

INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE
of the
COLLEGE OF REGISTERED NURSES OF SASKATCHEWAN

-and-

Robert Wiley
Saskatchewan RN 0038895
[REDACTED]

PENALTY DECISION

of the

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

of the

COLLEGE OF REGISTERED NURSES OF SASKATCHEWAN

Legal Counsel for the Investigation Committee:	Lynsey Gaudin
Legal Counsel for Robert Wiley:	No appearance for Mr. Wiley
Legal Counsel for the Discipline Committee:	Brittnee Holliday
Chairperson for the Discipline Committee:	Anne Kokesch

Date of Hearing: **December 3, 2025**

Location: *Via Videoconference*
College of Registered Nurses of Saskatchewan
1-3710 Eastgate Drive
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4Z 1A5

Date of Decision: **January 28, 2026**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. By Decision dated September 4, 2025, the Discipline Committee of the College of Registered Nurses of Saskatchewan (“CRNS”) found Robert Wiley guilty of professional misconduct pursuant to sections 26(1) and 26(2)(l) and (q) of *The Registered Nurses Act, 1988* (the “Act”) and guilty of breaching certain provisions of CRNS Bylaws, 2023, the Code of Ethics for Registered Nurses (2017), the SRNA Registered Nurse Practice Standards (2019), and the SRNA Registered Nurse Entry-Level Competencies (2019). Those provisions and the Discipline Committee’s reasons are set out in the September 4, 2025 Decision.

2. To summarize, Mr. Wiley was found guilty of the following:

1. **You have committed an act of professional misconduct as per section 26(1) of *The Registered Nurses Act, 1988*, in that, while working for the Saskatchewan Health Authority as a Registered Nurse in [REDACTED], you:**
 - (a) **Sent text messages of a sexual nature to a client in or around April 2023 while they were under your care, including sending nude photographs of yourself and other individuals to them; and**
 - (b) **Sent unsolicited text messages of a sexual nature to a co-worker between in or around September to November 2022, including sending nude photographs of yourself; and**
 - (c) **Telephoned and sent text messages to same client in (a) in or around April 2023, including sending a text message of a threatening nature to the client on or around April 14, 2023, contrary to the Saskatchewan Health Authority’s direction and while you were placed on [REDACTED] for this client; and**
 - (d) **...**
 - (e) **Made sexual and inappropriate remarks during a discussion with your manager on or around June 12, 2023 and did so despite their request for you to end the conversation.**

3. The Discipline Committee is established pursuant to section 30 of the Act. Considering its findings of professional misconduct, the Discipline Committee reconvened on December 3, 2025, via videoconference, to hear submissions regarding penalty.

II. PENALTY HEARING

4. At paragraph 70 of its September 4, 2025 Decision, the Discipline Committee concluded that it would reconvene to hear submissions on penalty and that the Penalty Hearing would be scheduled “in consultation with Mr. Wiley, legal counsel, and the Discipline Committee as to availability.”

5. When the Penalty Hearing commenced, shortly after 9:00 a.m. on December 3, 2025, Mr. Wiley was not present. Legal counsel for the Investigation Committee advised it was the position of the Investigation Committee, pursuant to section 30(9) of the Act, that the Hearing should proceed in Mr. Wiley’s absence.

6. Section 30(9) of the Act states:

(9) Where the nurse who is the subject of the complaint fails to attend the hearing, the discipline committee may, on proof of service of the notice mentioned in subsection (1), proceed with the hearing in the absence of the nurse.

7. The Discipline Committee adjourned for 30 minutes to allow the Hearing Facilitator to make attempts to contact Mr. Wiley. The Hearing Facilitator reported three attempts to reach Mr. Wiley by telephone during the 30 minute adjournment, encouraging his attendance at the Penalty Hearing by leaving voicemails. When the Penalty Hearing reconvened shortly after 9:40 a.m., Mr. Wiley was not present and had not returned the telephone calls.

