



File C24-07A

Respondent: Registered Professional Biologist

Complaint Submitted: June 13, 2024

Date of Decision: December 17, 2024

Complaint Summary:

The College received a complaint about the respondent's competence, due diligence, and alleged collusion in developing a handbook.

The complainant alleged that the respondent breached the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, specifically:

- Principle 1: Provide objective, science-based, unfettered, forthright and intellectually-honest opinion, advice and reports in applied biology.
- Principle 2: Undertake assignments and offer opinions only in areas where training and ability make the registrant professionally competent.
- Principle 3: Ensure they meet a professional standard of care by practicing applied biology with attention, caution, prudence, and due diligence.
- Principle 4: Provide a professional standard of service to clients and employers by conducting business practices fairly, avoiding conflict of interest, and respecting client or employer confidentiality.
- Principle 5: Hold paramount the safety, health and welfare of the public, including the protection of the environment and the promotion of health and safety in the workplace.
- Principle 6: Uphold professional obligations to the College while in the workplace.
- Principle 7: Maintain a standard of personal and professional conduct that does not reflect adversely on the College or its registrants.
- Principle 9: Recognize the duty to address poor conduct or practice of another professional under the Act in order to protect the public interest, the profession, and the reputation of the College as a regulator.

Decision:

The Investigation Committee reviewed the submissions from the complainant, responses from the respondent, and the provisions of the Professional Governance Act and the Applied Biologists Regulation, and decided to dismiss the complaint as unfounded, for the following reasons:

- There was a lack of evidence to support the allegation that the respondent was directed or influenced to make conclusions that were not scientifically based. The Committee found that the steps the respondent followed to develop the Handbooks met the professional obligations set out in the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (the Code).

- There was a lack of evidence to support the allegation that the respondent failed to appropriately supervise non-registrants in the development of the Handbooks. The Committee found that the supervision provided by the respondent met the requirements set out in the Code.

This file is now closed.