

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGEONS OF
ONTARIO**

Citation: Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario v. Takvorian, 2026 ONRCDSO 11

Date: August 11, 2026

File No.: 24-0277

BETWEEN:

ROYAL COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGEONS OF ONTARIO
- and -
Dr. Vicken Takvorian
Registration No: 62905

FINDING REASONS

RESTRICTION ON PUBLICATION

In the matter of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario and Dr. Takvorian the Discipline Panel ordered, under ss 45(3) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, that no person shall publish or broadcast the identity of any patients of the Registrant, or any information that could disclose the identity of any patients who are named in the Notice of Hearing and/or any of the exhibits in this matter.

PANEL MEMBERS:

Judy Welikovitich, Public Member, Chair
Noha Gomaa, Professional Member
Rajiv Butany, Professional Member
Brian Smith, Public Member
Andrea Gonsalves, Subject Matter Expert

APPEARANCES:

Bernard LeBlanc and Carly Waisglass, College Counsel
Affran Ahmad and Hisham Shah, for Dr. Vicken Takvorian

Heard: May 29 and June 1, 2026, by video conference

REASONS FOR DECISION

- [1] This matter came on for a hearing before a Panel of the Discipline Committee of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario (the “**College**”) on May 29, 2026. The hearing proceeded over two days, concluding on June 1, 2026. The matter was heard on a contested basis via videoconference.

THE ALLEGATIONS

- [2] In a Notice of Hearing dated April 12, 2024 (Exhibit 1), the College alleged that Dr. Vicken Takvorian (the “**Registrant**” or “**Takvorian**”) committed professional misconduct

pursuant to section 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*¹ (the “**Code**”).

- [3] The single allegation and related particulars are as follows: it is alleged that during the years 2019 – 2021, Takvorian contravened section 2(59) of Ontario Regulation 853/93 under the *Dentistry Act, 1991*,² as amended (the “**Misconduct Regulation**”) in that he engaged in conduct or performed an act that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members of the profession as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical.
- [4] More particularly, the College alleged that Takvorian engaged in inappropriate, threatening, and aggressive conduct with staff in his office, including that:
- a. he used demeaning language and called office staff members names, including but not limited to calling an office staff member “white trash” on or about June 21, 2021;
 - b. he engaged in aggressive behaviour including slamming office doors and shouting;
 - c. he lunged at an office staff member and pushed an office chair at the staff member; and
 - d. on or about October 14, 2021, Takvorian threatened to “decapitate” an office staff member.

THE REGISTRANT’S PLEA

- [5] The Registrant denied the allegation as set out in the Notice of Hearing.

BACKGROUND

- [6] During the time that the incidents were alleged to have occurred, Takvorian was employed as an associate dentist at Bridlewood Dental in Kanata, Ontario (“**Bridlewood**”). The practice was owned at the time by Dr. John Li. Dr. Li has since passed away.
- [7] The Panel received oral evidence from three witnesses: Ms. Gillian Taylor (“**Taylor**”), who was the practice manager at Bridlewood at the time of the events in question and at the time of the hearing, and Takvorian, who was dismissed from Bridlewood on October 21, 2021. McD who was employed as a dental assistant at Bridlewood during the relevant time and who resigned her employment at Bridlewood in November 2021, also testified. McD’s evidence was that she had also been a patient of Bridlewood from 2017 – 2019 and had allegedly been treated by Dr. Takvorian on at least one occasion.

DECISION AND REASONS

- [8] For the reasons set out below, the Panel found that the Registrant committed professional misconduct as alleged in Notice of Hearing 24-0277 (Exhibit 1). Specifically, the Panel found that the College satisfied its burden of proving, on a balance of probabilities, that

¹ SO 1991, c.18

² SO 1991, c. 24

the events laid out in the particulars occurred as alleged and that Takvorian's conduct amounted to professional misconduct.

