



## Dr. Fawzy GIRGIS

### Council Decision

Date Charge(s) Laid:	January 20, 2024
Charge(s) Amended:	N/A
Outcome Date:	September 26, 2025
Discipline Hearing:	October 9, 2025, November 4, 2024 & December 3, 2024
Penalty Hearing:	September 26, 2025
Disposition:	Reprimand, Suspension, Costs

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposes the following penalty on Dr. Fawzy Girgis in accordance with *The Medical Profession Act, 1981* (the "Act"):

- 1) Pursuant to s. 54(1)(b) of the Act, the Council suspends Dr. Girgis' privileges as a duly qualified medical practitioner for a period of 2 months Dr. Girgis' suspension will commence at 12:01 a.m. on 1 November 2025 and ending at 11:59 p.m. on 31 December 2025;
- 2) Pursuant to s. 54(1)(e) of the Act, the Council hereby reprimands Dr. Girgis and orders Dr. Girgis to appear before the Council at a future scheduled meeting, date to be determined, to have the reprimand administered in person; and
- 3) Pursuant to s. 54(1)(i) of the Act, the Council directs Dr. Girgis to pay the costs of and incidental to the investigation and hearing in the amount of \$24,404.05 payable no later than 30 days following Dr. Girgis' return to work , i.e. 1 February 2026;
- 4) Pursuant to s. 54(2) of the Act, if Dr. Girgis should fail to pay the costs as required by paragraph 3, Dr. Girgis' licence shall be suspended until the costs are paid in full; and
- 5) The Council reserves to itself the right to reconsider and amend any of the terms of this penalty order if requested to do so by Dr. Girgis.

Reasons for the decision will be drafted and approved at the November 2025 Council meeting.



28 November 2025

Dr. F. Girgis

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dr Girgis:

You appeared virtually for the purpose of a penalty hearing before the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan on September 26, 2025 pertaining to findings of guilt by the Discipline Hearing Committee (DHC). The DHC found you guilty of three charges of intentional dishonesty in your response to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba.

The Council of the College of Physician and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposed penalty pursuant to *The Medical Professional Act, 1981*. One component of the penalty imposed by the Council was a reprimand.

*You, Dr. F Girgis having been found guilty of professional misconduct are hereby reprimanded by the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan.*

Council takes the issue of dishonesty very seriously. Honesty and integrity are cardinal characters expected of members of the profession at all times, not just in their dealings with patients, but also in their relationship with the public and their regulators. Honesty and candour on the part of members is the foundation on which the privileges of belonging to a self-regulating profession is built. Your behaviour fell below the expected standards. Council acknowledges that you have had no findings or charges of unprofessional conduct since becoming licensed in Saskatchewan.

It is therefore the hope of Council that you will reflect and learn from this experience and that you will continue to maintain the high standards expected of members of the profession going forward.

**The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan.**

# **In the Matter of a Penalty Hearing before the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan and Dr. Fawzy Girgis**

**September 26, 2025**

## **Introduction**

Dr. Fawzy Girgis appeared virtually before the Council for the purpose of a penalty hearing on September 26, 2025. Dr. Girgis was represented by Ms. Richika Bodani. Mr. Luke Brisebois presented the penalty position on behalf of the Registrar's Office.

## **Background**

Dr. Girgis is a 63-year-old physician whose medical training was in Egypt. He was licensed in Manitoba in 2007 and in Saskatchewan in 2013.

## **The Charges against Dr. Girgis**

### **Charge 1:**

You, Dr. Fawzy Girgis are guilty of unbecoming, improper, unprofessional, or discreditable conduct contrary to the provisions of Section 46(o) of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981, S.S. 1980-81 c. M-10.1* particulars of which are that you provided inaccurate information to the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Ontario in connection with an application for licensure.

The evidence that will be led in support of this charge will include one or more of the following:

- 1) You applied for licensure with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.
- 2) You answered "no" to a question which asked whether you had ever been the subject of any complaint made to a medical licensing authority.
- 3) That statement was not accurate.
- 4) You answered "no" to a question whether you had ever been the subject of any type of investigation, inquiry or proceeding by a medical licensing authority relating to the professional conduct, competence, capacity or any other aspect of your medical practice.
- 5) That statement was not accurate.
- 6) One or both statements were made dishonestly, or in the alternative, you failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that you accurately responded to the questions in the application.

**Charge 2:**

You, Dr. Fawzy Girgis are guilty of unbecoming, improper, unprofessional, or discreditable conduct contrary to the provisions of Section 46(o) of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981*, S.S. 1980-81 c. M-10.1 particulars of which are that you provided inaccurate information to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba in connection with an application to renew your license.

