



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

APEGA members and permit holders are required to practise engineering and geoscience skillfully, ethically, and professionally. They must meet all prescribed requirements and follow all applicable legislation and regulations, such as the [Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act, General Regulation, Code of Ethics, and APEGA bylaws](#). Investigation and enforcement—followed by, when necessary, judgment based on a fair hearing of the facts—are requirements of ours in service to the public interest. For more information, please visit www.apega.ca/enforcement/discipline-decisions.

Date of Hearing: Written Submissions

Date of Decision: September 24, 2019

APEGA Discipline Case Number: 17-008-FH

**IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND GEOSCIENTISTS
OF ALBERTA**

Pursuant to the Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act,
being Chapter E-11 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000
Regarding the Conduct of MR. RICHARD BALLIANT, P.ENG. and
BAL-COMP ENGINEERING LTD.

Introduction

1. On January 8, 2019 the Hearing Panel of the Discipline Committee (“the Hearing Panel”) issued a written decision to the parties. The Hearing Panel found that two of the six allegations (Allegations 3 and 4) were proven against Mr. Balliant and constituted unprofessional conduct as set out below.

Allegation 3 - Mr. Balliant in his capacity as principal of Bal-Comp Engineering Ltd., failed to comply or take adequate steps to comply with an Order issued by Employment Standards, dated July 13, 2010, which required Bal-Comp Engineering Ltd. to pay an individual (“the Complainant”) the sum of \$41,461.61 to compensate the Complainant for outstanding wages, vacation pay, and termination pay owed to him by Bal-Comp Engineering Ltd..

Allegation 4 - On or about May 2011 to December 2015, Mr. Balliant failed to cooperate or to adequately cooperate with the investigation being conducted on behalf of the Investigative Committee, particulars of which include one or more of the following:

- i. Failed to provide a substantive written response to the complaint, despite requesting and being granted numerous extensions to provide a written response;
- ii. Failed to provide a copy of the Professional Practice Management Plan for



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

Bal-Comp Engineering Ltd., as requested; and

- iii. Failed to provide other papers, documents, or records in his possession related to the complaint, including but not limited to tax documentation.

IT IS FURTHER PROVEN that the above-referenced conduct constitutes unprofessional conduct as set out in section 44(1) of the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act*, and/or contravenes section 32.1 of the Bylaws, and/or contravenes one or more of Rules 3 and 5 of APEGA's *Code of Ethics*.

2. For the remaining allegations, the Hearing Panel found that Allegations 1 and 2 were not factually proven on a balance of probabilities and therefore did not constitute unprofessional conduct; the Hearing Panel agreed with the Investigative Committee's submissions at the hearing that Allegation 5 had not been factually proven on a balance of probabilities and therefore did not constitute unprofessional conduct. Allegation 6 was withdrawn by the Investigative Committee at the hearing on March 5, 2018.
3. The Hearing Panel directed that the parties advise Erum Afsar, APEGA Director of Enforcement, whether they wished to provide written submissions on possible orders or whether they wished to make their submissions at an oral hearing.
4. The parties elected to make written submissions.
5. Written submissions on sanctions from the Investigative Committee were received on March 15, 2019. No submissions on sanctions were provided by Mr. Balliant.
6. The following members of the Hearing Panel met on May 24, 2019 to consider the question of sanctions:

Ms. Wanda Goulden, P.Eng., P.Geo., Discipline Committee Panel Chair
Mr. Farhan Hanif, P.Eng., Discipline Committee Panel Member (via telephone)
Mr. John Nicoll, P.Eng., Discipline Committee Panel Member

Also present were Ms. Erum Afsar, P.Eng., APEGA Director of Enforcement and Ms. Aman Athwal, Independent Legal Counsel for the Hearing Panel of the APEGA Discipline Committee.

