Appendix A

On September 11, 2026, a panel of the Investigation Committee (the "Panel") of the College of Veterinarians of British Columbia (the "College") issued a decision, pursuant to section 65(2)(b) of the *Veterinarians Act,* SBC 2010, c. 15 (the "Act"), suspending the registration of Dr. Moira Drosdovech (the "September 11, 2026 order").

The September 11, 2026 order was made following receipt of an application filed by the College requesting the Panel to take extraordinary action as against Dr. Drosdovech (the "Registrant") to protect the public. In considering the College's application, the Panel held that the test to be applied on an application for an order under section 65 of the Act is the same as that articulated by the Court of Appeal in *Scott v. College of Massage Therapists of British Columbia*, 2016 BCCA 180 ("*Scott*"). Distilled to its essence, the Court in *Scott* created a two-part test for determining whether to impose interim limits or conditions on a registrant's practice or to suspend a registrant's registration. Under the *Scott* test, the Panel must be satisfied:

1. there is a *prima facie* case supporting the index allegations; and
2. there is an immediate risk of harm to the public that is real and not speculative, such that the public would require protection through an interim order.

Once satisfied, the *Scott* analysis requires consideration of the impact of any order on the registrant to ensure that any order is not disproportionate to the risk to the public.

Applying the test set out in *Scott*, and considering the information provided by the parties, the Panel found there was a *prima facie* case supporting the following allegations:

a. the Registrant issued false rabies vaccination certificates in relation to animals that she did not vaccinate against rabies or did not vaccinate on the date indicated on the certificate;

b. the Registrant engaged in fraud, by submitting blood for rabies titre testing which she knows to be the blood of a different animal than the one intending to travel and represented to laboratories that they are testing the blood of one animal when in fact they are testing the blood of another animal; and

c. the Registrant created false entries in her records, including entries indicating that an animal was vaccinated against rabies when it was not.

The Panel then considered the second stage of the *Scott* analysis and found there was a real risk of harm to the public as a result of the alleged and, with respect to some of the allegations admitted, misconduct. The Panel reached this conclusion after considering the seriousness of the conduct, the nature of the evidence (including the admissions made by the Registrant), and the likelihood of the alleged conduct being repeated if an interim order is not made. In the Panel's view the impugned conduct was serious given the risks associated with rabies transmission, the importance of regulatory requirements aimed at preventing and suppressing rabies, and the role veterinarians play in providing accurate and truthful information relating to vaccinations and titre tests. In assessing the

seriousness of the misconduct, the Panel also considered the impact on the reputation to the profession that results when a registrant disregards their professional obligations and the broader public interest. With respect to the likelihood of the conduct being repeated, the Panel considered the fact that the conduct at issue was not an isolated incident – it occurred on more than one occasion over several years.

After finding there was a *prima facie* case to the allegations and a real, non-speculative risk to the public, the Panel considered what interim measures would be sufficient and proportionate. While the Panel considered the Registrant's expression of remorse, the admissions she made, her stated intentions with respect to her actions, and the remedial steps she has since taken, the Panel ultimately held that only suspension could sufficiently protect the public in the circumstances – terms and conditions would not suffice given the seriousness of the misconduct and the Registrant's admitted non-compliance with a previous remedial action by consent agreement. Accordingly, an order of suspension was made and, pursuant to section 68(1)(b) of the Act, this public notification was issued.

Important note:

The suspension order issued by the Panel under section 65 of the *Act* was made for the purpose of protecting the public during the investigation and/or pending a hearing of the Discipline Committee. The investigation into the alleged misconduct is ongoing.