8. In support of its position that that the Penalty Hearing should proceed in the absence of Mr. Wiley, the Investigation Committee tendered the following document, which was accepted by the Discipline Committee and marked as Exhibit P-1:

- (a) Affidavit of Shirley Mandziak, legal assistant, sworn December 2, 2025 (Exhibit P-1).

9. Based on Exhibit P-1, the Discipline Committee has found the following material facts:

- (a) On October 7, 2025, the Hearing Facilitator wrote to Mr. Wiley with counsel for the Investigation Committee and the Discipline Committee copied. She advised that a Penalty Hearing was being scheduled and asked that Mr. Wiley confirm his availability for December 3, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. by no later than 11:30 a.m. on October 14, 2025;
- (b) On October 21, 2025, the Hearing Facilitator wrote to Mr. Wiley with counsel for the Investigation Committee and the Discipline Committee copied. She confirmed that the penalty hearing had been scheduled for December 3, 2025 at 9:00 a.m.;
- (c) On November 17, 2025, counsel for the Investigation Committee sent an email to Mr. Wiley attaching a November 17, 2025 letter and the September 4, 2025 Decision of the Discipline Committee. The November 17, 2025 letter noted attempts by the Hearing Facilitator to engage with Mr. Wiley regarding his availability to attend the sanction portion of the Hearing, encouraging Mr. Wiley's attendance at the scheduled Penalty Hearing, and advising that the Investigation Committee intended to proceed with the Penalty Hearing in Mr. Wiley's absence;
- (d) On behalf of the Investigation Committee, arrangements were made to send the November 17, 2025 letter and the September 4, 2025 Decision to Mr. Wiley via registered mail. Notice was received that the letter was delivered on November 20, 2025;
- (e) On November 24, 2025, the Hearing Facilitator again wrote to Mr. Wiley by email advising the Penalty Hearing would proceed on December 3, 2025, seeking confirmation of his attendance and a telephone number to reach him at, providing the

necessary information and instructions for the Penalty Hearing, and including a number to reach the Hearing Facilitator should he have any difficulties connecting to the Hearing.

10. Based on the above findings of fact, the Discipline Committee is satisfied that Mr. Wiley was provided with an opportunity to engage regarding his availability for the Penalty Hearing and, when he failed to do so, he was properly notified of the date, time, and place of the Penalty Hearing by the Hearing Facilitator and counsel for the Investigation Committee, through both email and registered mail. At the direction of the Discipline Committee, additional attempts were made to reach Mr. Wiley by telephone during the morning of December 3, 2025 to encourage his attendance.

11. The Discipline Committee finds that Mr. Wiley had appropriate notice of continuation of this matter to sanction and, similar to the liability portion of this Hearing, Mr. Wiley has chosen not to engage or attend.

12. Being satisfied that Mr. Wiley was properly notified of the Penalty Hearing, including the date, time, and place of the hearing in accordance with section 30(1) of the Act, and considering the evidence in Exhibit P-1, the Discipline Committee concluded that the Penalty Hearing would proceed in Mr. Wiley's absence.

13. The Penalty Hearing then proceeded with the Investigation Committee's submissions on the appropriate sanction(s) for the findings of professional misconduct.

14. Counsel for the Investigation Committee filed a Brief of Law on behalf of the Investigation Committee respecting Sanction and a Book of Authorities on behalf of the Investigation Committee. The following were also marked as Exhibits:

- (a) Document outlining Costs of the proceedings (Exhibit P-2); and,
- (b) Draft Order (Exhibit P-3)

III. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

15. Section 31 of the Act sets out the Discipline Committee's powers during the Penalty phase of the disciplinary process:

31(1) Where the discipline committee finds a nurse guilty of professional incompetence or professional misconduct, it may:

- (a) order that the nurse be expelled from the college and that the nurse's name be struck from the register;**
- (b) order that the nurse be suspended from the association for a specified period;**
- (c) order that the nurse may continue to practise only under conditions specified in the order which may include, but are not restricted to, an order that the nurse:
 - (i) not do specified types of work;**
 - (ii) successfully complete specified classes or courses of instruction;**
 - (iii) obtain treatment, counselling or both;****
- (d) reprimand the nurse; or**
- (e) make any other order that to it seems just.**

(2) In addition to any order made pursuant to subsection (1), the discipline committee may order:

- (a) that the nurse pay to the college within a fixed period:
 - (i) a fine in a specified amount;**
 - (ii) the costs of the inquiry and hearing into the nurse's conduct and related costs, including the expenses of the investigation committee and the discipline committee; or**
 - (iii) both of the things mentioned in subclauses (i) and (ii); and****
- (b) where a nurse fails to make payment in accordance with an order pursuant to clause (a), that the nurse be suspended from the college.**

IV. INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE'S POSITION ON PENALTY AND COSTS

16. The Investigation Committee argued that the following Order would be appropriate regarding the findings of professional misconduct against Mr. Wiley:

- (a) Pursuant to section 31(1)(d) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall receive a written reprimand.**

- (b) Pursuant to section 31(1)(b) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall be suspended from the College of Registered Nurses of Saskatchewan for a period of one year, effective the date of the Discipline Order.
- (c) Pursuant to section 31(1)(c) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall complete one of the following remedial coursework and education options at his own cost and provide proof of his completion to the CRNS Registrar or designate prior to his return to practice:
 - i. PBI Education: Professional Boundaries course (PB-24); or
 - ii. Center for Personalized Education for Professionals (CPEP): PROBE: Ethics & Boundaries Program – Canada.
- (d) Pursuant to section 31(1)(e) of the Act, Mr. Wiley, if occupying a nursing position, shall notify his employer(s) of these complaints and of the Discipline Decision and Decision respecting sanction, for a period of two years upon the completion of the suspension set out at paragraph 2.
- (e) Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall pay costs of the investigation and discipline proceedings, fixed in the amount of \$35,000.00.
- (f) Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii) and 31(2)(b) of the Act, the costs shall be paid within three years of the date of the Discipline Order. Failure to pay the costs within the time set by the Discipline Committee shall result in the immediate suspension of Mr. Wiley's license until payment is made in full pursuant to section 31(2)(b) of the Act.

17. The Discipline Committee appreciates the Brief of Law and Authorities provided by counsel for the Investigation Committee, along with counsel's oral submissions that highlighted the general principles regarding sanctions for professional misconduct and an in-

depth analysis of the relevant factors to consider when determining sanction with reference to penalties imposed for similar acts of professional misconduct.

V. ANALYSIS

Sanction

18. Several factors are considered when determining an appropriate sanction for a professional. While the list is not intended to be exhaustive, a frequently cited list of factors established by case law can be found in the decision of *Jaswal v Medical Board (Newfoundland)*¹, [“*Jaswal*”], at paragraph 35:

1. **the nature and gravity of the proven allegations**
2. **the age and experience of the offending physician**
3. **the previous character of the physician and in particular the presence or absence of any prior complaints or convictions**
4. **the age and mental condition of the offended patient**
5. **the number of times the offence was proven to have occurred**
6. **the role of the physician in acknowledging what had occurred**
7. **whether the offending physician had already suffered other serious financial or other penalties as a result of the allegations having been made**
8. **the impact of the incident on the offended patient**
9. **the presence or absence of any mitigating circumstances**
10. **the need to promote specific and general deterrence and, thereby, to protect the public and ensure the safe and proper practice of medicine**
11. **the need to maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the medical profession**
12. **the degree to which the offensive conduct that was found to have occurred was clearly regarded, by consensus, as being the type of conduct that would fall outside the range of permitted conduct**
13. **the range of sentence in other similar cases**

19. In *Camgoz v College of Physicians and Surgeons (Sask.)*², the Court of Queen’s Bench, as it then was, also outlined the *Jaswal* factors as factors to consider when determining penalty. The Court specifically noted that the list is not exhaustive and not each specified factor will be relevant in every instance. As such, the factors need to be considered in relation to the specific facts of each case.