Written Submissions on Sanctions of the Investigative Committee

7. The Investigative Committee reviewed the findings of the Hearing Panel, the applicable legislation and the potential orders that could be made by the Hearing Panel. The



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

Investigative Committee advised that it was requesting that the Hearing Panel make the following orders under sections 63 and 64 of the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act* (the "EGP Act"):

- a) Mr. Balliant shall be reprimanded for his conduct and the Discipline Committee's written decision on sanction shall serve as the reprimand;
- b) Mr. Balliant shall provide evidence to the Director of Enforcement by no later than March 7, 2020, that he has successfully completed the National Professional Practice Exam. The course and exam will be undertaken at his own cost;
- c) The requirement in paragraph (b) shall be satisfied by Mr. Balliant complying with paragraph 39(b) of the Discipline Committee's Decision on Sanctions in APEGA Discipline Case Number 17-001-FH ("DC 17-001") dated February 26, 2019;
- d) Mr. Balliant shall pay a fine in the amount of \$2,500;
- e) Mr. Balliant shall pay \$7,500 with respect to the costs of the hearing;
- f) The fines and costs referred to in paragraphs (d) and (e) shall be payable as follows:
 - i. The fine and costs shall be paid in equal monthly installments over a period of 48 months;
 - ii. The first installment will be due within 60 days of the date that the Discipline Committee's decision on sanctions is served on Mr. Balliant; and
 - iii. When submitting his first payment, Mr. Balliant shall submit post-dated cheques for the remainder of the installments to the Director of Enforcement;
- g) Should Mr. Balliant require an extension to the deadline for the payments referred to above at paragraph (f), or should he wish to vary the payment schedule, he may apply to the Director of Enforcement for an extension or variation. If such an application is made, Mr. Balliant shall provide the Director of Enforcement with the reason for his request, his proposal to vary



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

the payment schedule, and any other documentation requested by the Director of Enforcement;

- h) The fine and costs referred to in paragraphs (d) and (e) above are a debt owing to APEGA;
- i) If Mr. Balliant fails to comply with the orders set out in paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) his registration will be suspended until he complies; and
- j) The Discipline Committee's Decision shall be published or circulated as follows:
 - i. A written summary of the decision shall be published in the PEG, in a manner that identifies Mr. Balliant; and
 - ii. If any member of the public inquires with APEGA as to whether Mr. Balliant was the subject of a discipline hearing or was found guilty of any charges under the *Engineering and Geosciences Professions Act*, APEGA shall be at liberty to provide a complete copy of the Discipline Committee's decision.

8. The Investigative Committee submitted that the fundamental purpose of sentencing in the professional regulatory context is to ensure that the public is protected from unprofessional conduct. The goal of protecting the public is achieved by ensuring the public is not at risk of harm as a result of continuing conduct by the member, by ensuring the public has confidence in the profession and by sending an appropriate message to other members of the profession through APEGA's response regarding conduct that is found to be unacceptable.

9. The Investigative Committee submitted that the orders it required were supported by consideration of the factors set out in the case of *Jaswal v Medical Board (Newfoundland)*, 1996 CanLII 11630 at paragraph 35 (NL SCTD), which sets out a list of factors that should be taken into account when determining the appropriate penalty. The factors noted by the Investigative Committee were:

- a) Nature and Gravity of the Proven Allegations

The Investigative Committee asserted that both proven charges arise from Mr. Balliant's failure to respond in situations where his professional obligations required



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

him to respond. This is serious professional misconduct.

Regardless of Mr. Balliant's personal and professional circumstances at the time, his lack of responsiveness was a serious breach of the requirements of integrity, honesty, fairness and objectivity under Rule of Conduct 3 and the duty to uphold the honour, dignity and reputation of the profession under the Rule of Conduct 5.

The Investigative Committee also pointed out that Mr. Balliant failed to be appropriately responsive to APEGA, his professional regulatory body. The duty to cooperate with one's regulator is a fundamental obligation for a member of a regulated profession.

Despite being given numerous extensions to provide information requested by the Investigative Committee, Mr. Balliant never provided a substantive response to the Complaint, or any of the papers, documents or records requested. Mr. Balliant's failure to cooperate during the investigation is extremely serious.

b) Age and Experience of Mr. Balliant

Senior members of a profession bear a higher professional obligation. This is not a case where the allegations have been made against a new member of the profession who is still learning how to exercise professional judgment. Mr. Balliant has been a registered member of APEGA since 1984.

c) Presence or Absence of Prior Complaints or Convictions

On July 23, 2018, a different Hearing Panel of the Discipline Committee found that Mr. Balliant had engaged in unprofessional conduct by practicing outside his scope of competence and improperly stamping and authenticating and submitting them to a regulatory authority ("DC 17-001 FH"). A decision on sanctions was issued for that matter on February 26, 2019.

Both of these matters were being investigated and heard around the same time. Therefore, this is not a case where a member has engaged in further professional misconduct after being found guilty of similar professional misconduct. Although the Hearing Panel should consider the findings in DC 17-001-FH, those findings should not be considered a significant aggravating factor in the present matter.

