

ONTARIO CHIROPODISTS AND PODIATRISTS DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL

Citation: *College of Chiropractors of Ontario v. Tabrizi*, 2026 ONCPDT 6

Date: July 15, 2026

Tribunal File No.: 25-004-CP

BETWEEN:

College of Chiropractors of Ontario

College

- and -

Ali Tabrizi

Registrant

FINDING AND PENALTY REASONS

Heard: May 28, 2026

Panel:

David A. Wright (Tribunal Chair)

Itraf Ahmad (public)

Mary Ellen Mitchell (chiropractor)

Appearances:

Debra McKenna, for the College

Daniel Libman, 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.

Introduction

[1] Chiropractors and podiatrists must monitor and verify the claims submitted in their names to insurance companies. In this case, Ali Tabrizi, the registrant, did not do so. A clinic where he worked and that he co-owned submitted hundreds of thousands of dollars in claims in his name. This included claims for devices that could not be prescribed by a chiropractor. What is more, the records he kept were so deficient that it is not possible for the College to determine the appropriateness of his treatments.

[2] Mr. Tabrizi admitted misconduct, and the parties jointly submitted that the penalty should include record-keeping and ethics courses, a net four-month suspension, a further six-month prohibition on prescribing and providing orthopedic shoes and a year and a half of supervision. When the parties have made a joint submission, our role is to determine whether the proposed penalty is so unhinged from the circumstances that it would bring the administration of the College's professional discipline system into disrepute. It is important to note that there is no finding that the registrant intentionally submitted false claims or was aware that there were false claims being made in his name. Given that context, the proposed joint submission is within a reasonable range, and we accepted it.

[3] Tribunal Chair David Wright conducted case management conferences in this matter and sits on the panel with the consent of both parties.

The misconduct

[4] When these events happened, the registrant practised at several clinics, including Physiomed Yorkdale (the clinic). The registrant was a 25% shareholder in the company that operated the clinic. He was also its president, secretary and treasurer. He earned a daily rate, plus 50% of any foot treatment he provided. He also received a share of the profits, presumably in the form of dividends. Mr. Tabrizi is registered as a chiropractor but did not practise as a chiropractor at the clinic.

[5] The insurance company, GreenShield, reviewed claims from the clinic during the 23-month period from August 1, 2021, to June 30, 2023. The claims resulted in total payments to the clinic of \$798,138.49, of which \$623,138.80 was for services and products billed under Mr. Tabrizi's name.

[6] The clinic submitted a large number of claims for medical devices. Braces, including knee braces, made up a combined total of 35% of claim submissions (\$285,965). Thigh-high/full compression stockings made up 20% of all claims submitted to GreenShield (\$167,000). Orthopedic footwear made up 6% of all claim submissions. Chiropody services were 1% of all claim submissions.

[7] If Mr. Tabrizi were to testify at a contested hearing, it would be his evidence that clinic staff submitted claims to GreenShield through GreenShield's online portal without his knowledge or consent, and that he was not compensated for those claims. However, the registrant admits that claims submitted under his name to GreenShield were processed both manually and online, including claims submitted manually in relation to orthopedic shoes, orthotics, braces, and compression stockings. Once Mr. Tabrizi became aware of GreenShield's concerns (prior to the on-site review by GreenShield described below), he discontinued his practice at the clinic and resigned as an officer and director.

[8] As part of its audit, GreenShield conducted an on-site visit at the clinic on October 19, 2023. This was not a surprise visit. The insurance company wrote to the registrant to give the clinic notice almost two weeks in advance. Prior to the visit, GreenShield asked to review and obtain 20 patient files. It asked to see preliminary assessment records, treatment plans, clinical records, prescriptions, attendance records, financial records, and supplier invoices.

[9] While on site, GreenShield also requested an additional 21 files. Some of those files were not available. Moreover, the records were deficient, lacked necessary treatment details, and contained billing discrepancies, including the following:

- incomplete patient history;
- lack of information in the records regarding the registrant's clinical findings, diagnosis and differential diagnosis, assessments, and treatment plan for the patient;
- incomplete records to demonstrate medical necessity for prescribing off-the-shelf shoes, including what shoes were prescribed or the orthopedic features of the shoe that would address the patient's needs based on the assessment;

- incomplete financial records;
- multiple claims where plan members were dispensed knee-high compression stockings, but GreenShield was billed for thigh-high compression stockings; and
- multiple claims for braces, which are outside the registrant's scope of practice as a chiroprapist.