¹ 1996 CanLII 11630 (NL SC), 138 Nfld & PEIR 181

² 1993 CanLII 8952, 114 Sask R 161

20. The Discipline Decision set out the in-depth findings of professional misconduct. By way of summary, the Discipline Committee found that Mr. Wiley sent text messages of a sexual nature to a client while she was under his care, including sending nude photographs of himself and others, sent text messages of a sexual nature to a co-worker, including nude photographs of himself, telephoned and sent text messages to a client, including a text of a threatening nature, contrary to the direction of his employer and while placed on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for the client, and made sexual and inappropriate remarks during a discussion with his manager, after being previously disciplined for the professional boundaries issues with the client and co-worker.

21. The Discipline Committee reviewed the *Jaswal* factors and found the following relevant when determining penalty.

22. Sexual and/or threatening conversations with patients and unwanted sexual advances toward colleagues fundamentally breach the core expectations of the nursing profession. Maintaining clear professional boundaries is essential to foster a safe and therapeutic environment for patients. Similarly, engaging in unsolicited and unwanted sexual discussions with colleagues creates a hostile work environment that impacts team dynamics and collaboration. Although not the most egregious example one could think of when considering sexual misconduct, Mr. Wiley did not maintain appropriate professional boundaries and his threatening conduct amounted to abuse of a patient. Maintaining professional boundaries is essential to ensure the trust and safety of patients and colleagues, as well as the integrity of the profession.

23. Also relevant to the nature and gravity of Mr. Wiley's offences and which the Discipline Committee also considers aggravating factors is that the conduct occurred over a lengthy period of time, Mr. Wiley directly defied direction of his employer not to have further contact with the patient prior to the threatening text messages and numerous telephone calls, and Mr. Wiley continued to engage in discussions of a sexual nature the day after returning from a suspension specifically related to that same type of conduct.

24. As outlined above, Mr. Wiley's unwanted sexual and inappropriate communications spanned over a period with a patient and colleagues and continued after being disciplined for the same. While his actions were not the most serious sexual misconduct, his lengthy misconduct over many months impacted both patient and coworkers and was not isolated behaviour.

25. The Discipline Committee has also considered Mr. Wiley's failure to participate in these proceedings past the initial investigation despite being aware of all steps. The Discipline Committee finds Mr. Wiley showed disregard for the process, refusing to communicate with the Hearing Facilitator, referring to the proceedings as a "Kangaroo Court" and ultimately advising that he would not participate in the disciplinary proceedings despite some prior indications that he would.

26. The only mitigating factor before the Disciplinary Committee was that prior to these proceedings, Mr. Wiley had no CRNS disciplinary history. No evidence was presented by Mr. Wiley.

27. There is no question that Mr. Wiley's conduct and behaviour fell far outside what is expected of a nurse and such conduct is deserving of a significant penalty that promotes specific and general deterrence to protect the public and ensure safe and proper practice of nursing, as well as to maintain the public's confidence in the nursing profession.

28. General deterrence focuses on deterring society generally from engaging in similar misconduct by imposing public penalties on those found guilty of professional misconduct. Specific deterrence focuses on preventing the individual who committed professional misconduct from reoffending. Both aspects are necessary to protect the public and promote public confidence in the profession.

29. Rehabilitation is an important consideration within specific deterrence and sentencing principles generally. It is important to ensure Mr. Wiley respects boundaries when practicing going forward. The Discipline Committee agrees that the educational component regarding ethics and boundaries is appropriate in this case.

