

ALBERTA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

IN THE MATTER OF  
THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACT

AND IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING  
REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF

**JENNIFER CORPUZ**  
Registration number: 8899

**DECISION OF THE HEARING TRIBUNAL**

February 13, 2026

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The Hearing Tribunal held a hearing into the conduct of Jennifer Corpuz (“Ms. Corpuz”). In attendance on behalf of the hearing tribunal were **Dana Lyons**, a pharmacy technician and member of the Alberta College of Pharmacy (the “College” or “ACP”) and Chair, **Don Ridley**, a pharmacy technician and member of the College, **Kent Pallister**, a public member, and **Leanne Axelsen**, a public member.
2. The hearing took place on February 4, 2026, commencing at 9:34 am. The hearing was held under the terms of Part 4 of the *Health Professions Act*, RSA 2000, c. H-7 (the “HPA”).
3. In attendance at the hearing as counsel were Annabritt Chisholm (“Ms. Chisholm”), representing the Complaints Director of the College, and Rebecca Thompson (“Ms. Thompson”), representing Ms. Corpuz.
4. Also in attendance was James Krempien, Complaints Director for the College, and Ms. Corpuz. There was a Court Reporter in attendance, Jessica Young, and the Hearings Director for the College, Margaret Morley. There were also six observers present.
5. There were no objections to the composition of the Hearing Tribunal or the jurisdiction of the Hearing Tribunal to proceed with the hearing. There was no application to close the hearing, nor any other preliminary applications.
6. At the commencement of the hearing, a pdf document entitled “2026-02-03 Agreed Exhibit Book – Merits.pdf” was entered as Exhibit 1, with the agreement of both parties.

## **II. ALLEGATIONS**

7. The following were the Allegations against Ms. Corpuz heard at the hearing (the “Allegations”):

IT IS ALLEGED THAT while you were a registered Alberta pharmacy technician employed at CapitalCare Pharmacy (“the Pharmacy”) in Edmonton, you:

1. Diverted Zopiclone or another controlled drug from the Pharmacy on one or more of:
  - a. February 3, 2025;
  - b. February 4, 2025;
  - c. February 13, 2025;
  - d. February 18, 2025;
  - e. February 20, 2025;
  - f. February 24, 2025;
  - g. March 6, 2025;
  - h. March 8, 2025;
  - i. March 10, 2025;
  - j. March 13, 2025;

IT IS ALLEGED THAT your conduct in these matters:

- a. Breached your statutory and regulatory obligations to the Alberta College of Pharmacy as an Alberta pharmacy technician;
- b. Undermined the integrity of the profession;
- c. Decreased the public's trust in the profession; and
- d. Failed to exercise the professional and ethical judgment expected and required of an Alberta pharmacy technician.

IT IS ALLEGED THAT your conduct constitutes a breach of the following statutes and standards governing the practice of pharmacy:

- Domain 2 (Section 2.7.1(a)) of the Standards of Practice for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians;
- Principle 10 (1 and 2) of the ACP Code of Ethics; and
- Section 31(2)(a) of the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*;

and that your conduct set out above and the breach of some or all of these provisions constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to the provisions of sections 1(1)(pp)(ii), 1(1)(pp)(iii) and 1(1)(pp)(xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.

8. In a document entitled "Admission of Unprofessional Conduct" contained within the Exhibit Book, Ms. Corpuz admitted to the Allegations.

### III. **EVIDENCE**

#### *Admission of Unprofessional Conduct*

9. There was an Admission of Unprofessional Conduct (the "Admission") signed by Ms. Corpuz, which was included within Exhibit 1. The Admission includes the following admissions:
  1. Pursuant to section 70 of the *Health Professions Act*, Jennifer Corpuz ("Ms. Corpuz") wishes to provide a written admission of unprofessional conduct for the Hearing Tribunal's consideration.
  2. Ms. Corpuz acknowledges and admits that while she was a registered Alberta pharmacy technician employed at CapitalCare Pharmacy ("the Pharmacy") in Edmonton, she diverted Zopiclone or another controlled drug from the Pharmacy on one or more of:
    - a. February 3, 2025;
    - b. February 4, 2025;
    - c. February 13, 2025;
    - d. February 18, 2025;

