [40] Mr. Stretch’s breach is more serious than that of the registrant in *Moshenko*. While Ms. Moshenko made one negative public comment about a property, Mr. Stretch posted pictures and made a number of rude, disparaging comments about the seller and the comments were posted as replies to an unrelated party’s baby announcement. Both the seller and the unrelated party were harmed by Mr. Stretch’s conduct. Ms. Moshenko had no previous sanction history and Mr. Stretch has previously been sanctioned for unprofessional conduct in breach of bylaw 702.1.
- [41] In *Stretch (Re)*, [2019 SKREC 30](#) (file 2019-26) (“*Stretch*”), Darrel Stretch was issued an order of reprimand and a \$1,000 fine for inappropriate comments made to another registrant.
- [42] Mr. Stretch made an appointment to view a property listed for sale by Registrant A. When he arrived at the property for the showing, Mr. Stretch realized that the gas had been left on. He sent a text message to Registrant A accusing her seller clients of almost killing him and his clients by leaving the burners on the gas stove on. When Registrant A had difficulty getting in touch with Mr. Stretch, she sent him a text message telling him that he should have the balls to answer his phone. Mr. Stretch called Registrant A and, after some comments from her, Mr. Stretch responded by saying, “Go f*** yourself, you f***ing c***. I have the f***ing balls to answer my phone.”
- [43] Mr. Stretch had no previous sanction history, was co-operative with the investigation, and sent a message to Registrant A to apologize for his comments.
- [44] Mr. Stretch’s current breach is more serious than his previous breach. While Mr. Stretch’s comments to Registrant A were extremely inappropriate, they were not made in a public forum. This time Mr. Stretch’s inappropriate and unprofessional comments were posted publicly on social media, negatively impacting both the seller and an unrelated party.
- [45] While the following decision was rendered pursuant to a different bylaw, the conduct is directly relatable.
- [46] In *Peter (Re)*, [2023 SKREC 1](#) (file 2022-18) (“*Peter*”), Kevin Peter was issued an order of reprimand and a \$4,000 fine for breaching Bylaw 706 by publicly discrediting a competitor on social media.
- [47] Mr. Peter had listed a property for sale. A buyer wrote an offer that was made subject to a house and furnace inspection. A home inspection was carried out and the inspector identified the furnace as an issue. The buyer wanted the seller to have the furnace serviced, but the seller had the furnace inspected by another

professional and did not believe the furnace required servicing. Ultimately, the buyer chose not to remove the home inspection condition. The buyer's agent sent Mr. Peter a Notification Conditions Have Not Been Satisfied or Removed in Writing with no explanation. Mr. Peter tried to contact the buyer's agent, but was not successful. Mr. Peter created a Facebook post that stated: "Due to fall through of unqualified buyer & through a home inspector that lacked qualification for a furnace inspection from an arrogant inexperienced agent, although was cleared by Seller paying for Qualified Plumber to pass furnace inspection!". The post included a link to the listing of the property. The post initially did not identify the agent to whom Mr. Peter was referred, but he later edited it to include a reference to the buyer's agent. Mr. Peter made the post with the intention of reaching the buyer's agent and altered it to get it more direct to her. He was not aware that he was posting to everyone. Mr. Peter eventually took the post down.

- [48] Mr. Stretch's breach was more serious than that of the registrant in *Peter*. Both registrants posted publicly on Facebook, but while Mr. Peter made a single comment about another registrant, Mr. Stretch posted pictures and a number of comments about a member of the public using an unrelated third party's post as the platform for his comments. Mr. Peter had no previous sanction history, while Mr. Stretch has previously been sanctioned for unprofessional conduct.
- [49] It must be noted that the decision in *Stretch* was issued prior to May 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 to \$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.
- [50] As this is Mr. Stretch's second breach of Bylaw 702.1, the recommendation would usually be an increased fine in the amount of \$5,000 to \$6,000. However, Mr. Stretch is currently dealing with some extenuating health issues and has indicated that he is agreeable to a voluntary withdrawal as part of his sanction.
- [51] In consideration of Mr. Stretch's circumstances, a letter of reprimand, \$3,000 fine and withdrawal of registration with no eligibility to register for a period of 3 months from the date of withdrawal are appropriate sanctions for Mr. Stretch's breach of Bylaw 702.1.

CONSENT ORDER:

[52] In accordance with *The Real Estate Act*, its Regulations, and the Commission Bylaws, and with the consent of Mr. Stretch and the Investigation Committee of the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission, the Hearing Committee hereby orders:

[53] With respect to Count 1, the charge of professional misconduct contrary to Section 39(1)(c) of *The Real Estate Act*:

- a. Mr. Stretch shall receive an order of reprimand for the violation of Commission Bylaw 702.1;
- b. Mr. Stretch shall, within 3 months of the date of this order, pay to the Saskatchewan Real Estate Commission a \$3,000 fine for the said violation of the *Act*;
- c. Mr. Stretch's registration shall be terminated forthwith with no eligibility to register for a period of 3 months from the date of withdrawal.

[54] There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 18th day of December, 2025.

Jeffrey P. Reimer
Hearing Committee Chairperson