The evidence that will be led in support of this charge will include one or more of the following:

- 1) In approximately October of 2018 you applied to renew your license with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba.
- 2) You answered "no" to a question whether you had ever been denied an application for licensure, registration, permit or any other authorization to practice.
- 3) That statement was not accurate.
- 4) That statement was made dishonestly, or in the alternative, you failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that you accurately responded to the question.

**Charge 3:**

You, Dr. Fawzy Girgis are guilty of unbecoming, improper, unprofessional, or discreditable conduct contrary to the provisions of Section 46(o) of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981*, S.S. 1980-81 c. M-10.1 and/or paragraph (b) of bylaw 7.2 under the heading "Accountability", particulars of which are that you provided inaccurate information to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba in connection with an application to renew your license.

The evidence that will be led in support of this charge will include one or more of the following:

- 1) In approximately October of 2019 you applied to renew your license with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba.
- 2) You answered "no" to a question whether you had ever been denied an application for licensure, registration, permit or any other authorization to practice.
- 3) That statement was not accurate.
- 4) That statement was made dishonestly, or in the alternative, you failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that you accurately responded to the question.

5) You answered “no” to a question whether you were currently the subject of an investigation or other proceeding in relation to your conduct, competence or capacity or fitness to practice.

6) That statement was not accurate.

7) That statement was made dishonestly, or in the alternative, you failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that you accurately responded to the question.

The Registrar’s Office withdrew sub-paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of Charge 3.

Dr. Girgis pled guilty to a failure to exercise due diligence with respect to the remaining aspects of the charges and pled not guilty to acting dishonestly.

### **Decision of the Discipline Hearing Committee (DHC)**

A contested hearing on the issue of whether Dr. Girgis acted with intentional dishonesty took place before the DHC on October 9, 2024. Upon commencement of the hearing, Dr. Girgis brought an application that the matter be dismissed on the ground of delay. That application was argued before the DHC and ultimately dismissed with written reasons by the DHC on October 29, 2024.

When the hearing was reconvened on November 4, 2024, an agreed statement of facts was filed with the DHC. The Agreed Statement of Fact established that Dr. Girgis had provided information that was not accurate to both the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (“CPSO”) and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba (“CPSM”).

After the Agreed Statement of Fact was entered, the Registrar’s Office closed its case. Dr. Girgis then made an application for a non-suit on the grounds that Registrar’s Office had not introduced any evidence in relation to the dishonesty aspect of all three charges. That application was also argued before the DHC and then dismissed with written reasons issued on November 27, 2024.

The hearing then reconvened once again on December 3, 2024, for the presentation of Dr. Girgis’ case, where he testified before the Committee. Final written and oral argument took place before the DHC on December 19, 2024. The DHC issued its written decision on January 16, 2025, and found Dr. Girgis guilty of dishonesty on all three counts.

### **The Position taken by the Registrar’s Office**

The written penalty submission of the Registrar’s office is documented in info 139/25. The position of the Registrar’s Office is that, for the three charges of unprofessional conduct for

which Dr. Girgis has been found guilty, the appropriate penalty pursuant to s. 54 of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981* includes:

1. a 4-month suspension;
2. a reprimand in a form directed by Council; and
3. payment of the costs associated with this matter.

The Registrar's Office relied on *The Camgoz Factors* as outlined by the Saskatchewan Court of King's Bench in *Camgoz v College of Physicians and Surgeons (Sask)*, [1993 CanLII 8952 \(SK KB\)](#).

Of those factors, the ones most emphasized be the Registrar's office are:

- i) The nature and gravity of the proven allegations and evidence of the frequency of the commission of the particular acts of misconduct [Camgoz factors (a) and (d)]: intentional dishonesty is serious unprofessional conduct. Regulators such as the CPSS, CPSM, and CPSO rely to a significant degree on the honesty of applicants and can not meet their mandate of public protection where information is deliberately withheld from them. Moreover, the nature of the dishonesty on the part of Dr. Girgis goes beyond a single out-of-character utterance or one-off action. The DHC Committee found that Dr. Girgis was repeatedly dishonest in situations that clearly stipulated it would be unprofessional to do so.
- ii) Both specific and general deterrence [Camgoz factors (f) and (g)]: Both are important factors in imposing penalty in this case. It is important that the Council impose a sufficient penalty that physicians generally and Dr. Girgis in particular recognize the importance of answering questions posed by the regulator honestly and openly.
- iii) The need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the College's ability to properly supervise the professional conduct of its members [Camgoz factor (k)]: when physicians are dishonest with a regulator it calls into question the College's ability to regulate its members. The public needs to be assured that physicians will be held to account when they are dishonest and when they fail to meet their obligations to their regulatory body.
- iv) Ensuring that the penalty imposed is not disparate with penalties previously imposed in this jurisdiction in particular, and in other jurisdictions in general, for the same or similar act of misconduct [Camgoz factor (l)]: the Registrar's office provide case law from Saskatchewan and Ontario in support of its penalty position.