- e. February 20, 2025;
  - f. February 24 2025;
  - g. March 6, 2025;
  - h. March 8, 2025;
  - i. March 10, 2025;
  - j. March 13, 2025.
3. Ms. Corpuz agrees and acknowledges that her conduct in this matter:
    - a. breached her statutory and regulatory obligations to the Alberta College of Pharmacy as an Alberta pharmacy technician;
    - b. undermined the integrity of the profession;
    - c. decreased the public’s trust in the profession; and
    - d. failed to exercise the professional and ethical judgment expected and required of an Alberta pharmacy technician.
  4. Ms. Corpuz further agrees and acknowledges that her conduct, as set out above, breaches the following statutes and standards governing the practice of pharmacy:
    - Domain 2 (Section 2.7.1(a)) of the Standards of Practice for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians;
    - Principle 10 (1 and 2) of the ACP’s Code of Ethics; and
    - Section 31(2)(a) of the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*.
  5. Lastly, Ms. Corpuz further agrees and acknowledges that her conduct, as set out above, constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to subsections 1(1)(pp)(ii), (iii) and (xii) of the *Health Professions Act*.
  6. Ms. Corpuz makes this admission of unprofessional conduct having had the benefit of legal counsel and acknowledges and agrees that the Hearing Tribunal appointed to hear this matter may make findings of unprofessional conduct based on this document and issue sanctions and costs accordingly.

*Agreed Statement of Facts*

10. The Hearing Tribunal was advised that the parties had come to an agreement on facts, and as a result no witnesses were called to give testimony and evidence was entered by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts (“ASF”), which was entered as Exhibit 1.
11. The ASF included the following agreed facts, using the internal numbering from the ASF itself:
  1. Jennifer Corpuz has been registered with the Alberta College of Pharmacy (“College”) since March 14, 2008. She has been registered as a pharmacy technician since August 22, 2014.

2. At all relevant times relating to the Complaint, Ms. Corpuz was employed as a registered pharmacy technician at CapitalCare Pharmacy in Edmonton, Alberta (the “Pharmacy”).

#### Summary of the Complaint and Investigation

3. On April 3, 2025, the Complaints Director received a complaint about Ms. Corpuz from [REDACTED] Pharmacy Practice Lead at the Pharmacy (the “Complaint”). The Complaint set out that:
  - a. an internal investigation conducted at the Pharmacy found Ms. Corpuz had diverted approximately 40 bottles of zopiclone from the Pharmacy;
  - b. the Pharmacy had video of Ms. Corpuz diverting zopiclone or another controlled drug from the Pharmacy on 10 occasions;
  - c. Ms. Corpuz was shown the videos and either had no explanation for what the videos showed or said she did not recall what she was doing in the videos;
  - d. Ms. Corpuz’ employment at the Pharmacy was terminated on April 2, 2025; and
  - e. The Pharmacy notified the police of the missing zopiclone.

A copy of the Complaint and supporting documents are attached **Tab A** to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

4. The Complaints Director appointed Jennifer Mosher to complete an investigation into the Complaint. Following receipt of Ms. Mosher’s report and supporting documents the Complaints Director referred the matter to a hearing. A copy of the Notice of Hearing is attached as **Tab B** to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

#### Facts Related to the Allegations

5. On March 8, 2025, the Pharmacy conducted a routine inventory count and identified a discrepancy of 4,058.5 zopiclone tablets.
6. The Pharmacy conducted an initial investigation into the variance that included:
  - a. Checking for transcription errors in inventory levels during a software transition from Kroll to ConnectCare in November 2024;
  - b. Checking stock ordered vs. received to identify if a receiving error occurred; and
  - c. Reviewing zopiclone dispensing events.
7. The initial investigation did not identify an explanation for the zopiclone discrepancy.

