



Dr. Mehdi HORRI

Council Decision

Date Charge(s) Laid:	January 20, 2024
Charge(s) Amended:	N/A
Outcome Date:	September 26, 2025
Discipline Hearing:	March 31-April 10, 2025
Penalty Hearing:	September 26, 2025
Disposition:	Revocation, Costs

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposes the following penalties on Dr. Mehdi Horri pursuant to *The Medical Profession Act, 1981*:

- 1) Pursuant to section 54(1)(a) of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981*, Dr. Mehdi Horri’s name be struck from the register effective immediately;
- 2) Pursuant to section 54(1)(i), Dr. Mehdi Horri is directed to pay the costs of and incidental to the investigation and hearing in the amount of \$108,392.55 payable within one year.
- 3) Pursuant to section 54(1)(e), the Council hereby reprimands Dr. Horri. The format of the reprimand to be in written format.



28 November 2025

Dr. M. Horri



Dr. Horri:

You were found guilty of nine charges of unprofessional conduct April 2025. This is not the first time you have been charged with and found guilty of unprofessional conduct.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan has worked with you for many years by implementing educational courses and undertakings to try and keep you in practice.

However, your pattern of dishonesty, lack of integrity and remorse, and arrogance is of grave concern.

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan has determined that the risk to the public and your patients is far greater than the benefit of having you continue in the practice of medicine in Saskatchewan.

As part of your penalty, you are to receive a written reprimand.

YOU ARE HEREBY REPRIMANDED

The Council of the College of Physicians & Surgeons of Saskatchewan

IN THE MATTER OF A PENALTY HEARING PERTAINING TO DR. MEHDI HORRI

Ms. C. Kelsey O'Brien appearing on behalf of Dr. M. Horri

Mr. Evan Thompson appearing on behalf of the Registrar's Office

Dr. Mehdi Horri was found guilty of 9 charges of unprofessional conduct by a discipline Committee Hearing for conduct including:

1. three charges of breaching his 2018 Undertaking to the College not to see female patients without a chaperone;
2. three charges of making changes to patients' medical records after becoming aware they had filed complaints with the College;
3. failing to maintain appropriate medical records for two patients;
4. failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession by not obtaining sufficient informed consent for a surgical procedure; and
5. telling a potential witness to the College investigation that it was not the time to think about integrity in her communications with the College.

Decision

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposed the following penalty on Dr. Mehdi Horri:

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan imposes the following penalties on Dr. Mehdi Horri pursuant to The Medical Profession Act, 1981:

1. Pursuant to section 54(1)(a) of The Medical Profession Act, 1981, Dr. Mehdi Horri's name be struck from the register effective immediately;
2. Pursuant to section 54(1)(i), Dr. Mehdi Horri is directed to pay the costs of and incidental to the investigation and hearing in the amount of \$108,392.55 payable within one year.
3. Pursuant to section 54(1)(e), the Council hereby reprimands Dr. Horri. The format of the reprimand to be in written format.

Position of the Registrar's Office

The Registrar is asking for revocation of Dr. Horri's license to practice medicine, costs and a reprimand.

They cite his most recent conduct and past conduct as evidence that Dr. Horri is ungovernable.

Dr. Horri's history of unprofessional conduct:

- 2015 charged by CPSO with unprofessional conduct for having a sexual relationship with a former patient. Eventually a 12-month suspension was imposed. CPSS imposed a 9-month suspension and a condition that he attend a boundaries course and be assessed

to determine the future risk of harm from letting him practice again. Dr. Horri worked in Ontario during this 9-month suspension. In 2018 Dr. Horri was allowed back in practice in Saskatchewan with a signed undertaking. One of the requirements being that he would have a chaperone for all female patient encounters.