BURDEN AND STANDARD OF PROOF

- [9] The College bears the burden of proving the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing. The Registrant has no burden of disproving the allegations. The College must prove the allegations on a balance of probabilities standard.
- [10] This means that, after considering all the evidence and the submissions of the parties, the Panel had to decide whether it was more likely than not that the Registrant engaged in the conduct as alleged.
- [11] In reaching its decision, the Panel scrutinized the evidence carefully. The Panel's findings are based on evidence that the Panel found to be clear, convincing, and cogent, and both credible and reliable.

ALLEGATIONS AND PARTICULARS

- [12] This case involves a single allegation comprising four particulars.
- [13] The single allegation is that Takvorian engaged in conduct or performed an act that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members (registrants) of the profession as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical ("DDUU"). The particulars have been set forth above.
- [14] DDUU is considered a "catch-all definition" that is intended to capture any improper conduct that is not caught by the wording of any of the specific definitions of professional misconduct that are set forth in the Misconduct Regulation.³
- [15] In his text, *Complete Guide to the Regulated Health Professions Act*, Richard Steinecke expands on this concept in the following way:

The catch-all provision assumes a consensus within the profession that certain types of conduct are unacceptable for members. Members are judged according to that consensus and not on the private views of members of the Discipline Committee. The existence of this unwritten consensus prevents discipline from being arbitrary. In fact, the catch-all definition is not supposed to reflect the values of the general population, but the values of the profession itself. Members of the profession best understand the circumstances in which other members practise.⁴

³ Steinecke, Richard, *Complete Guide to the Regulated Health Professions Act* (Toronto:Thomson Reuters, 2025), S6:332

⁴ Ibid

Context and Overview

- [16] The College alleges that Takvorian engaged in aggressive and other inappropriate behaviour towards McD and in respect of other Bridlewood staff.
- [17] McD testified that during the years 2017 – 2019, she was a patient at Bridlewood and that she was treated by Takvorian on at least one occasion.
- [18] After McD completed her coursework to become a dental assistant, she did a short term as a student dental assistant at Bridlewood (the practical term was abridged due to the COVID-19 pandemic).
- [19] Thereafter, on February 11, 2021, McD was hired by Bridlewood to work as a dental assistant at the clinic, although her formal certification did not come through until May 2021.
- [20] McD alleged that beginning in May or June 2021, Takvorian displayed aggressive and other inappropriate conduct towards her. Taylor, the practice manager at Bridlewood, witnessed some of this behaviour and testified at the hearing about what she observed.
- [21] Takvorian testified in his own defence. He denied the allegation against him, including all the particulars.
- [22] Takvorian has been practising dentistry for approximately 25 years. He started working at Bridlewood as an associate dentist in July 2009 and continued in that capacity until his dismissal from the clinic on October 21, 2021. During the relevant period in 2021, Takvorian was working as a part-time associate, on Mondays and Tuesdays of each week.
- [23] Takvorian gave evidence that during the relevant period he was experiencing distress stemming from the death of his father on January 1, 2021, and the death of his mother on January 3, 2021.

Credibility of the Witnesses

- [24] This case was, in the words of both counsel, a “he said/she said” situation. Assessing the credibility of the witnesses was thus a significant component of the Panel’s decision-making process.
- [25] The Panel was cognizant that the value of a witness’s evidence must be assessed having regard to the witness’s credibility and reliability.⁵
- [26] Credibility has often been described by courts and tribunals in the following way:

“[O]pportunities for knowledge, powers of observation, judgment and memory, ability to describe clearly what (s)he has seen and heard, as well as other factors, combine to produce what is called credibility...