8. On March 17, 2025, the Pharmacy conducted a second inventory count and identified the number of missing zopiclone tablets had increased by 402.
9. On March 18, 2025, the Pharmacy Supervisor began reviewing security camera footage from within the Pharmacy. The Pharmacy Supervisor identified Ms. Corpuz removing bottles of zopiclone or another controlled drug from the inventory shelf on 10 occasions when Ms. Corpuz had no authorized reason to do so.
10. Ms. Corpuz participated in the Pharmacy's investigation and did not provide a valid explanation for why she took the zopiclone bottles from the inventory shelf on any occasion.
11. Ms. Corpuz removed a bottle of zopiclone or another controlled from the Pharmacy when she was not authorized to do so on the following dates:
  - a. February 3, 2025;
  - b. February 4, 2025;
  - c. February 13, 2025;
  - d. February 18, 2025;
  - e. February 20, 2025
  - f. February 24, 2025
  - g. March 6, 2025;
  - h. March 8, 2025;
  - i. March 10, 2025;
  - j. March 13, 2025.
12. Neither the Complaints Director nor Ms. Corpuz are aware of the status of the complaint made to the police by the Pharmacy related to this matter. To date, Ms. Corpuz has not been contacted by the police.

#### Facts Related to Sanctions

13. There have been no prior findings of unprofessional conduct against Ms. Corpuz.
14. On January 30, 2026, the Complaints Director was advised by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the Pharmacy District Manager for FreshCo Pharmacy #4297, and the pharmacy that Ms. Corpuz was employed at between August 8, 2025, and January 5, 2026, that Ms. Corpuz' employment at the pharmacy was terminated on January 5, 2026, due to allegations of diversion of lorazepam from the pharmacy inventory on December 11, 2025. The parties and Mr. [REDACTED] agree that this information shall be treated as repeated behavior and may be considered as an aggravating factor on sanction in this matter and will not be dealt with as a separate complaint matter.

**V. SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MERIT***Opening Statement on Behalf of the Complaints Director*

12. Counsel for the Complaints Director opened with her opening statement.
13. She advised that there is one allegation of unprofessional conduct against Ms. Corpuz, a pharmacy technician. The Notice of Hearing, located at Tab B of Exhibit 1, sets out ten (10) dates where Ms. Corpuz is alleged to have diverted zopiclone or another controlled drug from a pharmacy when she was not authorized to do so.
14. Ms. Chisholm advised that it is the obligation of the Complaints Director to make out the allegation on a balance of probabilities. However, she was pleased to advise that in this case, the parties have come to an agreement and are offering the ASF.
15. If the facts have been proven on a balance of probabilities and unprofessional conduct has been proven, then the parties have prepared Joint Submissions on Sanction and Costs for the Hearing Tribunal's consideration.
16. Ms. Chisholm concluded by thanking Ms. Corpuz and her lawyer Ms. Thompson for their cooperation in this matter. Because of cooperation, the hearing was shortened and neither party was required to call witnesses.

*Opening Statement on Behalf of Ms. Corpuz*

17. Counsel for Ms. Corpuz made a short opening statement on behalf of her client.
18. She confirmed that this matter was now proceeding by way of agreement. She thanked the Complaints Director for his cooperation in this matter and asked that these joint submissions be given due weight.

*Submissions on Behalf of the Complaints Director as to Merit*

19. Section 70 of the HPA allows an investigated party to make an admission at any time before the Hearing Tribunal makes decision as to whether or not unprofessional conduct has occurred. That has occurred in this case.
20. The Hearing Tribunal has the authority to determine whether the Admission is acceptable in whole or in part.
21. In this case, the Complaints Director is asking the Hearing Tribunal to accept the Admission, in whole. The Admission is found at Tab A and is set out in full above. Ms. Chisholm reviewed the Admission with the Hearing Tribunal.
22. Ms. Chisholm then reviewed the ASF, which is set out in detail above.

23. Following this, counsel advised the Hearing Tribunal that it has two tasks before it at this stage of the proceedings: it must consider which facts are proven on a balance of probabilities, and it must then consider whether those proven facts constitute unprofessional conduct under the HPA.
24. The Complaints Director urges the Hearing Tribunal to find the facts, as agreed upon by both parties, in the ASF.
25. In addition to the Admission, counsel submitted that Ms. Corpuz's conduct was "unprofessional conduct" under the definition of the HPA for three reasons:
- a. It contravenes the Standards of Practice for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians (effective February 1, 2025) ("Standards of Practice") and the Code of Ethics of the Alberta College of Pharmacy (effective May 22, 2009) ("ACP Code of Ethics"), as set out in the Admissions;
  - b. It contravenes another enactment that applies to the profession, namely the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*, RSA 2000, c. P-13 ("*Pharmacy and Drug Act*"), which sets out within it a prohibition on drugs only being compounded, dispensed or sold pursuant to a prescription; and
  - c. The conduct is serious and therefore undermines the integrity of the profession.
26. Ms. Corpuz, as a pharmacy technician, has an obligation to abide by the Standards of Practice and the ACP Code of Ethics. Diversion of drugs is clearly in breach of the Standards of Practice, the ACP Code of Conduct, and the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*. In addition, the conduct is sufficiently serious as to harm the profession as a whole.
27. Therefore, the Complaints Director submitted that the facts had been proven and that the proven facts constitute unprofessional conduct under the HPA.