- 2020 charged by CPSS with unprofessional conduct relating to conduct in 2017 and 2018. Dr. Horri admitted to unprofessional conduct relating to the treatment of 4 patients in hospital in 2017 and providing propofol to a patient in clinic in 2018. Dr. Horri was suspended for 4 months.
- 2023 suspension proceeding. Concerns about breaching an undertaking by not having a chaperone present for an encounter with 2 female patients. Executive decided not to suspend and allow the investigation to move forward regarding the allegations.
- 2023 Dr. Horri admitted that he breached an undertaking less than one month after he signed it. He did not have a chaperone present when he saw a female patient. 2-month suspension was enforced.
- 2024 suspension proceeding. New information led to concerns about Dr. Horri's adherence to the condition of having a female chaperone present for all female encounters. He seemed to not take the restriction seriously. Rather than a suspension a new undertaking was signed that would not allow Dr. Horri to see any female patients.
- 2025 CPSO discipline. Dr. Horri was charged criminally twice, once in 2023 and again in 2024. The CPSO found that his failure to report these charges was unprofessional. And suspended his license for 12 months. Apparently, Dr. Horri has signed an undertaking with the CPSO in 2021 to never practice in Ontario.

Ungovernability

Dr. Horri has consistently breached undertakings not to see female patients without a chaperone. He has on occasion sworn that he has been following the undertaking. He would then provide a document that demonstrates he decides when it is appropriate to use a chaperone or not with a female patient. Information gathered at different points in different investigations revealed that Dr. Horri was not using a chaperone for all female patient encounters. The breaches demonstrate his lack of respect for his regulator.

Dr. Horri has been found guilty of or admitted unprofessional conduct on 4 occasions and seventeen charges in Saskatchewan:

- June 2010 until Spring 2014 (relationship with former patient in Ontario sexual boundary violation)
- April 2017 (leaving a medical student in charge of arranging a STARS transfer without providing appropriate oversight; administering a medication without advising STARS personnel it had been administered)
- April 2017 (failing to maintain the standard of practice of the profession in relation to providing iron and fresh frozen plasma infusion for a patient)
- May 2017 (failing to follow hospital protocol; exhibiting anger towards nurses at the hospital; making a chart entry indicating he would contact the nurses' licensing body)

- June 2017 (failing to record reasons to not follow pharmacist recommendation to reduce quantities of medications being administered to a patient)
- October 2018 (failing to meet the standard of the profession in administration of propofol in his medical clinic)
- 2018-2023 (failure to have a chaperone present with an unknown number of female patients)
- August 2, 2022 (failure to maintain a proper medical record for Patient #1)
- October 4, 2022 (failure to obtain informed consent for a surgical procedure, failure to have a chaperone present for a surgical procedure in a female patient's axilla, failure to maintain an adequate medical record)
- November 10, 2022 (Alteration of medical records for Patient #1)
- November 21 & 28, 2022 (failure to maintain an adequate medical record and to have a chaperone present for encounters with Patient #3, including a rectal examination on the 28th)
- December 9 & 11, 2022 (alteration of medical records for patient #3)
- December 24-27, 2022 (encouraging potential witness to provide inaccurate information to the College)
- March 2023 (breaches of CPSS undertaking to not see female patients without a chaperone and self-report Undertaking breach)
- May 8, 2023 (alteration of medical records for Patient #2)
- September 2023-July 2024 (failure to report criminal matter to CPSO)
- March 2024-June 2024 (failure to report second criminal matter to CPSO)

Dr. Horri's behavior spans almost the entire breadth of potential unprofessional conduct by a physician. From the worst conduct, sexual abuse of a patient, to what is considered lesser breaches, failure to maintain an accurate medical record.

Dr. Horri is not remorseful for any of his unprofessional behaviour. He has demonstrated on his license renewals that he blames the College for his predicament and does not take accountability for his actions. He has repeatedly been dishonest with the college and encourages others to do the same.

Position of Dr. Horri

Dr. Horri is asking for a reprimand and to take courses.

Dr. Horri states that he is not ungovernable.

He had been found guilty of the most serious charge of a relationship with a former patient. He has not repeated this behavior nor had any boundary violations or sexually inappropriate behavior since.

The 9, 2025 charges are much less serious on the spectrum of misconduct. No actual harm was caused to any patient resulting from the misconduct alleged or determined in the 2025 Hearing.

Dr. Horri acknowledges his ill-advised comments about the College. These were an emotional reaction to the stress of the ongoing matters and he regrets making these comments.

Dr. Horri has cooperated fully with the 2025 hearing.

