

## ONTARIO CHIROPODISTS AND PODIATRISTS DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL

**Citation:** *College of Chiropractors of Ontario v. Martineau*, 2025 ONCPDT 10

**Date:** November 5, 2025

**Tribunal File No.:** 25-003-CP

### BETWEEN:

College of Chiropractors of Ontario

**College**

- and -

Nadia Belle Martineau

**Registrant**

### FINDING AND PENALTY REASONS

**Heard:** October 15, 2025, by videoconference

#### **Panel:**

Sophie Martel (panel chair)

Allan Katz (public)

Brooke Mitchell (chiropractor)

#### **Appearances:**

Amy Block and Debra McKenna, for the College

Rebecca M. Young, for the registrant

#### **RESTRICTION ON PUBLICATION**

Pursuant to Rule 2.2.2 of the HPDT Rules of Procedure and ss. 45-47 of the Health Professions Procedural Code, no one shall publish or broadcast the names of patients or any information that could identify patients or disclose patients' personal health information or health records referred to at a hearing or in any documents filed with the Tribunal. There may be significant fines for breaching this restriction.

The Ontario Chiropractors and Podiatrists Discipline Tribunal is the Discipline Committee established under the Health Professions Procedural Code.

## **Introduction**

[1] Nadia Belle Martineau, the registrant, was first registered with the College in June 2019. During the relevant time, she practised as a contractor at Ortho World, a clinic located in Mississauga (clinic).

[2] The registrant admits that she engaged in professional misconduct by validating claims for orthotics that had been dispensed by clinic staff and non-registrants rather than herself. She also admits that her patient records were false or misleading and that she provided false or misleading information to an insurance company when asked to verify that she had assessed patients and dispensed orthotics to them.

[3] Prior to the hearing, the registrant undertook to permanently resign from the College and not to reapply or seek registration in any other jurisdiction to practise as a chiropodist or podiatrist. The parties jointly submitted that considering the undertaking, the appropriate penalty was a reprimand. They also agreed on costs of \$8,000 payable in two installments.

[4] We accepted the joint submission because the proposed penalty did not bring the administration of justice into disrepute and was not otherwise contrary to the public interest.

[5] The parties agreed to a reduced panel consisting of an experienced adjudicator, a registrant of the College and a public member, pursuant to s. 4.2.1(2) of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, RSO 1990, c. S.22.

## **Agreed Facts**

[6] The College received a complaint from Sun Life in September 2024 about the registrant's practice at the clinic following a review it had conducted in June 2024.

[7] Sun Life had requested that the registrant validate services and/or products provided by the registrant to Sun Life plan members on December 13, 2023. In response to Sun Life's request, the registrant verified that she had assessed thirteen Sun Life plan members and dispensed orthotics to eleven Sun Life plan members that day. Her patient records, which Sun Life requested, also similarly indicated that the registrant had prescribed and dispensed orthotics to the plan members.

[8] Sun Life confirmed directly with several plan members that the registrant had validated claims for orthotics that she had not dispensed; rather, these orthotics had been dispensed by clinic staff and/or a non-registrant of the College.

[9] In July 2024, during a discussion with a Sun Life representative, the registrant acknowledged that she had not dispensed all the orthotics in question, that she had provided false or misleading validations to Sun Life and that her patient records were false or misleading. She indicated that orthotics had been re-ordered and dispensed by clinic staff based on assessments conducted by the registrant over one year earlier even though her records indicated that she had recently assessed patients.

[10] Following the Sun Life review, Sun Life and another insurance company delisted the registrant and the clinic.

[11] The agreed facts also indicate that if the registrant were to testify, it would be her evidence that, as a contractor and new chiropractor, she felt pressured by the clinic owners and was influenced by them to provide false information and documents to Sun Life regarding who ordered and dispensed orthotics at the clinic. With the benefit of hindsight and reflection, the registrant acknowledges that it was her professional responsibility to abide by the College's expectations and standards of the profession.