It is relevant, however, that Mr. Balliant is already required to complete the National Professional Practice Exam in the near future, as ordered in DC 17-001 FH, so there



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

is no need for him to do it twice.

Given the seriousness of Mr. Balliant's conduct in this matter, the Investigative Committee submitted that it is appropriate and necessary to impose a separate fine on Mr. Balliant.

d) Number of Times the Offence Occurred

The proven charges occurred with respect to two distinct sets of actions by Mr. Balliant (or inaction as the case may be). The first set of actions involved Employment Standards and the second set involved APEGA. In both cases, Mr. Balliant's lack of responsiveness continued over the course of several years.

e) Mr. Balliant's Role in Acknowledging What Occurred

The Investigative Committee submitted that this factor is neutral. During Mr. Balliant's testimony, he acknowledged that as a member of APEGA he has a duty to cooperate with an investigation and to respond to requests that are made of him. However, implicit in his testimony and submissions was the view that his personal and professional circumstances should excuse his failure to do so.

The Investigative Committee submitted that this factor should not be treated as mitigating; however, the Hearing Panel must be careful not to treat a failure to admit conduct or take responsibility as an aggravating factor in sentencing.

f) Whether Mr. Balliant Has Already Suffered Other Serious Financial or Other Penalties as a Result of the Allegations Having Been Made

The Investigative Committee accepted that Mr. Balliant and his company have encountered serious financial difficulties. However, the evidence does not show that these overarching financial difficulties arose as a result of the allegations having been made.

In the view of the Investigative Committee, a fine of \$2,500 is appropriate and necessary in this case to make clear to Mr. Balliant, the public, and the profession as a whole that financial pressures do not excuse a failure to uphold one's professional obligations.

g) Impact of the Incident on the Affected Persons



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

The Investigative Committee submitted that Mr. Balliant's conduct had a significant impact on the Complainant both in terms of not being able to work out a payment plan for the amount still owing to the Complainant under the Employment Standards Order, and in terms of the frustration that follows from a lack of responsiveness.

Mr. Balliant's failure to respond appropriately to the Investigative Committee negatively impacted the Investigative Committee's ability to conduct an efficient and thorough investigation into the Complaint.

h) Need to Promote Deterrence

The Investigative Committee submitted it was important to impose orders that would deter Mr. Balliant and other members of the profession from engaging in similar conduct in the future and that would send a message to the public.

Even in the face of difficult personal or professional circumstances, it is extremely important for professionals to be responsive to government agencies and their professional regulatory bodies. Public confidence in the integrity of the profession depends on it.

Given the nature of Mr. Balliant's evidence and his conduct, it is important for the Hearing Panel to impose orders that will deter him and other members of the profession from engaging in similar conduct in the future.

i) Need to Maintain the Public's Confidence in the Integrity of the Profession

The Investigative Committee submitted that ordering Mr. Balliant to pay a fine signals to the public that APEGA takes this kind of conduct very seriously.

j) Degree to Which the Conduct was Outside the Range of Permitted Conduct

Mr. Balliant's conduct was well outside the range of permitted conduct.

k) Range of Sentences in Similar Cases

The Investigative Committee noted that it while it was difficult to find cases that precisely parallel the proven misconduct, there were two cases that provided some basis for comparison of sanctions ordered in cases involving a member's failure to cooperate with APEGA. Those cases were that of *Ezeddin Shirif* (May 12, 2014) and *Craig J. Hogan* (May 16, 2012).



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

10. In conclusion, the Investigative Committee suggested that the proposed orders are intended to protect the public from similar conduct and are necessary to uphold the integrity of the profession in the eyes of the public. The required penalty reinforces the seriousness of Mr. Balliant's actions and will deter any such conduct in the future both from him and the members of APEGA. It also submitted that the orders sought reflect a proper consideration of the Jaswal factors and are appropriate in the circumstances.