Dr. Horri has multiple letters of support from colleagues and present and former patients to support his continued practice. There is a physician shortage in Estevan and this should be considered.

Dr. Horri has expressed remorse for his conduct and is willing to be governed by the College and commit to ensuring no further breaches of an undertaking or practice restrictions occur.

The 2025 charges are not worthy of revocation. Dr. Horri made inappropriate comments to a witness, but no false information was given to the College by this witness or Dr. Horri. The conduct by Dr. Horri in the 2025 cases did not include a boundary violation, providing false information to the College, no proof of lack of skill and knowledge, and no proof of not cooperating with the College. Dr. Horri has shown rehabilitative potential, remorse, and insight into his actions.

Discussion

The decision to revoke a physician's license is the most serious of penalties that the Council may take. The Council must make sure that all other avenues have been exhausted that may accommodate the physician to remain in practice.

The Registrar is seeking revocation and Dr. Horri a reprimand and additional courses to take. These are two very different outcomes. The Council must weigh the evidence carefully and determine the most appropriate outcome that aligns with our priority of public protection.

The penalty to be imposed relates to the 9 findings of misconduct made the Discipline Committee. However, applying progressive disciplinary principles, in determining the appropriate penalty, Council may consider Dr. Horri's previous discipline history.

The Council considered all written information before us from both parties. It is voluminous. The verbal presentations were appreciated and listened to carefully and considered by Council in its deliberations.

Council recognizes that Dr. Horri has routinely not been honest with the College. This is demonstrated in his text to V.H. "still think these people deserve honesty" when referring to the College. He had altered 3 medical records knowing full well that an audit would detect this yet did not inform the College of these alterations until it was exposed. His lawyer had sent him a text and asked him to "read these documents very carefully, Medhi, and make sure every word is true – the College is going to scrutinize your response more carefully than usual for this suspension proceeding because at the hearing in September you provided an affidavit in which

you swore that you were abiding by the Undertaking to have a chaperone present for all female patient attendances. Since that was clearly not true.”

Council recognizes Dr. Horri’s lack of insight and remorse. Dr. Horri states that no actual harm was caused to any patient resulting from the misconduct alleged or determined in the 2025 Hearing. The victim impact statements from patients 1,2 and 3 disagree with this assertion.

Patient number one’s feelings about the alteration of their medical record:

“I felt dismissed and devalued,”

“has affected my sense of safety and trust when seeking medical care, especially in sensitive and vulnerable settings.”

“I urge the Council to consider the cumulative impact of Dr. Horri’s actions, not just on those of us directly involved, but on the broader public trust in the medical profession and its regulatory bodies. This experience has made me more hesitant, more skeptical, and more fearful of future medical interactions — and that, to me, is a serious harm that deserves recognition.”

Patient number two’s feeling about lack of informed consent, absence of as chaperone and alteration of their medical record:

“I do not feel that this was a simple oversight—it was a serious ethical violation that has left me feeling worthless in the eyes of the professional medical world. The absence of my consent undermined my autonomy, the right to choose my physician/surgeon and right to make decisions about my own body.”

“His failure to follow established restrictions shows his disregard for professional conduct and my patient safety. This makes me question my worth as a person and as a patient.”

“After learning about the alteration of my medical records my trust in the healthcare system has significantly declined.”

“This experience as a whole has had a lasting effect on me. I now approach all medical settings with anxiety and distrust.”

Patient number three’s feelings about the interactions with Dr. Horri:

“It makes me nervous going to the doctor because it’s something I have to deal with on a day-to-day basis. It takes a toll on my mental health and it’s something that I have to live with and figure out.”

These three patients were profoundly affected by Dr. Horri’s conduct. His assertion that no patient harm occurred demonstrates a concerning lack of insight and remorse.

Council recognizes Dr. Horri’s lack of accountability. Dr. Horri seems to blame the College for all of his professional issues. It does not appear that he is taking any accountability for his conduct.

This is clearly demonstrated in his answers to two renewal questions to the CPSS:

What was the nature of the situation which resulted in the inquiry or investigation?

"It's multiple reasons and it never stops since everything was done by the CPSS, the organization is aware"

Has the inquiry/investigation been completed, and if so, what was the outcome?

