

IN THE MATTER OF THE *VETERINARIANS ACT*, S.B.C. 2010, c. 15

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARIANS OF BRITISH
COLUMBIA and a
hearing before a DISCIPLINE PANEL
of the COLLEGE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE**

AND

DR. PAVITAR BAJWA

**Counsel for the Respondent
Counsel for the College**

**C. Parfitt
J. Lithwick and R. Bushell**

Panel Members

**C. Baird Ellan, KC, Chair
Dr. A. Cheung**

Date of Decision

July 13, 2026

RULING ON COLLEGE’S APPLICATION TO ADJOURN GENERALLY

1. Overview and Background

[1] The Respondent was the subject of a citation issued on February 21, 2024 (the “Citation”) alleging non-compliance with the CVBC *Bylaws* and *Professional Standards*, and professional misconduct contrary to Section 61 of the *Act*, between January 2021 and April 2023, arising out of the care of a male Papillon-Chihuahua cross. A discipline hearing commenced in February 2025 and was adjourned several times primarily for reasons pertaining to Dr. Bajwa’s ongoing health

challenges, until the last date set for continuation, May 20, 2026. The Panel was in the process of determining how to proceed in the face of a sixth adjournment request when we were advised, on June 5, 2026, that Dr. Bajwa sadly passed away in India on June 4. The Panel has extended its condolences to his family and his Counsel.

[2] The College now applies to adjourn the discipline hearing generally pending confirmation of Dr. Bajwa's passing, which we are told will be followed by a request to the Investigation Committee to discontinue the proceedings pursuant to section 277 of the CVBC *Bylaws*.

[3] The College has asked the Panel to provide a general outline of the matter with a view to addressing the public interest, including the interests of the complainant, as well as those of members of the profession, by explaining why the matter will be resolved without a decision on the merits. The College relies on the Panel's authority over the proceeding pursuant to Section 59 of the Act, and its power to adjourn under s. 284(1)(b) of the Bylaws.

[4] Counsel of record for Dr. Bajwa is Clea Parfitt. She was provided the opportunity to respond to the College's application, and sent the following comments:

Due to the passing of Dr. Bajwa, I do not have instructions... I note, however, that I consider it irregular that the College would decline to cancel the citation until after asking the Panel to adjourn the hearing. Dr. Bajwa can no longer participate in the hearing, and further proceedings of the hearing then cannot be fair to him. Asking the Panel to adjourn with reasons is unnecessary and unfair in the absence of Dr. Bajwa. ... It remains my view that the College should be cancelling the Citation. It can advise that it is doing so because of Dr. Bajwa's passing. Anything further from the College or the Panel is unnecessary, and unfair to Dr. Bajwa.

[5] The Panel agrees with the College that it is preferable to say something in reasons on Dr. Bajwa's individual files, for the benefit of the public, any involved complainants, and Dr. Bajwa's colleagues. The Act and Bylaws do not specify a process in the event of the death of a registrant who is subject to a citation, and as stated by the College, the Investigation Committee is the body with the authority to request that the Registrar cancel a citation. In the meantime, the Panel is authorized by section 284 of the Bylaws to govern or adjourn its proceedings.

[6] There is some authority for a regulatory panel to complete its process following the death of a registrant.¹ In addition, panels of the CVBC Discipline Committee have adjourned two other matters generally for similar reasons.² We expect some formalities will need to be completed in order to confirm the death, and the Panel agrees with the College and the other panels that it is preferable not to leave Dr. Bajwa's matters in limbo, with nothing said.

[7] We do not disagree however with Ms. Parfitt's position that nothing should occur that would operate to the detriment of the Respondent's interests, in the absence of his ability to respond. While in some cases, matters proceed posthumously because it is deemed to be in the interests of justice to do so,³ those are exceptional cases and there is no such application in this matter. Accordingly, the Panel will not draw any conclusions regarding outstanding issues or the merits of the Citation in this matter, beyond the rulings it has already made.