*Submissions on Behalf of Ms. Corpuz as to Merit*

28. Ms. Thompson had nothing further to add in response.

*Questions of the Hearing Tribunal*

29. The Hearing Tribunal deliberated but had no questions for the parties.

**VI. FINDINGS REGARDING MERIT**

*Facts*

30. After hearing from both parties and being given time to review the ASF, the Admission, and the documents contained in Exhibit 1, the Hearing Tribunal accepts the facts set out in the ASF (copied in full in the "Evidence" portion of this decision, above), on a balance of probabilities.

*Unprofessional Conduct*

31. The Hearing Tribunal finds that the conduct admitted to amounts to unprofessional conduct as defined in s. 1(1)(pp) of the HPA, which includes the following:

(pp) “unprofessional conduct” means one or more of the following, whether or not it is disgraceful or dishonourable:

...  
(ii) contravention of this Act, a code of ethics or standards of practice;

(iii) contravention of another enactment that applies to the profession;

...  
(xii) conduct that harms the integrity of the regulated profession;

32. In her signed Admission, Ms. Corpuz agreed and acknowledged that her conduct was unprofessional conduct, and that her conduct in these matters breached the following:

- Domain 2 (Section 2.7.1(a)) of the Standards of Practice for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians;
- Principle 10 (1 and 2) of the ACP Code of Ethics; and
- Section 31(2)(a) of the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*.

33. The Hearing Tribunal agrees with both parties that that the conduct constitutes breaches of the following provisions of a Standards of Practice and ACP Code of Ethics, which were expressly acknowledged as breached by Ms. Corpuz in her signed Admission of Unprofessional Conduct:

**a. Standards of Practice:**

2.7.1 A regulated member must:

- (a) comply with the letter and spirit of the law that governs their practice, including any standards, guidelines, policies of Council, and the Code of Ethics;

**b. ACP Code of Ethics:**

PRINCIPLE 10, Act with Honesty and Integrity

To uphold this principle, I:

1. Comply with both the letter and the spirit of the law that governs the practice of pharmacy and the operation of pharmacies.
2. Am honest in dealings with

- a) patients;
- b) other pharmacists, pharmacy technicians, health professionals and the college; and
- c) contractors, suppliers and any others encountered in business dealings related to the practice of my profession or the operation of a pharmacy.

**c. *Pharmacy and Drug Act:***

Section 31(2)(a):

**Schedule 1 drugs**

**31...**

(2) Schedule 1 drugs may

- (a) be, subject to subsection (3), compounded, dispensed or sold only pursuant to a prescription, and

...

- 34. The Hearing Tribunal is of the opinion that the conduct of Ms. Corpuz breaches the above standard and provisions of the Code of Ethics, and that such breaches are sufficiently serious to constitute unprofessional conduct. Ms. Corpuz diverted drugs in the midst of her employment as a pharmacy technician, with no prescription. That does not comply with the letter or the spirit of the laws that govern the practice of pharmacy. Ms. Corpuz was not forthcoming with information with the Pharmacy Clinical Leader, in that she did not advise on the diversion of the drugs. Trust was an issue, as a result of her position within the pharmacy, and her access to drugs.
- 35. The Hearing Tribunal concludes that Ms. Corpuz contravened section 31(2)(a) of the *Pharmacy and Drug Act*. Zopiclone, being a Schedule 1 drug, may only be dispensed pursuant to a lawful prescription. By diverting the drug from the pharmacy for non-patient use and in the absence of a prescription, Ms. Corpuz breached the statutory framework governing controlled pharmacy practice.
- 36. Finally, Ms. Corpuz's conduct also undermined the integrity of the profession. The public puts trust in pharmacy technicians that they will handle medications properly, and in accordance with the applicable law. Theft is a criminal offence, and when pharmacy professionals engage in this conduct it fundamentally undermines the integrity of the profession, as diverted medications may be trafficked, misused by vulnerable people or used in ways that are not clinically appropriate or medically indicated. These are highly regulated substances for a reason – Schedule 1 medications come with careful safeguards as to their use. In addition, this conduct could have affected the coworkers within Ms. Corpuz's place of employment, as there would be a comprehensive investigation following this conduct which would have placed stress on everyone working in that pharmacy as the investigation unfolded.
- 37. As such, the Hearing Tribunal finds that Ms. Corpuz is guilty of unprofessional conduct as her conduct constituted a contravention of the codes and standards applicable to her