"Not completed. And the way the CPSS acts it will never end"

Council recognizes Dr. Horri's lack of adherence to his Undertakings. He has practiced with an Undertaking not to see female patients without a chaperone since 2018. There have been changes and updates over time with the latest in 2024 not allowing him to see any female patients. In 2023 Dr. Horri supplied an affidavit to the Executive for a suspension proceeding. In Dr. Horri's own words:

"I have generally complied with this and all other terms of the undertaking"

"Over time, however, my diligence in complying with the chaperone requirement slipped, particularly when in-person attendances ramped up after the Covid-19 lockdown ended."

"I acknowledge that there have been some occasions when I have not had a chaperone in the room with me when meeting with a female patient"

Factors in Determining Penalty

Evidence of the frequency of the commission of particular acts of misconduct within particularly, and without generally, the Province.

The list of this conduct can be found in this document at paragraph__. While you read the list it becomes clear that Dr. Horri has shown a lack of insight, lack of accountability, lack of professionalism, lack of honesty, and lack of collegiality in a repetitive and serious manner.

Specific deterrence

Council considers that this has been exhausted. Dr. Horri has been suspended several times as a penalty to hopefully deter him from his unprofessional conduct. He has signed several Undertakings and has admitted that he has not adhered to the Undertaking. If Council believed that there was a penalty that would help modify Dr. Horri's conduct it would have been considered.

General Deterrence

Council does believe this to be important. The membership must know that all types of repetitive misconduct, and also not adhering to signed Undertakings, will have very serious consequences. Dr. Horri's conduct stretches from the most serious to arguably the least serious. The conduct is well known in the medical community and the members must take notice.

Previous record, if any, for the same or similar conduct

Dr. Horri points out that he has had only one boundary violation albeit what Council considers is the worst. Council acknowledges that this behavior has not been repeated, but also that the restrictions put in place to protect the public have not been adhered to. Dr. Horri has breached his undertaking more than according to his own admission.

The length of time that has elapsed between the date of any previous misconduct and the conviction thereon, and the member's (properly considered) conduct since that time

It is clear from the material that Dr. Horri's misconduct has really been continuous from 2017 to 2025. Dr. Horri cannot seem to help himself follow the rules that govern him.

- *Ensuring that the penalty imposed will, as mandated by s. 69.1 of the Act, protect the public and ensure the safe and proper practice of medicine; and,*
- *The need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the respondent's ability to properly supervise the professional conduct of its members; and,*
- *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.*

The Council takes no joy in taking a physician out of practice in Saskatchewan. We are very sensitive to the needs of the communities. However, our number one priority is public protection.

Dr. Horri has demonstrated over the last 8 years a blatant disregard for the authority of the College in his practice of medicine. He has breached his Undertakings to the College on numerous occasions, misleading the College as to his compliance with his Undertakings, altering medical records, not obtaining informed consent for medical procedures, encouraging a witness to lie to the College. His past disciplinary history includes instances of his failure to meet clinical standards including using propofol in his clinic, leaving a medical student in charge of a critically ill patient, not following hospital protocols, and failure to meet the standards of practice of the profession.

Patient number one has expectations of the Council:

"I urge the Council to consider the cumulative impact of Dr. Horri's actions, not just on those of us directly involved, but on the broader public trust in the medical profession and its regulatory bodies. This experience has made me more hesitant, more skeptical, and more fearful of future medical interactions — and that, to me, is a serious harm that deserves recognition."

Council is satisfied that, based on the nature of the most recent findings of misconduct considered together with his previous discipline record, Dr. Horri is not prepared to obey the rules of, or respect the authority of the College. He is proven himself to be ungovernable. Council has determined that the only way to protect the public, based on the repetitive nature of misconduct and his failure to be honest with the College, is by revoking Dr. Horri's license to practice medicine in Saskatchewan.