[8] The College submits that a summary of the history of the proceedings will assist to place the matter in context. The Panel elects to provide only the factual summary in the following section, which has been vetted for any qualitative statements or personal information to which the Respondent would not be able to respond.

2. Chronology

[9] The Citation, originally authorized on May 11, 2023 and amended three times since, alleges deficiencies in Dr. Bajwa's care and treatment of the subject dog; deficiencies in his related prescription practices and record-keeping; and failure to cooperate with the related investigation.

[10] The discipline hearing proceeded on four days during the week of February 3 – 7, 2025 and was adjourned to continue in June 2025. A prior hearing date in January 2025 had been

¹ *College of Patent Agents and Trademark Agents (CPATA) v Eric Fincham*, [2025 CPATA 5 \(CanLII\)](#)

² 2026-07-08 CVBC v. Bajwa File No. 21-044(b), *Adjournment Decision*; 2026-07-08 CVBC v. Bajwa, File No. 21-011, *Adjournment Decision*.

³ *R. v. Smith*, [2004 SCC 14](#) (CanLII), [2004] 1 SCR 385; *Ontario (College of Pharmacists) v. Savji*, [2015 ONCPDC 24](#) (CanLII); *Ontario (College of Pharmacists) v. St-Denis*, [2017 ONCPDC 10](#) (CanLII); *Ontario (College of Pharmacists) v. Sharma*, [2021 ONCPDC 18](#) (CanLII);

adjourned. One of the Panel members left the Discipline Committee in March 2025, and the Panel has continued since then with two members.

[11] Throughout the course of the proceedings, Dr. Bajwa experienced significant ongoing health challenges that affected his ability to attend. The Panel was called upon to make many rulings in relation to adjournments as well as other procedural matters. Some of these rulings may be found on the CVBC website.

[12] The June 2025 continuation dates were adjourned due to the Respondent's having travelled to India to seek medical treatment. Among other conditions of the adjournment, the Panel directed that Dr. Bajwa provide regular medical updates. After Dr. Bajwa returned from India in September, the discipline hearing was re-set for dates in December 2025; however, he left again for India in November, and those dates were adjourned. A further hearing date was set for May 2026, but Dr. Bajwa remained in India and his Counsel requested another adjournment on his behalf for health reasons.

[13] That request was initially denied by the Panel in a ruling on April 14, 2026 on the basis of insufficient materials but was renewed shortly before the hearing date. The parties convened on May 20, 2026 to discuss how to proceed, and the Panel directed a schedule for written submissions; however, Dr. Bajwa's counsel advised on June 1, 2026, before submissions were tendered, that he had been admitted to the intensive care unit in India in critical condition. Ms. Parfitt then advised on June 5, 2026 that Dr. Bajwa had passed away the previous day.

[14] The foregoing is an abbreviated outline of the history of the proceedings. The Panel made eight rulings, preceding this one. Some of the procedural issues centred on sufficiency of materials justifying requested adjournments and on compliance with the terms and conditions imposed in relation to them. In some cases, the Panel had difficulty determining whether compliance issues were attributable to Dr. Bajwa, to his Counsel, or simply to difficulties in communication arising from Dr. Bajwa's health challenges.

[15] It suffices to observe here that this case presented the Panel with a challenging task of balancing the public interest in the timely resolution of disciplinary proceedings with Dr. Bajwa's

right to have a fair opportunity to participate in his hearing; particularly within the year preceding his death.

3. Conclusion

[16] The Panel echoes the comments and follows the procedure adopted by the panels in the two prior CVBC decisions cited above.⁴ The discipline proceeding is adjourned generally pending further action on the part of the Investigation Committee and/or the Registrar. Unfortunately, the complainant will be left without a decision on the complaint. In keeping with the prior CVBC decisions and the applicable principles, it is not open to us to provide that.

Carol Baird Ellan

Carol Baird Ellan K.C., Chair

Amy Cheung

Dr. Amy Cheung

⁴ *Supra*, footnote 2.