## **Costs**

The Registrar's Office's position is an order of full costs totaling \$48,808.09. Full costs are not sought as a starting or default position but in light of the contextual analysis of a variety of factors including:

1. All three charges were substantiated at the contested hearing. Furthermore, findings of dishonesty rather than simple carelessness or lack of due diligence were also made with respect to all three charges. Those findings were made on the basis of an agreed statement of fact and Dr. Girgis's own testimony.
2. Dr. Girgis brought multiple applications before the DHC that prolonged the hearing of the issues on the merits and increased the required costs. Each application was dismissed by the DHC with written reasons after an adjournment.

The Registrar's Office emphasizes that these points are not to be viewed as punishment for taking steps to defend oneself against the charges he was facing; rather, they are to be viewed as contextual factors arising directly from the choices Dr. Girgis made that resulted in additional costs associated with this proceeding. Dr. Girgis should bear responsibility in relation to those costs.

### **The Position taken by Dr. Girgis's Legal Counsel**

The written penalty Submission on behalf of Dr. F. Girgis is contained in document Info 150\_25 of Council's documents. Dr. Girgis submits that given the unique issues at play, a penalty in the nature of the below is warranted:

- (a) a reprimand, either in-person or written;
- (b) completion of an educational course; and,
- (c) costs no greater than \$15,285.57.

Dr. Girgis opined that the Registrar's Office's position on penalty is unreasonable, and attempts to justify significant costs and a lengthy suspension do not align with the principles articulated by Saskatchewan Courts and this Council in the past.

The factors articulated in *Camgoz v College of Physicians & Surgeons (Sask)*, 1993 CanLII 8952 (Sask QB) were also used by Counsel to Dr. Girgis in her submission. The following mitigating factors are uncontested and should be considered in favour of a less severe penalty:

- Dr. Girgis is an experienced practitioner, who has practiced in this province for decades.
- Dr. Girgis has *no* previous disciplinary findings against him.
- The Registrar's Office has not demonstrated any concern for an ongoing frequency of concerning conduct.

- It has been over 6 years since the conduct in question occurred, with not a single concern raised since that time.
- There is no patient safety, public safety, or safe practice of medicine issues at play.

With regards to *Camgoz (a)*, Dr Girgis acknowledges the importance of honesty during licensure renewal. Since 2020, he has completed all licensure renewals without any issues. This was not a case where Dr. Girgis attempted to hide a criminal conviction or failure to complete programming through another institution.

The need for specific deterrence is non-existent as Dr. Girgis has already taken steps to ensure that his licensure renewal applications after 2019 were completed correctly. A written reprimand outlining the unique issues in this case fully satisfy the need for general deterrence.

Dr. Girgis has been dealing with this same matter in some form or another since 2017. Despite CPSS being acutely aware of this in 2018, there were no charges laid against Dr. Girgis until 5 years later, on March 15, 2023. The hearing proper did not take place until December 3, 2024, over twenty months after the charges were laid. The Decision was rendered in January 2025. It has taken over 9 months to proceed to a penalty hearing.

Dr. Girgis argued that there are significant errors in the Discipline Committee's decision that Council ought to take into consideration when assessing penalty. Firstly, the Committee failed to conduct a proper credibility assessment of Dr. Girgis's evidence. Secondly, the Committee relied on unsupported assumptions as findings of fact with no evidentiary basis. Thirdly, the Committee conflated all three charges in order to surmise intent, as opposed to considering the facts and evidence of each charge individually. The significant errors in the Discipline Committee's decision are a major mitigating factor that must be considered by Council.

As outlined in *Camgoz*, any penalty must protect the public and ensure the safe and proper practice of medicine. In this circumstances, it is contrary to the public interest to suspend Dr. Girgis from practice. Removing Dr. Girgis from practice will contribute to the physician shortage and overall health system crisis that Saskatchewan is facing.

Counsel for Dr. Girgis presented two cases of law; one in which no suspension was found (*College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*) v. *Goldenthal*, 2002 ONCPSD 38 and the one that resulted in 3-4 months suspension *College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*) v. *Pandhi*, 2002 ONCPSD 20.

## **Costs**

Dr Girgis submitted that if a costs award is made, it should be \$15,285.57 being the cost of the Court Reporter, and 50% of the cost of the Hearing Administrator and of the Discipline Hearing Committee.