30. Reprimands are also appropriate where there has been a finding of misconduct and a written reprimand supports both specific and general deterrence. A written reprimand deters individuals who have engaged in professional misconduct from committing similar actions in the future and deters other members of the profession by outlining and admonishing the professional misconduct at issue. The Discipline Committee finds a written reprimand is warranted in this case.

31. Given Mr. Wiley's failure to maintain professional boundaries, it is also in the public interest for future employers to be made aware of these findings, to ensure future employers institute the necessary oversight to protect the public and employees. As is customary, a copy of this Penalty Decision will be shared with all Canadian Registrars of registered nurses.

32. Regarding suspension, the Discipline Committee has found that Mr. Wiley's misconduct disregarded the fundamental obligations he owed to a patient and reflected a serious failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. In such circumstances, the Discipline Committee concludes that a suspension is warranted.

33. A suspension is justified when considering sanctions imposed on health professionals in other similar circumstances. The Discipline Committee found the following cases with similar circumstances most helpful in considering the appropriate length of suspension for Mr. Wiley:

Saskatchewan Registered Nurses v Gonzales (December 5, 2017): The nurse sexually harassed colleagues and inappropriately engaged in communications of a sexual nature with colleagues under his charge. Patients or clients were not included in this misconduct, as is the case for Mr. Wiley. The nurse entered a guilty plea, taking responsibility for the misconduct and cooperated with the Investigation Committee to come to an agreed statement of fact and joint submission on penalty. The penalty included a six month suspension, an educational component, a return to work plan.

College of Nurses of Ontario v O'Handley (2023 CanLII 138091 (ON CNO)): The nurse engaged in inappropriate sexual behaviour and made remarks of a

sexual nature toward a patient while admitted to hospital and after discharge. Colleagues were not included in this misconduct. The nurse entered a guilty plea, taking responsibility for the misconduct, and cooperated in coming to an agreed statement of fact and joint submission on penalty. The penalty consisted of a five month suspension, reprimand, meetings with the Regulator with an educational component, inability to engage in independent practice for 12 months, and to inform his employer of the penalty decision.

College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario v Phipps (2018 ONCPSD 48 (CanLII)): A physician sexually harassed patients by sharing nude photos of himself with patients and coworkers, including touching a patient inappropriately. The physician contested the proceedings and also did not agree on sanction. Several mitigating factors were considered in the penalty that are not present in Mr. Wiley's circumstances. The penalty was 14 month suspension, public reprimand, payment of patient therapy, ongoing monitoring of all professional encounters with patients, and ongoing psychiatric treatment and monitoring with reporting back to the regulatory body.

Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Hayden (2019 ONCSWSSW 10): The social worker made sexual remarks and engaged in appropriate text messaging with a client. The social worker also requested the client send photographs of herself and when she did not oblige, refused to contact the client's physician. The social worker was placed on a leave of absence and told not to contact the client but continued to do so. The social worker did not attend the disciplinary proceedings. The penalty was a written reprimand, revocation of the member's certificate of registration without the ability to reapply for five years, and publication of the findings.

34. As outlined above, the Discipline Committee has determined that a suspension is warranted. On review of the proceeding cases, the Discipline Committee has determined that a suspension of 12 months falls within the range of similar cases and is appropriate.

35. In addition to the penalties submitted by the Investigation Committee, the Discipline Committee considered conditions for Mr. Wiley's return to practice. In light of the serious findings of professional misconduct, the Discipline Committee is of the opinion that if Mr. Wiley returns to the practice of nursing in Saskatchewan, public protection warrants supervision of Mr. Wiley's practice for a period of time. The Discipline Committee reviewed previous cases of repeated and lengthy similar professional misconduct, as in *Gonzales*, and found that it would also be appropriate to include additional conditions to ensure protection of the public and ensure safe nursing practice. Such conditions will include periods of direct and indirect supervision by a registered nurse, an inability to engage in individual practice, and employer performance reviews submitted to the Registrar so Mr. Wiley's progress can be monitored.