[10] The registrant and his clinic were delisted by GreenShield. He was also directed to repay GreenShield \$45,747.

[11] Mr. Tabrizi acknowledges that it was his professional responsibility to practise within scope, conduct and document a proper patient assessment to ensure that treatments provided were medically necessary, verify that treatment and financial records were being properly maintained at the clinic, and ensure that business practices, including billing, met the standards of the profession. He admits that he breached these obligations.

[12] He also admits that the deficiencies in record keeping effectively preclude a complete documentary review of the appropriateness of his treatments and frustrate the College's oversight role in conducting an objective, document-based review of patient management.

[13] The College's Fees, Billing, and Accounts guideline makes clear that registrants are accountable for the billing practices of the clinics where they work:

Members are required to comply with their professional and statutory obligations with respect to fees, billings and accounts regardless of particular employment circumstances or contractual arrangements with a clinic. It is incumbent upon every Member to understand their obligations and to also explain those obligations to their employers and to clinic owners.

...

Members are accountable for any fees, billings or accounts that use their name or registration number and/or are issued or charged for services or treatments rendered by the Member. All Members must be aware of how their name and registration number are being used and to involve themselves and be knowledgeable of the billing practices of the clinic. Members are also required to ensure

that appropriate records are created and maintained, as required by COCOCO standards, regulations, and this guideline.

[14] The Records Standard sets out similar obligations.

In other words, there is a legal onus on every Member to both make and maintain records in their practice and that obligation exists regardless of the Member's particular employment circumstances or arrangement with a clinic. To be clear, these statutory record keeping obligations apply to all Members regardless of the individual clinical circumstances. Consequently, it is incumbent upon every Member to understand their obligations and to explain those obligations to their employers and to clinic owners.

[15] As the Tribunal explained in *College of Chiropractors of Ontario v. McKenzie*, 2025 ONCPDT 11 at para. 25:

As with records, registrants cannot simply leave fees, billings and accounts to their employer or clinic. As registrants of a regulated profession, chiropractors and podiatrists must take all reasonable steps to ensure that their name and privilege of registration are not misused by others with whom they work. Among other things, they must have a process for routinely reviewing the fees, billings and accounts issued in their name. They cannot take a hands-off approach to administrative matters.

[16] What is more, the registrant's failings were not limited to a failure to monitor or verify the work of others. His records did not contain details of his findings, diagnoses, assessments or treatment plans. They did not even record what shoes he prescribed, let alone the medical necessity for the shoes.

[17] As noted in *College of Chiropractors of Ontario v. Chan*, 2025 ONCPDT 5 at para. 5, "When they identify themselves as registrants of this College, chiropractors and podiatrists are representing that they are applying their training, expertise, and the College's practice standards." When a chiropractor or podiatrist prescribes footwear, it must be medically necessary and meet the other requirements in the Prescription Footwear Standard. It is equally important that medical necessity be documented in accordance with the Records Standard. Each time a registrant does not meet professional standards or document their professional work, they reduce the public and insurers' confidence in the chiropractic and podiatry professions as a whole.

[18] In addition, Mr. Tabrizi has admitted that he signed or issued a false or misleading document (the paper claims). We note that this does not require that the registrant intended to mislead: *College of Chiropodists of Ontario v. Scotti*, 2026 ONCPDT 3 at para. 14. He has also admitted that in failing to ensure and document the medical necessity of devices, he practised in a conflict of interest.

[19] The registrant committed the following misconduct under s. 1 of Ontario Regulation 750/93 under the *Chiropody Act, 1991*, SO 1991, c. 20:

- failing to meet or contravening standards of practice of the profession, including but not limited to the College standards pertaining to Assessment and Management, Patient Relations, Records, Prescription Footwear, and Prescription Custom Foot Orthoses (para. 2);
- practising the profession while in a conflict of interest (para. 10);
- failing to keep records as required by the regulations (para. 17);
- signing or issuing, in the member's professional capacity, a document that contains a false or misleading statement (para. 20);
- contravening the *Chiropody Act, 1991*, the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, or the regulations under either of those Acts: specifically, Ontario Regulation 203/94 under the *Chiropody Act, 1991*, Part III (Records) (para. 30); and
- 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 registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable, or unprofessional (para. 33).