⁵ *R v WL*, 2019 ONSC 1812 (CanLII), at para 29

... The test must reasonably subject (the witness') story to an examination of its **consistency with the probabilities that surround the currently existing conditions. In short, the real test of the truth of the story of a witness must be its harmony with the preponderance of probabilities** which a practical and informed person would readily recognize as reasonable...."⁶ [Emphasis added]

[27] In other words, courts and tribunals say that the real test of credibility requires:

- a. a decision-maker to put the witness's story in its own context, and to subject it to an examination of its consistency with existing conditions; and
- b. that the evidence must be in harmony with the preponderance of probabilities that a practical and reasonable person would recognize as reasonable in the circumstances.⁷

[28] The Panel assessed the credibility and reliability of each witness' evidence on a principled basis. It considered many factors, including:

- a. Did the witness appear and conduct themselves as an honest and trustworthy person?
- b. Did the witness have an interest in the outcome of the case, or any reason to give evidence that was more favourable to one side than to the other?
- c. Did the witness seem able to make accurate and complete observations about the event? Did he or she have a good opportunity to make those observations? What were the circumstances in which those observations were made? What was the condition of the witness at that time? Was the event that was observed or witnessed unusual or routine?
- d. Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness have any reason to remember the things about which he or she testified?
- e. Did any inability or difficulty that the witness had in remembering events seem genuine, or did it seem made up as an excuse to avoid answering questions?
- f. Did the witness seem to be reporting what they saw or heard, or simply putting together an account based on information obtained from other sources – i.e., what they may have heard from other witnesses – rather than personal observations?
- g. Did the witness' testimony seem reasonable and consistent as they gave it? Was it similar to or different from what other witnesses said about the same events? Did the witness say or do something different on an earlier occasion?

⁶ *Faryna v Chorny*, 1951 CanLII 252 (BCCA)

⁷ *Health Sciences Association of Alberta v. Capital Care Group Inc.*, 2018 CanLII 105101 (AB GAA) at para 35

- h. Did any inconsistencies in the witness' evidence make the main points of the testimony more, or less, believable, and reliable? Was the inconsistency about something important, or a minor detail? Did it seem like an honest mistake? Was it a deliberate lie? Was the inconsistency because the witness said something different, or because he or she failed to mention something? Was there any explanation for it? Did the explanation make sense?

EVIDENCE AND REASONS FOR DECISION

Alleged particulars relating to events of June 21, 2021

- [29] It was alleged that on or about June 21, 2021, Takvorian used demeaning language and called office staff members names, including but not limited to "white trash".
- [30] Taylor, McD and Takvorian all testified about the events of June 21, 2021.
- [31] Taylor testified that, due to a shortage of staff, she had assigned McD to work as Takvorian's assistant that day. She and Takvorian had an interaction about the assignment, as Takvorian expressed that he did not want to work with McD. The interaction took place when Takvorian arrived at the clinic for work, in a room at the back of the clinic. There was a swinging door leading to the room opening on to a kitchen and a small office with a sliding 'pocket' door.⁸ The office was used by the clinic's associate dentists such as Takvorian.
- [32] Taylor testified that upon learning that McD would be his assistant for the day, Takvorian became angry, dropped his bag, threw his shoes on the floor, and slammed the pocket door shut. He then opened the door, stepped out of the office and said that he would not work with McD, that she was "white trash" and should not be working at Bridlewood. Taylor did not recall everything Takvorian said to her during the interaction, but that he was "ranting". Towards the end of the interaction, Taylor moved away from the door to the back of the room, ending up in the kitchen near the microwave.
- [33] Taylor further testified that at some point while she was in the kitchen area further away from the door and small office, McD attempted to enter the back room. Taylor did not know whether McD heard Takvorian refer to her as "white trash".
- [34] As McD attempted to open the door to the back room, Takvorian "slammed the door" shut and would not let her in. Takvorian's counsel challenged this evidence in cross-examination, suggesting that the door to the kitchen had an overhead closing mechanism that closes the door in a controlled manner, preventing it from being slammed. In cross-examination, Taylor clarified that "you can't really slam it but she (McD) was trying to get through and he pushed it back so she couldn't open it."
- [35] According to Taylor, Takvorian did this twice. Initially, she testified that she did not recall whether he said anything to McD as she was trying to enter the room. Under cross-examination, Taylor recalled that on McD's second attempt, Takvorian pushed the door back

⁸ Although the witness did not use the term 'pocket door', based on the descriptions of the door given in oral evidence at the hearing, the Panel considers the term to be applicable.

and said “get out of here”. Under cross-examination, Taylor confirmed that she did not hear whether Takvorian called McD “white trash” at that time.