11. On the issue of costs, the Investigative Committee asked for an order that Mr. Balliant pay \$7,500 of the hearing costs. The Investigative Committee submitted that the total anticipated costs are in the range of \$60,000. To support this request for costs, the Investigative Committee requested that the Hearing Panel consider the following factors:

a) Seriousness of the Charges:

The two proven charges reflect a serious failure by Mr. Balliant to uphold his professional obligations and there is no reason why the costs should be reduced on the nature of the charges.

b) Degree of Success in Resisting the Charges:

Mr. Balliant was successful in resisting two of the six charges advanced by the Investigative Committee. Since, Mr. Balliant was successful in resisting the charges, the Investigative Committee suggested that it would be inappropriate to require Mr. Balliant to pay 100% of the costs.

c) Necessity of Calling all of the Witnesses Who Gave Evidence or for Incurring Other Expenses Associated with the Hearing:

The Investigative Committee called two witnesses and both of their evidence was necessary. Mr. Balliant requested a last-minute adjournment which resulted in some thrown-away costs. Although the total costs of the hearing are significant, given the nature of the issue, the costs incurred are reasonable.

d) Whether Mr. Balliant Cooperated with Respect to the Investigation and Offered to Facilitate Proof by Admissions:

Mr. Balliant was deliberately non-responsive and failed to adequately cooperate during the investigation. Mr. Balliant did not offer to facilitate proof by admission, despite acknowledging during his testimony that he has a duty to cooperate with and



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

respond to APEGA in an investigation. As a result, the costs of the hearing were more significant than would have been the case had Mr. Balliant admitted the conduct. Accordingly, it is appropriate for Mr. Balliant to bear a portion of the costs of the hearing.

- e) Financial Circumstances of Mr. Balliant and the Degree to which his Financial Position Has Already Been Affected by Other Aspects of Any Penalty That Has Been Imposed:

In light of Mr. Balliant's financial position, and taking into account that the Investigative Committee is seeking a \$2,500 fine and that Mr. Balliant is subject to a costs order in DC 17-001, the Investigative Committee suggested that Mr. Balliant pay a portion of costs of this hearing in the sum of \$7,500. This amount constitutes 13% of the costs of the hearing and these costs could be payable over a period of 48 months.

12. The Investigative Committee submitted that the position of the Investigative Committee was consistent with the principles established by the Courts in relations to costs. The Courts have recognized that where a member of a profession is found guilty of unprofessional conduct, it is appropriate that the member bear the costs or a portion of the costs rather than requiring all other members to bear those costs that arose from the member's unprofessional conduct.

Submissions of Mr. Balliant

13. Mr. Balliant did not provide any written submissions on sanction to the Hearing Panel. He did, however, correspond with the Director of Enforcement about sanction submissions (as set out below) but in the end, did not provide any written submissions.
14. On March 29, 2019, Mr. Balliant was sent an email reminder of his deadline to provide written submissions. On April 1, 2019, Mr. Balliant emailed the Director of Enforcement stating that he would bring hard copies of his submissions the next morning, as they are too large to send via email. On April 3, 2019, Mr. Balliant emailed stating that he was unable to get out on April 2, 2019 and since this was a serious matter, he asked if he could have a meeting to discuss the contents of his written submissions before distribution.
15. On April 4, 2019, the Director of Enforcement sent an email to the parties confirming her in person discussion with Mr. Balliant. She indicated that Mr. Balliant said his submission package was not yet completed and he needed more time. The Director of Enforcement agreed to provide Mr. Balliant with an extension until April 9, 2019 and noted that at that time that no further extensions would be granted.



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

16. On April 9, 2019, Mr. Balliant emailed the Director of Enforcement stating that he was unable to finalize his documents due to an “extremely serious matter”. He wrote that he would forward his submissions the next day.
17. On April 12, 2019, Mr. Balliant emailed the Director of Enforcement indicating he was dealing with threats, had concerns with the lack of confidentiality of his submissions, submitted that the investigator was not fair or reasonable and requested a week extension to provide his written submissions. As per the Director of Enforcement’s email of April 4, 2019, no further extensions were granted. Mr. Balliant was informed of this on April 16, 2019. On April 23, 2019, Mr. Balliant emailed the Director of Enforcement informing her that he had had a theft, break-in and vandalism on April 19, 2019 and still wanted to meet to discuss a solution.
18. At no point did Mr. Balliant provide written submissions on sanction to the Hearing Panel before they convened on May 24, 2019.