Penalty

[20] The main components of the jointly proposed penalty are:

- a six-month suspension, of which two months will be remitted (will not need to be served) if the registrant completes the remedial work within the first four months;

- completion of the University of Toronto record-keeping course and the PROBE Ethics & Boundaries Course;
- a six-month prohibition on imaging, casting, prescribing, constructing, fitting, dispensing and/or ordering orthopedic shoes;
- supervision by a mentor for 18 months;
- a requirement that, for the next 18 months, he provide any employers detailed information about this case; and
- a reprimand.

[21] The College and the registrant's agreement on penalty must be implemented unless it is so "unhinged from the circumstances" that implementing it would bring the administration of the College's professional discipline system into disrepute: *Bradley v. Ontario College of Teachers*, 2021 ONSC 2303 (Div. Ct.) at paras. 9–12; *Ontario College of Teachers v. Merolle*, 2023 ONSC 3453 (Div. Ct.). The test is adapted from the Supreme Court's analysis in the criminal law context in *R. v. Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43.

[22] There must be something completely unacceptable, unusual or unconscionable to reject a joint submission, not just the panel's disagreement or belief that a different outcome would better serve the public interest or be a more fit penalty. The Tribunal may not "tinker" with a joint submission, which is the result of a careful balancing by the parties of the relevant considerations. It should take the joint submission "as is" and proceed on the basis that any aspects of penalty that were not included were intentionally excluded.

[23] The most important goal of a penalty order is protection of the public. The public must have confidence in the registrant, the profession and the College's ability to govern the professions of chiropody and podiatry in the public interest. Other principles support this goal: discouraging the registrant and others from committing misconduct (specific and general deterrence), rehabilitating the registrant, ensuring a safe return to practice where appropriate and expressing the Tribunal and the profession's disapproval of the misconduct. See *College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario v. Fagbemigun*, 2022 ONPSDT 22 at paras. 7–8.

[24] Four broad groups of factors are applied in analyzing penalty: the seriousness of the misconduct, any discipline history, the registrant's actions since the misconduct and the personal circumstances of the registrant.

[25] Mr. Tabrizi committed two serious types of misconduct. He failed to monitor billings in his name, and the records he kept of his own work were sorely lacking. The consequences were significant. A large amount of money was improperly charged to the insurance company, and because of the state of the records, the College could not properly carry out its public protection function.

[26] In terms of his actions since the misconduct, most significant is that when he learned of the insurer's concerns, he stopped practising at the clinic and resigned as an officer and director.

[27] The parties relied on *McKenzie* and *Chan*, both of which resulted in four-month suspensions after remission, to show that the joint submission is within the range of other comparable cases. We agree that they demonstrate the appropriateness of the penalty.

[28] In *Chan*, the registrant failed to conduct adequate assessments before prescribing orthotics and failed to keep proper records. In *McKenzie*, the registrant's misconduct included failing to monitor billings (which resulted in false claims), failing to ensure that a clinic maintained patient records correctly, failing to conduct and/or document assessments before prescribing orthotics, and failing to dispense orthotics she had prescribed. She also signed receipts indicating she had dispensed the orthotics when this was not true.

[29] The parties have also agreed on costs of \$25,000, which is reasonable. We therefore accepted the joint submission.

Order

[30] We made the following order:

Penalty

1. The Tribunal requires the Registrant to appear before the panel to be reprimanded.
2. The Tribunal directs the Registrar to:

a. suspend the Registrant's certificate of registration for a period of six (6) months, commencing on the date of the hearing, two (2) months of which will be remitted upon the Registrant successfully completing, to the Registrar's satisfaction, the remedial work outlined below.

b. place the following terms, conditions and limitations on the Registrant's certificate of registration requiring the following:

i. Before returning to practice, the Registrant shall successfully complete the University of Toronto Medical Record Keeping Course and the PROBE Ethics Course at his own expense and provide documentary evidence of his completion of those remedial steps to the satisfaction of the Registrar.

ii. For certainty, the Registrant is required to successfully complete the courses in paragraph 2(b)(i) regardless of whether the two months of his suspension are remitted, and the Registrant will not be permitted to return to practice until he successfully completes the courses.

iii. Upon returning to practice after his suspension, the Registrant is prohibited from imaging, casting, prescribing, constructing, fitting, dispensing and/or ordering orthopaedic shoes for a period of six (6) months (the "Restricted Period"). The Registrant is additionally not entitled to assign these duties to anyone else in his clinic, regardless of whether he receives a fee, during the Restricted Period, but shall refer such duties to another registrant of the College in good standing at another clinic not affiliated with the Registrant's clinic.