### **Professional Misconduct**

[12] The registrant's conduct contravened multiple College standards. Contrary to the Assessment and Management standard, she did not perform an assessment for each patient seen in clinical practice and establish a management plan based on that assessment. Contrary to the Patient Relations standard, she did not take reasonable steps to ensure patients understood the assessment findings, diagnoses, treatment plan and prognoses; rather she inappropriately relied on clinic staff to fulfill these steps. She contravened the Records standard in multiple ways, including by failing to maintain accurate records, by falsifying records and issuing documents that contain a false or misleading statement. Finally, the registrant contravened the Prescription Custom Foot Orthoses (PCFO) standard, which requires that a registrant who prescribes a PCFO is also responsible for dispensing that PCFO to the patient. It is the responsibility of the prescribing registrant to ensure that the PCFO is dispensed to the patient by a registrant. The registrant also did not fulfill the dispensing requirements regarding properly advising and instructing patients, including discussing expected treatment

outcomes. The standard states that in appropriate circumstances, a prescribing member may re-dispense a PCFO to a patient within one year of the original orthotic prescription without the requirement for a full patient assessment. In this case, the registrant validated PCFOs based on assessments that were more than one year old.

[13] By acceding to pressure and influence by the clinic owners rather than adhering to the standards of her profession, the registrant practised under a cloud of a conflict of interest.

[14] The registrant compounded the misconduct by providing false or misleading information and records to Sun Life when asked to validate claims made by plan members.

[15] The College has a Zero Tolerance Policy Statement regarding inappropriate business practices given that honesty and integrity are fundamental attributes for every registrant. Inappropriate business practices include situations where a registrant does not personally fit and dispense prescribed orthotics, signs or issues a document that contains a false or misleading statement and falsifies records. Such conduct is not only contrary to the Zero Tolerance Policy Statement but also conduct that members of the profession would reasonably regard as being disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional.

[16] Ultimately, the registrant agrees, and we find that she committed acts of professional misconduct under the following paragraphs of s. 1 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation (O. Reg. 750/93), under the *Chiropractic Act, 1991*, SO 1991, c. 20:

1. Paragraph 2 – failing to meet or contravening a standard of practice of the profession, including but not limited to the College’s standards on:
  - a. Assessment and Management;
  - b. Patient Relations;
  - c. Records; and
  - d. Prescription Custom Foot Orthoses

2. Paragraph 10 – practising the profession while the member is in a conflict of interest;
3. Paragraph 17– failing to keep records as required by the regulations;
4. Paragraph 18 – falsifying a record relating to the member’s practice;
5. Paragraph 20 – signing or issuing, in the member’s professional capacity, a document that contains a false or misleading statement;
6. Paragraph 21 – submitting an account or charge for services that the member knows is false or misleading;
7. Paragraph 30 – contravening the *Chiropractic Act, 1991*, the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, or the regulations under either of those Acts: specifically, Ontario Regulation 203/94 under the *Chiropractic Act, 1991*; and
8. Paragraph 33 – engaging in conduct or performing an act, in the course of practising the profession, that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional.

## **Penalty**

[17] Our role is limited when the parties agree on penalty. We should only depart from a joint submission if the proposed penalty would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or is otherwise not in the public interest: *R. v. Anthony Cook*, 2016 SCC 43. A disciplinary body that rejects a joint submission on penalty must show why the proposed penalty is so unhinged from the circumstances of the case that it must be rejected: *Bradley v. Ontario College of Teachers*, 2021 ONSC 2303.

[18] In this case, because the registrant has agreed not to practise chiropractic and to never re-apply to practise, we do not need to consider the appropriate range of suspensions for this type of misconduct. Her agreement to permanently resign and not practise in any jurisdiction protects the public. Furthermore, the undertaking sends the message to the profession, the public and the insurance stakeholders that the profession’s standards must be complied with and that the falsification of information will not be tolerated.

