

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
Andrew D. Gay, K.C.**

Panel Members

**C. Baird Ellan, K.C., Chair
Dr. A. Cheung
Dr. A. Runnells**

Date of Decision

July 14, 2026

RULING ON COLLEGE’S APPLICATION TO ADJOURN GENERALLY

1. Overview and Background

[1] In this matter, the Respondent, Dr. Pavitar Bajwa, was the subject of a citation originally issued on April 25, 2024 (the “Citation”) and amended on May 16, September 10 and November 18, 2024. The Citation as finally amended alleged that Dr. Bajwa failed to cooperate with an investigation by the CVBC into Dr. Bajwa’s operation of a veterinary hospital, the Surrey Animal

Hospital, primarily by numerous instances of failing to respond or fulfill official requests, between July 8, 2022 and April 28, 2024. The Citation alleged multiple alleged breaches of the CVBC *Bylaws* and *Professional Standards*, and professional misconduct contrary to Section 61 of the *Act*. The matter was assigned to this Panel in the fall of 2025, and set for hearing several times, but adjourned primarily due to health challenges on Dr. Bajwa's part. Sadly, the Panel was advised on June 5, 2026, that Dr. Bajwa passed away in India on June 4. The Panel has extended its condolences to his family and his counsel.

[2] As in several other matters pertaining to Dr. Bajwa, the College applies to this Panel for a general adjournment of the discipline hearing now set for July 27 – 30, 2026. The procedure of having the panels adjourn proceedings and address the individual matters in reasons for publication has been followed by three other panels to date,¹ in order that observers of the proceedings, including complainants, members of the profession, and the public not be left asking why no hearings are occurring in respect of the Respondent's several outstanding disciplinary matters. The College advises that it expects to ask the Investigation Committee to direct that the Registrar cancel the Citation pursuant to s. 277 of the Bylaws after completing whatever formalities may remain. The Panel is satisfied that this is the correct procedure and relies on the prior CVBC decisions in this respect.

[3] The College has therefore asked the Panel to include a general chronology and provide an explanation of why the matter has not been addressed on the merits, with a view to addressing those who may have been interested in the outcome and to satisfy the College's duty to protect the public interest.

[4] Dr. Bajwa's counsel, Clea Parfitt, provided the following observations:

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

¹ 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*, 2026-07-13 CVBC v. Bajwa. File No. 21-104, *Ruling on General Adjournment*.

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] Mr. Gay for the College responded to Ms. Parfitt's observations as follows:

The hearing is scheduled for later this month and needs to be adjourned. ...As the panel maintains independence from the College, it is arguably more "fair" to Dr. Bajwa that the panel be the entity to explain why the matter is not proceeding.

... Ms. Parfitt has not addressed the [issue of] formal documentation of Dr. Bajwa's passing. The College does not think that the absence of such documentation should prevent a general adjournment of the hearing. The College accepts at face value the information provided that Dr. Bajwa has passed away. The College can separately consider how it would protect the public interest in the unlikely event that the information were inaccurate, but does not feel that this theoretical concern should impede a general adjournment of the hearing.

[6] The Panel agrees with the College and the other CVBC panels that have dealt with the issue that it is necessary for panels to say something about each matter in written reasons for publication, 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. The Investigation Committee has the authority under section 77 of the *Act* 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.

[7] There is some authority for a regulatory panel to complete its process following the death of a registrant.² As indicated, 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; particularly here, where a hearing has been set and the dates have been posted on the website, and the dates are fairly imminent.

² *College of Patent Agents and Trademark Agents (CPATA) v Eric Fincham*, [2025 CPATA 5 \(CanLII\)](#)

[8] We do not disagree however with Ms. Parfitt’s position that nothing should be published that would operate to the detriment of the Respondent’s interests, given his inability to respond. While sometimes matters in different legal spheres 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 application to have that occur 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.

2. Chronology

[9] The Panel is indebted to counsel for the College for providing a chronological summary of this matter, which the Panel has adapted for insertion here. The hearing was set for November 26 and 27, 2024 in the September 10, 2024 Amended Citation. The matter was assigned to a panel by the Discipline Committee on September 25, 2024, but a number of changes in personnel occurred before this Panel was finally assigned in March 2025, after the hearing had been reset for March 24 – 27, 2025. We are advised that the November dates had been adjourned to accommodate Ms. Parfitt’s schedule.

[10] Ms. Parfitt then made an application to adjourn the hearing on March 21, 2025, because Dr. Bajwa had elected to travel to India to seek medical treatment. The Panel convened the hearing and received submissions on the adjournment and several procedural issues, resulting in a ruling issued on April 1, 2025. The hearing was reset for the week of June 9, 2025, but was adjourned again, with written reasons delivered on June 16, 2025, due to Dr. Bajwa’s medical condition and because he remained in India.

[11] The Panel imposed conditions on the adjournment and did not set a new hearing date. Instead, a Case Management Conference (“CMC”) was held on July 30, 2025, at which counsel

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);

consented to directions requiring Dr. Bajwa to provide medical updates, give notice if he intended to return to BC, and provide three weeks' notice if he intended to return to practice.

[12] Dr. Bajwa remained in India until mid or late September 2025, and another CMC was set for September 3, 2025, then reset for October 14, 2025; however, in the meantime, Dr. Bajwa returned to BC without notice to the College or the Panel and expressed an intention to resume practice on a specified date.

[13] In a ruling dated October 8, 2025,⁴ the Panel ruled that Dr. Bajwa had not complied with its direction respecting three weeks' notice and suspended his registration under Section 65 until the expiry of what it considered to be the required notice period.

[14] At a later CMC, dates in January 2026 were tentatively reserved for the hearing. However, by November of 2025, Dr. Bajwa had returned to India and on December 15, his counsel provided the Panel with a medical update suggesting it was not feasible for the hearing to proceed in January 2026. A further CMC was held on January 14, 2026, at which time the July 2026 hearing dates were set. No earlier dates could be found due to counsel's schedules.

[15] The foregoing is an abbreviated history of the proceedings. Prior to this ruling, although no evidence was ever called, the Panel made a total of seven or eight written rulings in relation to case management. As indicated, some of the procedural issues centred on sufficiency of materials justifying requested adjournments and on Dr. Bajwa's or his counsel's compliance with the terms and conditions imposed in relation to them. In some cases, as with other matters, 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 ongoing health challenges.

[16] The College's characterization of this and other matters relating to Dr. Bajwa is apt: it presented a challenging task of balancing the public interest in the timely resolution of disciplinary

⁴ 2025-10-08 CVBC v Bajwa File No. 23-067, [Interim Order](#)

proceedings with Dr. Bajwa's right to have a fair opportunity to participate in his hearing; particularly in light of his deteriorating health within the year preceding his death.

3. Conclusion

[17] The Panel adopts the procedure followed by the panels in the prior CVBC decisions cited above.⁵ The discipline proceeding is adjourned generally pending further action on the part of the Investigation Committee and/or the Registrar to discontinue the Citation, in due course.

Carol Baird Ellan

Carol Baird Ellan, K.C., Chair

Amy Cheung

Dr. Amy Cheung

Al Runnells

Dr. Al Runnells

⁵ *Supra*, footnote 1.