profession, it contravened another enactment applicable to this profession, and it undermined the integrity of the profession.

## VI. SUBMISSIONS ON SANCTIONS

### *Submissions on Behalf of the Complaints Director as to Sanction*

38. Counsel for the Complaints Director submitted that the Hearing Tribunal has authority to order sanctions and costs under section 82 of the HPA.
39. She submitted that the parties reached an agreement on sanctions in this matter and entered the Joint Submission on Sanctions and Costs (“JSS”) as Exhibit 2 in the hearing.
40. Counsel for the Complaints Director explained that the issuance of sanctions are designed to protect the public from ongoing unprofessional conduct in three fundamental ways:
  1. As a specific deterrent, to ensure that Ms. Corpuz will not engage in similar conduct in the future, by educating her on her professional responsibilities, and deterring her, or some combination of the two;
  2. As a general deterrent, to ensure that the profession more broadly will not engage in similar conduct, by educating the members of the profession, and deterring them from engaging in similar conduct, as well; and
  3. Lastly, to promote public confidence in the profession’s ability to regulate the profession.
41. When considering joint submissions on sanctions, the Hearing Tribunal’s role is slightly different than if the Hearing Tribunal was considering sanctions after a contested hearing. In cases like this, the Hearing Tribunal should accept the JSS unless it finds it does not meet the “public interest test”.
42. Counsel for the Complaints Director advised that when it comes to joint submissions on sanction, the Supreme Court of Canada’s decision in *R. v. Anthony Cook*, 2016 SCC 43 is of assistance. In that case, the Supreme Court confirmed that when looking at a joint submission on sanction, the correct test “is whether the proposed sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest.”
43. In *Anthony Cook*, the Supreme Court goes on to say at para. 34:
 

“Rejection denotes a submission so unhinged from the circumstances of the offence and the offender that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the justice system had broken down.”
44. If the JSS does not offend the public interest test, the Hearing Tribunal must exercise a very high level of deference to the joint submission of the parties.

45. In this case, the JSS included the following elements:
1. Ms. Corpuz' practice permit shall be suspended for nine months:
    - a. with six months to be served commencing the date the Hearing Tribunal accepts this Joint Submission on Sanctions and Costs; and
    - b. three months to be held in abeyance so long as no additional complaints of a similar nature are investigated and referred to hearing within five years from the date the Hearing Tribunal accepts the Joint Submission on Sanctions and Costs.
  2. Notwithstanding the expiry of the period of suspension in Order 1a., Ms. Corpuz' practice permit shall remain suspended until, in addition to any other registration requirements imposed by the ACP's registration department in the normal course:
    - a. Ms. Corpuz provides the Complaints Director with evidence that she has received an unconditional pass of the Centre for Personalized Education for Professional's PROBE course. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for the costs of attending the PROBE course; and
    - b. Ms. Corpuz completes and provides the Complaints Director with a report from an independent medical assessment from a physician approved by the Complaints Director that states she is fit to practice and includes any treatment and monitoring recommendations made by the assessing physician. The Complaints Director may provide this report to the ACP's registration department for consideration of any necessary conditions on Ms. Corpuz' practice permit at the end of the suspension in Order 1a, which the registration department shall impose at its sole discretion. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for the costs of the independent medical assessment and the costs that stem from any treatment and monitoring recommendations. The Complaints Director and/or the ACP Registration department will provide reasonable assistance to Ms. Corpuz in arranging the independent medical assessment if requested, including providing the list of approved physicians and their contact information, providing any necessary documents to the assessing physician, or clarifying the nature of information being sought.
  3. Any practice permit issued to Ms. Corpuz upon satisfaction of the provisions of Orders 1a. and 2 above, shall be subject to the following conditions:
    - a. Ms. Corpuz shall practice under direct supervision for a minimum of 12 months following her return to practice. At the end of 6 and 12 months, and prior to the removal of the direct supervision condition from her practice permit, her supervisor, approved by the Complaints Director, must provide the Complaints Director with a report on their supervised conduct that is satisfactory to the Complaints Director. At each instance, the supervisor providing the report must have directly observed Ms. Corpuz' practice and conduct for a minimum of six months. A satisfactory report will include information from the approved supervisor that conduct similar to that described in the Notice of Hearing has not reoccurred;