iv. At his own expense, the Registrant will receive supervision of his chiropody practice with a mentor selected by the Registrar for a period of eighteen (18) months from the date the Registrant returns to practice from the suspension. The terms of the mentorship are as follows:

- The mentor shall visit with the Registrant on at least four (4) occasions – twice in the first nine months and twice in the last nine months;
- The visits with the mentor will be as directed by the mentor;
- The mentor shall determine the length of each visit;
- In conducting the supervision, the mentor shall

discuss practice management, record-keeping, ethical practice, and compliance with the College's standards with the Registrant, and the Registrant is required to fully cooperate with the supervision;

- The mentor shall prepare a report to the Registrar after the second visit and the last visit with the Registrant;
- The Registrant shall provide the mentor with the Tribunal's decision and then provide written confirmation to the Registrar, signed by the mentor, that the mentor has received and reviewed the final decision;

v. In the event that the Registrant obtains employment to provide chiropody services during the eighteen (18) months following the Registrant's return to practice after his suspension, the Registrant shall notify the Registrar of the name, address and telephone number of any employer within fifteen (15) days of commencing employment. The Registrant shall further provide the employer with copies of the Tribunal's Decision and Order, the Notice of Hearing, the Agreed Statement of Facts and the Joint Submission on Penalty and ensure the employer forwards written confirmation to the Registrar within fifteen (15) days confirming receipt of these documents and agreeing to notify the Registrar immediately if the employer becomes aware the Registrant is not complying with the College's standards.

4. The Tribunal's decision will be published, in detail with the Registrant's name, in the College's official publications, on the College's website, on the College's public register and/or on CanLII.

Costs

5. The Tribunal requires the Registrant to pay the College costs in the amount of \$25,000.00 on the date of the hearing.

ONTARIO CHIROPODISTS AND PODIATRISTS DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL

Tribunal File No.: 25-004-CP

BETWEEN:

College of Chiropractors of Ontario

College

- and -

Ali Tabrizi

Registrant

**The Tribunal delivered the following Reprimand
by videoconference on Wednesday, May 28, 2025.**

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

Mr Tabrizi,

as part of its penalty order, this panel has ordered that you 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 have found that you have committed multiple forms of professional misconduct while practising at Physiomed Yorkdale and serving as an officer and director of the corporate entity that owns and runs that clinic.

An audit by GreenShield into claims made in your name showed numerous problems with record keeping. Some patient records were not available during the audit visit. Others were deficient, lacking important details such as a complete patient history, the medical necessity of the treatments, clinical findings, diagnosis, assessments, and treatment plans. Patient records were lacking prescriptions for devices and/or shoes. Some records indicated billing for one device but supplying another. Some indicate that you dispensed braces that are outside the scope of chiropractic. Finally, some records did not reflect a chiropractic visit at all.

You failed to fulfil your professional responsibilities to keep proper records, practise within scope, conduct and document a proper patient assessment to ensure that treatments were medically necessary, verify that treatment and financial records were being properly maintained at the clinic, and ensure that business practices, including billing, met the standards of the profession. It was your responsibility to make sure that the claims submitted in your name were accurate. Your lack of oversight of billing and poor record keeping concern us greatly.

You admitted and we have found that you engaged in professional misconduct in several ways, including by failing to meet several standards of practice of the profession, practising while in a conflict of interest, failing to keep records as required, and signing or issuing a document that contains a false or misleading statement. Your conduct was disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional.

You have been a registrant for over 10 years and we are concerned by the extent of the professional misconduct that you have engaged in. Your choices negatively reflect on all chiropractors and podiatrists, affect the relationships that registrants have with insurance providers and have caused harm to the public.

You will have some time to reflect on how to better meet the required practice standards and other ethical obligations during your six-month suspension, which will be reduced to four months if you complete required course work promptly. For a further six months, your prescription and dispensing of orthopedic shoes will be restricted. We hope that after successfully completing the University of Toronto Record-Keeping Course and the PROBE Ethics course, and receiving supervision from a mentor, your care and judgement will improve.

We acknowledge that you discontinued your practice at the clinic and resigned as an officer and director when you became aware of the concerns, and that you have admitted the misconduct. However, we want to be clear that your conduct is unacceptable and that should you appear before the Tribunal again, a more significant penalty will likely be imposed.