36. Overall, the Discipline Committee finds the proposed penalty by the Investigation Committee is appropriate given the misconduct, with the addition of practice conditions should Mr. Wiley return to nursing in Saskatchewan.

Costs

37. Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, the Discipline Committee is permitted to order a member to pay the costs of the investigation and hearing into their conduct. The Investigation Committee has estimated in Exhibit P-2 that the total approximate costs of this professional discipline proceeding will be \$106,045.05.

38. In *Abrametz 2018*, the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal concluded that costs are discretionary, noting such discretion should be exercised judicially³, and that the purpose of costs is to ensure the sanctioned member bears the costs of disciplinary proceedings and not the membership as a whole⁴. Additionally, the Court noted a list of non-exhaustive factors⁵ identified by Nova Scotia Court of Appeal in *Hills v Nova Scotia (Provincial Dental Board)*⁶;

³ *Abrametz 2018*, at paragraph 43

⁴ *Abrametz 2018*, at paragraphs 44 and 45

⁵ *Abrametz 2018*, at paragraph 48

⁶ 2009 NSCA 13

- a. The balance between the effect of a cost award on the Appellant and the need for the [regulator] to be able to effectively administer the disciplinary process;**
- b. The respective degrees of success of the parties;**
- c. Costs awards ought not to be punitive;**
- d. The other sanctions imposed and the expenses associated therewith;**
- e. The relative time and expense of the investigation and hearing associated with each of the charges and in particular those on which guilt were entered and those where the Appellant was found not guilty.**

39. The Discipline Committee is also aware of the recent Alberta Court of Appeal decision in *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*⁷, which provided new factors to consider regarding costs orders, setting out the types of costs that would be appropriately borne by a member of a regulated profession, and removing any link between the seriousness of the charges and the amount of the costs award.

40. This Discipline Committee has concluded that it is not bound by the *Charkhandeh* decision and that this case remains one in which it would be appropriate for Mr. Wiley to bear a significant portion of costs. The Alberta Court of Appeal's approach in *Charkhandeh* is inconsistent with the analysis of costs undertaken by most Canadian courts, including in the recent decision in *Moore v College of Chiropractors*⁸. In *Moore*, the Ontario Superior Court maintained that it is reasonable to impose costs on a regulated professional as a way to prevent the profession from bearing the expense of disciplinary proceedings and that the overall costs order must be proportionate.

41. With these principles in mind, the focus is on what is an appropriate costs order in these circumstances. Costs are not intended to fully indemnify the regulatory body and the Discipline Committee must balance the effects of the costs order and the need of the regulatory body to effectively administer the discipline process. The costs order must be proportionate.

42. The Investigation Committee has submitted that Mr. Wiley should pay around one third of the actual costs. The overall costs of the investigation and discipline proceedings are significant, estimated at \$106,045.05. The Investigation legal fees were substantial but not

⁷ 2025 ABCA 258

⁸ 2025 ONSC 6190

itemized. Rationale for increased costs included Mr. Wiley's lack of cooperation, preparing witnesses in a sensitive case and then also preparing Affidavit evidence to avoid the witnesses from having to testify orally when Mr. Wiley chose not to participate, and repeated communication efforts with Mr. Wiley. Mr. Wiley's own conduct through the disciplinary process is found to have substantially increased the costs.

43. Similarly, Mr. Wiley did not participate in this hearing such that, unlike in many disciplinary matters, there was no cooperation or participation from Mr. Wiley that could be found to have reduced the associated costs and/or that should be accounted for when determining what costs are appropriate.

44. Mr. Wiley did not adduce any evidence of his personal circumstances or of any financial consideration that would establish he cannot pay such costs, however, it can be adduced that his employment was impacted by his conduct as Mr. Wiley received two suspensions from his employer in relation to this misconduct and is no longer employed by that employer.