- b. For a period of five years from the date her practice permit is issued, Ms. Corpuz must provide a copy of the Hearing Tribunal's decision to any employer who offers her employment as a pharmacy technician or in a pharmacy or health care setting where the restricted activities of a regulated member of the College (including the sale of scheduled drugs) can occur. Ms. Corpuz shall provide verification of this notice to the Complaints Director at any time she obtains or changes employment; and
  - c. For a period of five years from the date her practice permit is issued, Ms. Corpuz may not be a pharmacy owner or proprietor.
4. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for payment of \$5,000 of the costs of the hearing. Payment will occur in accordance with a monthly payment schedule as agreed by the Hearings Director and shall be paid within 24 months of the date of the Hearing Tribunal's written decision.
46. The Complaints Director's position is that these proposed sanctions meet the objectives of sanctioning expressed above.
47. In addition, counsel went through some of the factors relevant to a proper sanction from the leading case of *Jaswal v. Medical Board of Newfoundland* (1996) 42 Admin L.R. (2d) 233 (Nfld. T.D.), as follows:
- 1. **The nature and gravity of the proven allegations:** The Complaints Director considers this conduct to be very serious. The ACP and the public trust pharmacy technicians to uphold the integrity of the drug system and to ensure the proper distribution of drugs.
  - 2. **Age and experience of the member:** The member has been registered with the ACP since March 14, 2008, and has been registered as a pharmacy technician since August 22, 2014. Therefore, she was a seasoned pharmacy technician at the time of the conduct and would have been clearly aware that this conduct was wrong.
  - 3. **Character and personal attributes:** Ms. Corpuz currently has no prior findings of unprofessional conduct with the ACP. However, as set out in the ASF above, her employment at a second pharmacy was terminated on January 5, 2026 due to allegations of diversion of lorazepam from the pharmacy inventory on December 11, 2025. This conduct has not been investigated, and there has been no unprofessional conduct finding in relation to this conduct, but it is conceded in the ASF by Ms. Corpuz and it demonstrates repeated behavior, and is therefore an aggravating factor. The parties and the individual who reported that information to the Complaints Director have agreed that this conduct can be dealt with as part of this matter, because it is similar conduct.
  - 4. **Impact on patients:** There were no patients affected on this matter.
  - 5. **Number of times the offence occurred:** In this matter, Ms. Corpuz admitted to having diverted drugs ten times. This is not a one-time offence, but repeated

behavior, and this is an aggravating factor. In addition, the Hearing Tribunal notes the additional information provided in relation to Ms. Corpuz's conduct that occurred in late 2025, which suggests a pattern of this conduct.