Costs

The Registrar seeks an order pursuant to section 54(1)(i) of *The Medical Profession Act, 1981*, that Dr. Horri pay a proportion of the costs incurred by the College in the investigation and discipline proceedings. The costs are significant. The total amount according to summary provided by the Registrar is \$216,785.11 calculated as follows:

Hearing Administrator	\$6,945.75
Preliminary Inquiry Committee (PIC)	\$14,472.37
Subpoenas, Process Servers, and Publication Ban	\$587.83
Discipline Hearing Committee	\$78,298.25
Catering	\$1,287.85
Experts	\$3,545.45
Witness Costs & Discipline Support	\$7,592.61
Legal Costs	\$104,055.00
TOTAL:	\$216,785.11

The Registrar's Office's position is that an award of 65 to 70 percent of the total costs is appropriate. The proportion is based on the divided success between the parties at the contested discipline proceedings. Dr. Horri was found guilty of 9 of the 13 charges that were before the Discipline Committee (approximately 70%). However, it should be noted that one of the original 14 charges that was investigated and laid was withdrawn by the Registrar's Office. The Registrar's Office provided receipts for the costs incurred.

Both legal counsel for the Registrar's Office and Dr. Horri referred Council to the decision of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan v Leontowicz*, 2023 SKCA 110 (CanLII) case. The Court set out the general principles to be applied to assessing costs as follows:

- 1) Absent a legislative provision to the contrary, costs are not obligatory; rather they are at the discretion of the regulatory body. As noted above, section 54(1) of *The Medical*

Profession Act, 1981 uses the word “may” which signals that a costs award is permissive and not mandatory.

- 2) The purpose of a costs award is not to indemnify the opposing party (as is typical in civil actions) but to have “the sanctioned member bear the costs of disciplinary proceedings as an aspect of the burden of being a member ... and not visit those expenses on the collective membership.” However, as was established in *Abrametz*, the Court of Appeal reiterated that “the burden of membership principle that underpins a costs order does not necessarily mean full indemnification.”
- 3) A costs award should not be punitive, nor should it be “so prohibitive as to prevent a member from defending his or her right to practice in the chosen profession, or from being able to dispute misconduct charges.

The Court in *Leontowicz* identified the following factors which a discipline body ought to consider in determining appropriate costs:

1. Whether the costs are so large that the costs are punitive;
2. Whether the costs are so large that they are likely to deter a member from raising a legitimate defence;
3. The member’s financial status;
4. A member has an obligation to provide financial information to support a contention that a cost award will impose an undue hardship;
5. The regulatory body should provide full supporting material for the amount of costs claimed;
6. The regulatory body should provide the individual with an opportunity to respond to the information and respond to the total quantum of costs which may be ordered before costs are imposed;
6. The regulatory body should provide reasons for reaching the decision that it made.

Counsel for Dr. Horri argued that no costs award should be made given the mixed success that the College had before the Disciplinary Committee. She objected to several of the cost categories claimed in relation to the proceedings as in the nature of “overhead costs” that ought not be charged to Dr. Horri. She cited the case of *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258 in support of this position.

In *Charkhandeh*, the ABCA commented that, while the legislation permits costs awards, it did not contemplate costs related to “overhead” expenses. Overhead costs are an inherent component of self-regulation and properly fall on the regulator. The Court stated:

“Generally, a professional should not have to pay all or a significant portion of the expenses associated with the infrastructure of the hearing, for example travel expenses and daily allowance for the tribunal members. In the normal course the types of expenses that the professional should be expected to pay are those costs discretely associated with the hearing itself.”

The costs identified as overhead expenses or problematic by Dr. Horri’s counsel were itemized as follows:

1. Invoices for the hearing administrator for efforts to locate another hearing member after a previous member stepped down after Dr. Horri raised concerns of bias. Dr. Horri should not have to bear the cost of attempting to locate hearing members. Dr. Horri is entitled to a fair hearing, which includes unbiased panel members. Dr. Horri should not be penalized for reasonably, and ultimately successfully, raising legitimate concerns of bias.
2. A last-minute adjournment was required to find a new panel member. Dr. Horri should not be expected to pay for duplication of work by either the hearing administrator, legal counsel, or anyone else. There are also invoices by former Discipline Committee members who ultimately did not sit on the 2025 Hearing Panel (Dan Shapiro and Florence Wardell). Further, any invoices or charges related to the bias hearing must not be paid by Dr. Horri.
3. The College is seeking over \$100,000 in legal fees; there are certain aspects of the legal fees charged which are inappropriate. These include several charges for administrative tasks such as "Update of College Website" or scheduling meetings. Also, the legal fees include the cost of two lawyers. Dr. Horri should not be responsible for paying for two in-house lawyers for the College.
4. Approximately \$3,500 is sought for expenses relating to experts. The evidence of Dr. Eben Strydom, the College's expert, was largely not preferred as compared to the expert put forward by Dr. Horri. Dr. Strydom's original report included commentary on allegations which were ultimately not pursued at the hearing.
5. An invoice is included for services by Remi Ogunrinde, the panel member against whom Dr. Horri brought an application respecting bias. Ms. Ogunrinde was not a Hearing Committee member during the 2025 Hearing. Dr. Horri should not be required to pay for her services. Additionally, the record shows the time claimed by Ms. Ogunrinde was for her to receive submissions on, and discuss, Dr. Horri's bias application against her. Dr. Horri should not be expected to cover these costs.
6. There are significant charges, almost \$7,600, relating to the witnesses called by the College, including payment for transportation of witnesses, meals and accommodations, and witness support (Taylor Chetty). Witness transportation, accommodation and allowances are properly viewed as hearing/administrative expenses and overhead that should not be passed on to the member.
7. Portions of the invoices charged by PIC members Angela MacDougall and Dr. Doig relate to travel expenses and daily allowances. These are administrative costs of a self-regulatory profession.
8. There should be a further reduction of PIC expenses given the investigation into complaints by D.S. While the PIC did not recommend charges, the College pursued them anyway and lost.
9. Catering expenses of over \$1,200 have been put forward. These are administrative expenses properly borne by a regulatory body as part of regulating a profession.

Dr. Horri's legal counsel pointed out to Council that of the close to \$470,000.00 in costs claimed by the Alberta College in the *Charkhandeh* case the Court allowed only \$60,000.00.

She also drew Council's attention to its own 2023 decision relating to Dr. El-fellani Mohammed who was found guilty of unprofessional conduct regarding interactions with seven patients, making inappropriate comments, and performing a medically unnecessary breast examination. Total costs awarded against Dr. Mohammed were \$56,300.43 of which legal fees accounted for \$22,650.00.

The *Charkhandeh* case has not been followed yet by a Saskatchewan Court and Council's view is that the *Leontowicz* case governs. In *Leontowicz* there is no restriction on a claim for costs classified as "overhead" and Council does not view those costs as necessarily unreasonable. The conduct of the investigation and hearing will, of necessity, involve some administrative work.

Council agrees that the cost of self regulation be borne by the members at large through our licencing fees. However, does this mean that members who act unprofessionally should not bear any responsibility for the costs incurred by the College? That answer is no.

Most members practice in a professional manner in the province of Saskatchewan. They work hard and are privileged to be self regulated. There is no justification to financially punish the members in good standing for the misconduct of Dr. Horri or any member.

Council recognizes that full indemnity for costs is not appropriate in this case. The College was not fully successful in proving all the charges against Dr. Horri and he ought not to bear the costs of his successful defence of those charges or of the costs associated with the change to membership of the Discipline Committee. However, the fact remains that he was convicted of 9 charges after a lengthy hearing.

Council does not, in this case, accept that cost should simply be apportioned based on the number of charges proven versus the number of charges that the College proceeded on before the Discipline Committee. A charge was dropped by the College and Dr. Horri ought not to bear the costs related to that charge.

Council does recognize the concerns raised by Dr. Horri related to the amount of what was termed the "overhead" costs.

As to his financial position and the impact that the cost award will have on Dr. Horri, Council recognized that any cost award will have significant impact given the decision to revoke his license. Dr. Horri filed an affidavit that sets out his current financial situation. While he has cash flow issues, he does have two real estate properties which he values at \$2,300,000.00 less a mortgage debt of \$700,000.00 for a net value of \$1,600,000.00. Dr. Horri does have the means to pay a cost award.

Council determined that in fairness to Dr. Horri he should only bear 50% of the \$216,785.11 costs claimed by the Registrar. This reduces the costs to \$108,390.00.

This is a reasonable amount given the divided success and taking into account the concerns raised by Dr. Horri regarding overhead and legal costs.

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