Mr. Balliant’s Failure to Provide Written Submissions by the Deadline

19. At the outset of the hearing, the Hearing Panel considered whether to proceed with the hearing given Mr. Balliant’s failure to provide written submissions notwithstanding that he had indicated in his emails that he had hard copies of his submissions, but never provided them and then asked for another extension to provide written submissions.
20. The Hearing Panel reviewed the correspondence between Mr. Balliant and the Director of Enforcement and finds that Mr. Balliant’s correspondence is reflective of a pattern of behaviour that has been repeated since the start of this hearing. Mr. Balliant’s correspondence relating to the written submissions is similar to the conduct that the Hearing Panel observed in proven Allegations 3 and 4. There is a pattern of repeated delays and requests for extensions by Mr. Balliant. Mr. Balliant has a habit of refusing to recognize and accept the authority of APEGA, his professional regulatory body, and which is concerning for the Hearing Panel.
21. Mr. Balliant was given two weeks to respond to the Investigative Committee’s written submissions on sanction. Before his written submissions were due, Mr. Balliant was sent an email reminding him of his deadline to provide written submissions. On the day his submissions were due, he emailed stating that he would bring them in the following morning. Mr. Balliant never brought them in and instead asked for a meeting. The Director of Enforcement met with Mr. Balliant and provided him with an extension until April 9, 2019 and informed him that no further extensions would be granted. On the deadline date, Mr.



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

Balliant emailed stating that he was unable to finalize his documents and stated he would provide them the next day. No submissions were received by Mr. Balliant the next day.

22. On April 12, 2019 Mr. Balliant emailed and gave a number of reasons why he was not able to provide his submissions to the Director of Enforcement and requested a week extension to do so. This extension request was refused and Mr. Balliant was informed of same. On April 23, 2019 Mr. Balliant wrote an email asking for a meeting to discuss a solution.
23. The Hearing Panel finds that Mr. Balliant was given sufficient time to provide written submissions on sanction and failed to do so. As such, the Hearing Panel decided to proceed with the hearing.

Decision of the Hearing Panel on Sanctions and Costs

24. The proven allegations of unprofessional conduct are very serious, as they both arise from Mr. Balliant's failure to respond in two forums where his professional obligations required him to do so.
25. First, Mr. Balliant failed to comply or take adequate steps to comply with an Order issued by Employment Standards. Mr. Balliant represented himself as a Professional Engineer in his dealings with Employment Standards and should have taken more responsibility as a Professional Engineer for an employment matter that involved his company and a former employee. Mr. Balliant had an obligation to respond and take adequate steps to comply with the Order issued by Employment Standards.
26. Second, Mr. Balliant failed to adequately cooperate with the investigation that was being conducted on behalf of the Investigative Committee. Mr. Balliant never provided a substantive response to the complaint or provided any of the papers, documents or records requested in relation to the complaint.
27. A self-governing profession is founded on the principle that each member will be diligent and cooperative in engaging with their governing body. A member of a regulated profession cannot ignore their governing body. When a member acts in an ungovernable way, it impairs the profession's ability to regulate in the public interest and it harms the standing of the profession in the public eye. Such conduct also calls into question the willingness of the member to accept regulation from APEGA and shows a complete disregard for the authority of APEGA and other government bodies. Further, the ability of APEGA to investigate complaints is vital to the protection of the public and the integrity of the profession. The refusal of a member to cooperate with an investigation is unacceptable.



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

28. The Hearing Panel reviewed each of the sanctions sought on behalf of the Investigative Committee. Based on this very serious unprofessional conduct, the Hearing Panel agrees with all of the orders submitted by the Investigative Committee, subject to the Hearing Panel's revisions on the timing and method of payment of the fine and costs.

The Proposed Reprimand

29. The Hearing Panel finds that a reprimand is appropriate to denounce Mr. Balliant's failures to comply with his professional obligations and to deter similar conduct in the future by Mr. Balliant or by others in the profession.

National Professional Practice Exam

30. The Hearing Panel finds that it is appropriate that Mr. Balliant be directed to successfully complete the National Professional Practice Exam. Requiring Mr. Balliant to successfully complete the National Professional Practice Exam is a way of ensuring that Mr. Balliant can demonstrate his understanding of the required professional and ethical standards for a Professional Engineer.

The Proposed Fine

31. The Hearing Panel agrees that the requested fine of \$2,500 is appropriate to further confirm the serious and unacceptable nature of Mr. Balliant's conduct. Fines are punitive measures, so the fine will deter Mr. Balliant and others in the profession from similar types of conduct.
32. The Hearing Panel finds that the proposed fine of \$2,500 is appropriate in the circumstances and is not so large as to impose a significant financial burden on Mr. Balliant given his personal and professional circumstances.