[19] Patients often rely on insurance coverage when seeing registrants. The type of misconduct in which the registrant engaged jeopardizes the relationship registrants have with their patients and with insurance companies. Our reprimand denounces this misconduct and reinforces the Zero Tolerance Policy Statement that inappropriate business practices will be met with significant consequences.

[20] The agreed-upon costs are reasonable and appropriate given the registrant's admission to the misconduct and her cooperation in the disciplinary process, which shortened the hearing and avoided the need to call witnesses.

### **Order**

[21] We ordered:

#### Penalty

1. The Registrant will be reprimanded by the Discipline Tribunal via an electronic hearing, and the fact and nature of the reprimand shall be recorded on the College's public register for an unlimited period of time.
2. The finding, undertaking to permanently resign, and penalty of the Discipline Tribunal shall be published, with the Registrant's name, online and/or in print, including but not limited to, in the official publications of the College, on the College's public register and posted to CanLII;

#### Costs

1. The Registrant shall pay costs to the College in the amount of \$8,000 on the following timetable:
  - \$4,000.00 – to be paid on October 15, 2025; and
  - \$4,000.00 – to be paid on April 30, 2026.

**ONTARIO CHIROPODISTS AND PODIATRISTS DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL**

**Tribunal File No.:** 25-003-CP

**BETWEEN:**

College of Chiropractors of Ontario

**College**

- and -

Nadia Belle Martineau

**Registrant**

**The Tribunal delivered the following Reprimand  
by videoconference on Wednesday, October 15, 2025.**

**\*\*\*NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT\*\*\***

As you know, Ms. Martineau, as part of its penalty, this Discipline Panel has ordered you to be given an oral reprimand. The fact that you have received this reprimand will be part of the public portion of the Register and, as such, part of your record with the College.

We found that you engaged in misconduct relating to the ordering and dispensing of orthotics and to the provision of false or misleading information to an insurance company. You validated claims for orthotics that you had not dispensed. Your patient records were inaccurate and misleading, indicating that you had prescribed and dispensed orthotics to insurance plan members when that was not the case. In reality, the orthotics were dispensed by clinic staff or by someone who was not a registrant of the College. In addition, orthotics were reordered and dispensed by clinic staff based on assessments you had conducted more than a year earlier, even though your records indicated that a recent assessment had taken place.”

The Panel has found that you engaged in professional misconduct in multiple ways including by

1. Contravening the Chiroprody Act, 1991, the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 or the regulations under either of those Acts;
2. Failing to meet the standards of practice of the profession, specifically pertaining to Assessment and Management, Patient Relations, Records, and Prescription Custom Foot Orthoses.
3. Engaging in conduct which would reasonably be regarded by other members of this profession as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional.

The fact that you engaged in professional misconduct is a matter of profound concern and is contrary to the College’s Zero Tolerance Policy. You have brought discredit to the entire chiroprody and podiatry professions and to yourself. Public confidence in this

profession has been put in jeopardy. The result of your misconduct is that you have let down the public, the chiropody and podiatry professions, and yourself.

It is essential that all registrants practice within the standards and guidelines of the practice and fulfill their assessing and reporting obligations in an honest and accurate manner. Doing so is crucial to maintaining public confidence in the profession and for the College to carry out its mandate of public protection. In addition, patients often rely on insurance coverage when seeing members of this profession, and you have jeopardized the good relationship registrants have with insurance companies.

We appreciate that you have taken responsibility here and that you were willing to admit misconduct. We also recognize that you have signed an undertaking to permanently resign from the College and surrender your certificate of registration and not reapply.

Our penalty of an oral reprimand provides an opportunity to impress upon you the seriousness of your misconduct and to signal to the profession more broadly that this is serious misconduct. Today's order, together with your undertaking, is in the public interest and helps maintain public confidence in the profession.