Dr. Girgis argued that there was no justifiable basis for the Registrar's Office to transfer the entirety of the College legal counsel's costs on to Dr. Girgis. Furthermore, the costs submitted to the College also consisted of expenses for panel members and witnesses. Dr. Girgis had no say on whether or not it was appropriate for panel members to be picked from other parts of the province and should not bear the burden of the College choosing to appoint an individual who did not live nearby.

Dr. Girgis pled guilty to a lack of due diligence, the only part of the charges that he challenged was the suggestion of dishonesty. Furthermore, during the hearing the Registrar's Office withdrew significant portions of Charge #3. As a result, it was submitted that the total costs of the hearing administrator and the discipline hearing committee be halved.

### **Decision of Council**

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposes the following penalty on Dr. Fawzy Girgis in accordance with The Medical Profession Act, 1981 (the "Act"):

1. Pursuant to s. 54(1)(b) of the Act, the Council suspends Dr. Girgis' privileges as a duly qualified medical practitioner for a period of 2 months. Dr. Girgis' suspension will commence at 12:01 a.m. on 1 November 2025 and end at 11:59 p.m. on 31 December 2025;
2. Pursuant to s. 54(1)(e) of the Act, the Council hereby reprimands Dr. Girgis and orders Dr. Girgis to appear before the Council at a future scheduled meeting, date to be determined, to have the reprimand administered in person; and
3. Pursuant to s. 54(1)(i) of the Act, the Council directs Dr. Girgis to pay the costs of and incidental to the investigation and hearing in the amount of \$24,404.05 payable no later than 30 days following Dr. Girgis' return to work, i.e. 1 February 2026;
4. Pursuant to s. 54(2) of the Act, if Dr. Girgis should fail to pay the costs as required by paragraph 3, Dr. Girgis' licence shall be suspended until the costs are paid in full; and
5. The Council reserves to itself the right to reconsider and amend any of the terms of this penalty order if requested to do so by Dr. Girgis.

### **Reasons for Decision**

Considerable time was given by Council to discuss the appropriate penalty in this case. The position of the Registrar's Office is for a 4-months suspension while Dr. Girgis's counsel argued for no suspension. Dr. Girgis's arguments focused a great deal on the delay in bringing this case forward and what it deemed as significant errors in the decision of the DHC.

The DHC determined that Dr. Girgis was dishonest in his application to the CPSO and CPSM. This was not just a failure to maintain due diligence. It was Council's responsibility to determine penalty, not to re-litigate the decision of the DHC. Council takes the issue of dishonesty seriously. Honesty and integrity are cardinal characters expected of members of the profession at all times, not just in their dealings with patients, but also in their relationship with the public and their regulators. Honesty and candour on the part of members is the foundation on which the privileges of belonging to a self-regulating profession is built. Council determined therefore that a suspension is warranted. In determining the length of suspension, Council considered the case law provided by both legal counsel and the *Camgoz* factors Dr. Girgis argued that the delay in bringing the proceedings forward was a significant mitigating factor. Council acknowledges the delay in bringing this case forward but did not consider this a mitigating factor. It did however consider the fact that Dr. Girgis has maintained 'good character' since being licensed in Saskatchewan as a mitigating factor. There was no case law similar to this one.

Council considered the case against Dr. Akinpeloye as the most similar. Dr. Akinpeloye was suspended for 2-months for providing false and inaccurate information to the College of Physician and Surgeons of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Health Authority. Council imposed a 2-month suspension commencing November 1, 2025 as part of penalty to pass the message along to registrants as a specific and general deterrence.

Council considered costs in this matter. The Registrar's Office argued for full costs while Dr Girgis asked for 50% of the costs of the DHC and the hearing Administrator and no legal costs.

Council considered the direction provided by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in the *Leontowicz decision* and *Abrametz v. The Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2018 SKCA 37 on how cost should be assessed. Council was aware that the default situation should not be full costs. It weighed the position of the Registrar's Office with regards to the costs associated with a contested hearing. Council did not consider the fact that Dr. Girgis chose to proceed to a contested hearing as an aggravating factor especially as some of the charges were withdrawn during the hearing. Dr Girgis had argued against paying legal costs and some of the expenses associated with the DHC. Council rejected this argument. Legal costs and expenses are an integral part of the costs associated with proceedings. Council considered it unreasonable to expect DHC members or witnesses to be appointed from a specific area of the province. Keeping all this in mind Council decided that 50% of total costs was reasonable and in accordance with the principles set out above.

Dr. Girgis was permitted to appear virtually for the penalty hearing as he was going on vacation. He was at the airport at the time of penalty hearing. It was not obvious to Council that he understood the gravity of the issue and how serious Council considers it. Council believes an in-person reprimand will more effectively pass the message across to him.

**Approved by the Council of the College of Physicians & Surgeons of Saskatchewan:  
29 November 2025**