Payment of Costs

33. The Hearing Panel accepts that Mr. Balliant is currently in a very difficult financial position and the Investigative Committee recognized the same in its submissions.
34. The Hearing Panel agrees that an order requiring Mr. Balliant to pay \$7,500, amounting to 13% of the costs of the hearing is fair, appropriate and reasonable in the circumstances. Although Mr. Balliant has financial difficulties, the investigation and the hearing in this matter arose because of Mr. Balliant's conduct. In these circumstances, where unprofessional conduct is established, the costs of the discipline process should be borne, at least in part, by the member whose conduct is at issue and not wholly by the members of the profession.



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

In this case, two of the six allegations were found to be proven and amounted to unprofessional conduct. Therefore, it is appropriate that Mr. Balliant bear a portion of the costs associated with the hearing.

Timing of Payment of the Fine and Costs

35. With respect to timing for Mr. Balliant to pay the fine and costs, the Hearing Panel has revised these orders in the interest of clarity for all parties and administrative efficiency.
36. The Hearing Panel notes that the total amount to be paid by Mr. Balliant to APEGA for the fine and costs is \$10,000. For simplicity, the Hearing Panel finds that in the circumstances, the \$10,000 amount should be split into two equal payments. The first payment of \$5,000 will be due on or before March 11, 2020 and the second payment of \$5,000 will be due on or before March 11, 2021.
37. This avoids Mr. Balliant having to complete and provide 48 post-dated cheques to the Director of Enforcement and the Director of Enforcement from having to manage 48 post dated cheques. This also provides Mr. Balliant with approximately six months before his first payment is due and a year a half until the second and final payment is due to APEGA.
38. The Hearing Panel also agrees that the fine and costs payable constitute a debt to APEGA.
39. The Hearing Panel agrees that if Mr. Balliant fails to comply with orders b, c, d, e and f, his registration will be suspended until he complies with the outstanding orders.

Publication of the Decision

40. The Hearing Panel has determined that this decision should be published and it should be published in a manner that identifies Mr. Balliant. Publication is important to protect the public interest. It is also important to make clear to the public and the profession that this conduct cannot be tolerated and to make the decision available to members of the public.

Conclusion

41. After considering the submissions of the parties on sanctions, the Hearing Panel makes the following orders as a result of its finding of unprofessional conduct in its decision of October 18, 2018:
 - a) Mr. Balliant shall be reprimanded for his conduct and the Discipline Committee's written decision on sanction shall serve as the reprimand;



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

- b) Mr. Balliant shall provide evidence to the Director of Enforcement by no later than March 7, 2020, that he has successfully completed the National Professional Practice Exam. The course and exam will be undertaken at his own cost;
- c) The requirement in paragraph (b) shall be satisfied by Mr. Balliant complying with paragraph 39(b) of the Discipline Committee's Decision on Sanctions in APEGA Discipline Case Number 17-001-FH ("DC 17-001") dated February 26, 2019;
- d) Mr. Balliant shall pay a fine in the amount of \$2,500;
- e) Mr. Balliant shall pay \$7,500 with respect to the costs of the hearing;
- f) The fines and costs referred to in paragraphs (d) and (e) shall be payable as follows:
 - i. The first payment of \$5,000 shall be paid to the Director of Enforcement on or before March 11, 2020; and
 - ii. The second and final payment of \$5,000 shall be paid to the Director of Enforcement on or before March 11, 2021.
- g) The fine and costs referred to in paragraphs (d) and (e) above are a debt owing to APEGA;
- h) If Mr. Balliant fails to comply with the orders set out in paragraphs b), c), d), e) or f) his registration will be suspended until he complies with the order;
- i) The Discipline Committee's Decision shall be published or circulated as follows:
 - i. A written summary of the decision shall be published in the PEG, in a manner that identifies Mr. Balliant; and
 - ii. If any member of the public inquires with APEGA as to whether Mr. Balliant was the subject of a discipline hearing or was found guilty of any charges under the Engineering and Geosciences Professions Act, APEGA shall be at liberty to provide a complete copy of the Discipline Committee's decision.



APEGA Discipline Committee Decision on Sanctions

Dated this 24 of September, 2019

On behalf of the Hearing Panel of the APEGA Discipline Committee

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "W. Goulden", written over a horizontal line.

Ms. Wanda Goulden, P.Eng., P. Geo.
Discipline Committee Panel Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Farhan Hanif", written over a horizontal line.

Mr. Farhan Hanif, P. Eng., Discipline
Committee Panel Member

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Nicoll", written over a horizontal line.

Mr. John Nicoll, P.Eng., Discipline
Committee Panel Member