6. **Role of the member in acknowledging what occurred:** Ms. Corpuz entered into an ASF, meaning she acknowledged the seriousness of the conduct. This is a mitigating factor.
  7. **Impact of the sanction on the professional:** Ms. Corpuz's position at the pharmacy was terminated. She has also been terminated from another position since then, related to separate conduct.
  8. **Specific and general deterrence:** A suspension of nine months' time is a significant time away from practice and impacts one's ability to earn an income, which is a deterrent to the member and other members of the profession and demonstrates the severity of this conduct. Serving 6 months and holding 3 months in abeyance encourages the member to commit to rehabilitation. The requirements to pass the PROBE course and commit to an independent medical exam are rehabilitative in nature meant to address any substance abuse issues that are present. The duty to notify her employers of this decision for at least 5 years, and practicing under direct supervision, will ensure protection of the public but also maintains a rehabilitative aspect to the sanctions.
48. These factors were reaffirmed by the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258 ("*Charkhandeh*").
  49. There are significant sanctions which will ensure specific and general deterrence. It is also similar to a range of sanctions in similar cases. In particular, at Exhibit 2, Tab 6, the parties have included the similar case of *Re: Ryan Young* (ACP, 2023) which had similar facts to this case but did not proceed by agreement. In that case, there was a longer suspension ordered, but the Hearing Tribunal ordered very similar sanctions to those being proposed here, although these have a more rehabilitative focus in this case. This is also a *Jaswal* factor.
  50. With respect to costs, Ms. Chisholm advised that costs to date are approximately \$6,000. However, these estimated costs do not include costs relating to the preparation of the agreements between the parties, or the costs of the hearing today. Ms. Corpuz has agreed to \$5,000 in costs, with payment to occur over 24 months. Ms. Corpuz is not alleging that this is a crushing financial blow to her.
  51. Therefore, on the submission of counsel, the JSS being proposed is well within the guardrails or spectrum of appropriate sanctions. They will not cause a reasonable person to conclude that the sentencing process has broken down. The sanctions serve the general principles of sanctions expressed above, meets the *Jaswal* criteria for fitness, and would meet the public interest test outlined in *Anthony-Cook*. Therefore, the Hearing Tribunal should accept the JSS.

*Submissions on Behalf of Ms. Corpuz as to Sanction*

52. Counsel for Ms. Corpuz was offered an opportunity to reply.
53. In Ms. Thompson’s submission, the JSS represents a proper balancing of aggravating and mitigating factors and meets the sentencing objectives. It meets the need of specific and general deterrence, with a focus on rehabilitative action to allow Ms. Corpuz to return to the profession safely and with the full confidence of the College and the public moving forward, once she has completed her requirements.

*Questions of the Hearing Tribunal*

54. The Hearing Tribunal asked the parties about paragraph 1 of the ASF, which stated that Ms. Corpuz had been registered with the ACP since 2008, but had been registered as a pharmacy technician since 2014.
55. In response, Ms. Chisholm advised that pharmacy technicians became regulated in approximately 2011. From 2008 to 2011, anticipating regulation, there was a voluntary register with the College for people who were already acting in a pharmacy technician capacity. Following this period, voluntary registrants were grandfathered in and given until the summer of 2014 to meet the requirement for full registration. Ms. Corpuz followed this path.
56. Ms. Thompson confirmed that Ms. Chisholm’s answer is correct – Ms. Corpuz voluntarily registered in 2008, worked through the requirements for formal registration from 2011 to 2014, and was formally registered in 2014.
57. The Hearing Tribunal was satisfied with this response and had no further questions for the parties.

**VI. ORDERS**

58. After carefully considering the JSS, the facts of the case, and the parties’ submissions, the Hearing Tribunal accepted the JSS during the hearing and confirmed its acceptance in this written decision.
59. The Hearing Tribunal is aware of its requirements, set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Anthony-Cook* and reaffirmed in *Bradley v. Ontario College of Teachers*, 2021 OBSC 2302, to afford appropriate deference to joint submissions.
60. In *Anthony-Cook*, the Supreme Court stated: “a joint submission will bring the administration of justice into disrepute or be contrary to the public interest if, despite the public interest considerations that support imposing it, it is so ‘markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the case that they would view it as a break down in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system’” (para. 33).