- [36] Taylor explained that with the passage of time, she did not recall what happened after McD’s attempts to enter the back room or what she did next.
- [37] Later that day, Taylor’s assistant told her that there was yelling going on in the back room.
- [38] Taylor went to the back room and found Takvorian and McD yelling at one another. She told them to “break it up – it’s unprofessional” and to get back to work.
- [39] She recalled that she left something on Takvorian’s desk about workplace harassment. She also spoke to Takvorian about workplace harassment.
- [40] She further recalled that he said that he thought he was being harassed by McD and another staff member named Monique McIntosh (“**McIntosh**”). He believed that they were attempting to “limit his production.”
- [41] Takvorian also alleged that he was being sexually harassed and that McD had sent him emails that were inappropriate but that he never showed them to Taylor.
- [42] On June 23, 2021, Dr. Li sent a letter entitled “Final Warning” to Takvorian (Exhibit 2). The letter states as follows:

“On June 21, 2021, you made another explosive harassment comment in the office: you called our dental assistant [McD] White Trash, which is absolutely unacceptable...

...1. We have warned you previously for your similar explosive harassment behaviour. Considering your past over 10 years service to our dental office, we are giving you a final warning: You must stop all work place harassment behaviour and comments in our office: any more similar incidence (*sic*) happens in future, you will be dismissed at once...”

- [43] The letter was signed by Dr. Li, and co-signed by Taylor and by McIntosh, who was identified as the assistant manager in the letter.
- [44] Taylor did not recall whether Takvorian responded to this letter.
- [45] She recalled that Takvorian did mention that he had received a “love letter” from McD, but not until after the incident on June 21, 2021. She was never provided with this letter.
- [46] In cross-examination, Taylor acknowledged that she was aware that, on June 10, 2021, McD sent Takvorian an email which said “Dear Vincent, My cell is [XXX-XXX-XXXX]. I would be delighted if you wanted to do something active together. Hope you had a good day. Good night...sleep well...” (Exhibit 6). The email ended with two emojis, one of which had a heart.
- [47] Taylor said that she did not know whether McD’s advances were unwelcomed by Takvorian, but that “it takes two”. She did confirm that after his receipt of the June 10 email

from McD, Takvorian no longer wanted to work with McD. She also testified that McD did not want to work with Dr. Takvorian. She further testified that she did her best to accommodate the situation in a “very fast manner”, but that it could not happen “overnight”. She did her best to ensure that Takvorian worked with another dental assistant but that on June 21, 2021, that was not possible. Due to Takvorian’s outright refusal to work with McD, the dental office had to get another assistant to come from another dental office owned by Dr. Li to work at Bridlewood that day.

- [48] At the conclusion of her cross-examination, Taylor commented that Takvorian was “a great dentist; most of the patients loved him.”
- [49] McD also testified about the events of June 21, 2021. Her evidence was that generally, working with Takvorian was stressful and that he made her nervous.
- [50] She recalled that on June 21, 2021, she arrived at the office and found that there was no staff at the front but that there were patients in the waiting room. She went to the back room at the clinic. As she approached, she could hear yelling but could not discern what was being said.
- [51] McD attempted to open the door to tell Taylor that there was no staffperson at the front when Takvorian “slammed the door in my face.” She recalled that he also threw a chair and lunged at her. Taylor did not recall that Takvorian threw the chair.
- [52] She further recalled that when she attempted to open the office door a second time, Takvorian slammed the door in her face again. She said he called her a “white trash sleaze” and said “why don’t you just leave?”
- [53] In cross-examination, McD said that the “lunging incident” took place in May 2021. She also said that “this should have been documented. I should have been protected.”
- [54] She testified that she opened the door again, grabbed her shoes and went to the front to “sit the patients” in the operatories.
- [55] She described herself as feeling “horrible, shamed” because Takvorian was refusing to work with her; that it was very unprofessional.
- [56] With respect to the June 10 email, McD testified that sending it was her mother’s idea because she was aware that things were tense between McD and Takvorian.
- [57] She explained that when she said in the email that she thought that she and Takvorian should “do something active together,” that she meant that they might go for a walk and talk.
- [58] Later in the day, McD testified she was in the back room trying to reason with Takvorian. She testified that in that conversation he again called her “white trash” and “a sleaze”. She believes that Taylor was possibly in the front of the office at that time.
- [59] When asked about the events of June 21, 2021, Takvorian responded first, that he did not recall much, then, that he did not recall the alleged incident at all, then lastly, that “this