45. Mr. Wiley was found guilty of 4 of the 5 counts of professional misconduct against him. Mr. Wiley was found not guilty on one count. While this is a factor to consider, it was properly noted by counsel for the Investigation Committee that when the evidence and argument respecting the count on which Mr. Wiley was found not guilty is considered, the focus of the hearing was on the four counts that Mr. Wiley was found guilty.

46. In consideration of the above, the Discipline Committee has found that an order for Mr. Wiley to pay \$35,000.00 in costs is reasonable and proportional. Such costs Order balances having the member bear a portion of the costs of the discipline proceedings, rather than the collective membership of CRNS, is not punitive, and would not prevent a member from defending themselves.

VI. ORDER

47. In light of the above conclusions, the Discipline Committee makes the following Order pursuant to section 31 of the Act:

1. Pursuant to section 31(1)(d) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall receive a written reprimand to be posted on the CRNS website;
2. Pursuant to section 31(1)(b) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall be suspended from the College of Registered Nurses of Saskatchewan for a period of one year, effective the date of the Discipline Order;
3. Pursuant to section 31(1)(c) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall complete one of the following remedial coursework and education options at his own cost. He shall meet with the CRNS Registrar or designate to discuss his learnings and provide proof of his completion prior to his return to practice:
 - (a) PBI Education: Professional Boundaries course (PB-24); or
 - (b) Center for Personalized Education for Professionals (CPEP): PROBE: Ethics & Boundaries Program – Canada.
4. Pursuant to section 31(1)(e) of the Act, Mr. Wiley, if occupying a nursing position, shall notify his employer(s) of the Discipline Decision and Decision respecting sanction, for a period of two years upon the completion of the suspension set out at paragraph two.
5. Pursuant to section 31(1) of the Act and following completion of the suspension period, should Mr. Wiley return to the practice of registered nursing in Saskatchewan, he may only do so subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) The first 480 hours of actual worked hours of nursing practice shall be under the direct supervision of a registered nurse.
 - (b) The next 1520 hours of actual worked hours of nursing practice shall be under the indirect supervision of a registered nurse.
 - (c) For two years following completion of the suspension, Mr. Wiley may not engage in any independent practice of registered nursing such as home care or community nursing.

- (d) Mr. Wiley shall arrange to have his employer file four written performance reviews to the Registrar in a format provided by the Registrar.
6. Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, Mr. Wiley shall pay costs of the investigation and discipline proceedings, fixed in the amount of \$35,000.00.
7. Pursuant to section 31(2)(a)(ii) and 31(2)(b) of the Act, the costs shall be paid within three years of the date of the Discipline Order. Failure to pay the costs within the time set by the Discipline Committee shall result in the immediate suspension of Mr. Wiley's license until payment is made in full pursuant to section 31(2)(b) of the Act.

January 28, 2026



Anne KoKesch, Chairperson
On behalf of Members of the Discipline Committee
Christine Barlow
Kristin Dutchak
Leonard Wegner
Leah Currie

Pursuant to section 31(1)(e) of the Act, a copy of this decision will also be forwarded to:

- (a) The editor of the CRNS news bulletin and the administrator for the CRNS website;
- (b) All Canadian Registrars of registered nurses;
- (c) College of Licensed Practical Nurses of Saskatchewan;
- (d) College of Psychiatric Nurses Association of Saskatchewan;
- (e) The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan; and,
- (f) Any other jurisdictions or other stakeholders as may be seen as appropriate by the Registrar.

Right of Appeal

Pursuant to section 34(1) of *The Registered Nurses Act, 1988*, a nurse who has been found guilty by the discipline committee or who has been expelled pursuant to section 33 may appeal the decision or any order of the discipline committee within 30 days of the decision or order to:

- (a) the council by serving the executive director with a copy of the notice of appeal;
or
- (b) a judge of the court by serving the executive director with a copy of the notice of appeal and filing it with a local registrar of the court.