61. The Hearing Tribunal does not find that this joint submission would offend the public interest test, as set out in *Anthony-Cook*. It acknowledges that the test is an “undeniably high threshold” (para. 34).
62. In addition, the Hearing Tribunal considered the underlying purposes of choosing an appropriate sanction in these matters, the *Jaswal* factors, and the *Ryan Young* decision which was provided. Considering all those factors and considering the aggravating and mitigating factors set out above, the Hearing Tribunal concludes that the JSS is appropriate.
63. Specifically, the Hearing Tribunal finds that the JSS was appropriate because:
  - a. The sanctions do have an appropriate focus on rehabilitation of Ms. Corpuz, via the PROBE course;
  - b. There is a year or longer (a minimum of 12 months) of direct supervision. This is significant and appropriate because it allows someone else in the profession to have oversight over Ms. Corpuz and her practice;
  - c. There are some costs that are to be paid by Ms. Corpuz, which are not insignificant, and she cannot work for the period of suspension. Given the severity of the conduct, having a sanction with these elements is effective for specific deterrence for Ms. Corpuz and sends a signal to other members of the profession;
  - d. In addition, there are 5 years of accountability where Ms. Corpuz has to alert future employers. This is a significant amount of time to ensure that future employers are aware and monitoring for this type of conduct in future positions; and
  - e. There is also a requirement for a medical assessment of Ms. Corpuz. This is appropriate to ensure that she is fit for practice and to review any substance use issues that may have contributed to the conduct that was at issue in this hearing.
64. The Hearing Tribunal found the proposed costs order to be reasonable, noting Ms. Corpuz’s agreement with the quantum of costs, and the fact that Ms. Chisholm advised that the costs are likely more than \$6,000. Therefore, the Hearing Tribunal accepts that both the College and Ms. Corpuz are sharing the cost of the hearing, which is by agreement and generally in line with the principles outlined in the *Charkhandeh* decision, and the time to pay will ensure that the cost award is not a crushing financial blow to Ms. Corpuz.
65. **Accordingly, the Hearing Tribunal orders as follows:**
  1. Ms. Corpuz’ practice permit shall be suspended for nine months:
    - a. with six months to be served commencing the date the Hearing Tribunal accepts this Joint Submission on Sanctions and Costs; and

- b. three months to be held in abeyance so long as no additional complaints of a similar nature are investigated and referred to hearing within five years from the date the Hearing Tribunal accepts the Joint Submission on Sanctions and Costs.
2. Notwithstanding the expiry of the period of suspension in Order 1a., Ms. Corpuz' practice permit shall remain suspended until, in addition to any other registration requirements imposed by the ACP's registration department in the normal course:
  - a. Ms. Corpuz provides the Complaints Director with evidence that she has received an unconditional pass of the Centre for Personalized Education for Professional's PROBE course. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for the costs of attending the PROBE course; and
  - b. Ms. Corpuz completes and provides the Complaints Director with a report from an independent medical assessment from a physician approved by the Complaints Director that states she is fit to practice and includes any treatment and monitoring recommendations made by the assessing physician. The Complaints Director may provide this report to the ACP's registration department for consideration of any necessary conditions on Ms. Corpuz' practice permit at the end of the suspension in Order 1a, which the registration department shall impose at its sole discretion. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for the costs of the independent medical assessment and the costs that stem from any treatment and monitoring recommendations. The Complaints Director and/or the ACP Registration department will provide reasonable assistance to Ms. Corpuz in arranging the independent medical assessment if requested, including providing the list of approved physicians and their contact information, providing any necessary documents to the assessing physician, or clarifying the nature of information being sought.
3. Any practice permit issued to Ms. Corpuz upon satisfaction of the provisions of Orders 1a. and 2 above, shall be subject to the following conditions:
  - a. Ms. Corpuz shall practice under direct supervision for a minimum of 12 months following her return to practice. At the end of 6 and 12 months, and prior to the removal of the direct supervision condition from her practice permit, her supervisor, approved by the Complaints Director, must provide the Complaints Director with a report on their supervised conduct that is satisfactory to the Complaints Director. At each instance, the supervisor providing the report must have directly observed Ms. Corpuz' practice and conduct for a minimum of six months. A satisfactory report will include information from the approved supervisor that conduct similar to that described in the Notice of Hearing has not reoccurred;
  - b. For a period of five years from the date her practice permit is issued, Ms. Corpuz must provide a copy of the Hearing Tribunal's decision to any employer who offers her employment as a pharmacy technician or in a pharmacy or health care setting where the restricted activities of a

regulated member of the College (including the sale of scheduled drugs) can occur. Ms. Corpuz shall provide verification of this notice to the Complaints Director at any time she obtains or changes employment; and

- c. For a period of five years from the date her practice permit is issued, Ms. Corpuz may not be a pharmacy owner or proprietor.
4. Ms. Corpuz shall be responsible for payment of \$5,000 of the costs of the hearing. Payment will occur in accordance with a monthly payment schedule as agreed by the Hearings Director and shall be paid within 24 months of the date of the Hearing Tribunal's written decision.

Signed on behalf of the Hearing Tribunal by the Chair on the 13th day of February, 2026

Per: *Dana Lyons*  
Dana Lyons (Feb 13, 2026 08:57:35 MST)  
Dana Lyons, Chair