incident did not happen.” He said that he “vaguely recalled that on June 21st, we were short-staffed” and so he was going to have to work with McD.

- [60] In cross-examination, Takvorian denied that he threw his shoes to the floor, he denied that it was physically possible to slam the back room door shut because of its hinge and stopper at the top of the door; he said that slamming the door on McD “never occurred”. When it was put to him that he frequently yelled at McD, he denied that as well.
- [61] Further, he testified that he did respond to the warning letter of June 23, 2021; that he “might have sent two emails” to Dr. Li, but no email was entered into evidence.
- [62] With respect to McD, Takvorian testified that her chair-side manner was not acceptable and that he had sent an email to Dr. Li complaining that she was loud and used the F-word in front of patients. No such email was tendered in evidence at the hearing.
- [63] He further testified that he did not feel that McD was a “good fit” for Bridlewood.
- [64] After considering the evidence, the Panel found that the events of June 21, 2021 did occur as alleged.
- [65] The Panel heard evidence from Taylor that due to a staffing shortage, she informed Takvorian that he was going to have to work with McD that day. Taylor’s testimony regarding Takvorian’s reaction to this news was entirely credible. Her evidence that he slammed the pocket sliding door to the office in the back room, that he dropped his bag, threw down his shoes, was ranting and referred to McD as “white trash” was internally consistent. She had no interest in the outcome of the hearing and she testified in a measured and thoughtful way.
- [66] Taylor acknowledged where there were gaps in her memory and she testified believably and with confidence regarding the things she did remember.
- [67] McD was clearly highly distressed during her testimony. She gave evidence that on June 21, 2021, Takvorian slammed the door in her face twice, that he threw the office chair at her and lunged at the door when she tried to enter. Taylor could not corroborate McD’s evidence that Takvorian lunged at her and pushed a chair at her.
- [68] There was some confusion about whether the events described by McD occurred in May 2021 or on June 21, 2021. Her evidence was unclear about when it was that Takvorian pushed on the back room door to keep her out, pushed a chair at her and called her a “white trash sleaze,” but her recollection of the events was clear and certain. McD’s confusion about the date of the incident was not explored by the Registrant in cross-examination.
- [69] The Panel was satisfied that these incidents occurred on June 21, 2021. The events described by Taylor and McD were so similar that they must have been describing the events of the same day, and Taylor was clear about the date. Further, the events align with those discussed in Dr. Li’s June 23, 2021, letter to Takvorian, which situates them on June 21, 2021, just two days before the letter.

- [70] McD testified that she had mixed feelings about Takvorian: that she was both afraid of him and attracted to him at times. She was clearly doing her best to tell the Panel the truth.
- [71] Notwithstanding her confusion surrounding the timing of the events of June 2021, the Panel believed McD and found that she was credible overall.
- [72] The details of the events described by McD were consistent with Taylor's evidence about the events of June 21st. Both witnesses described Takvorian as twice having "slammed" the back room door in McD's face and then explained that although the door's closing mechanism prevented it from "slamming", he had forcefully pushed the door back at McD when she tried to enter. Both witnesses testified that Takvorian referred to McD as "white trash"; both witnesses testified that Takvorian was angry because he did not want to work with McD and so a different assistant had to be called to Bridlewood from another office. Taylor testified that Takvorian said that McD did not belong at Bridlewood; McD testified that he said "why don't you just leave?" Given the context of this evidence, the Panel found that it was in harmony with the overall preponderance of probabilities and that it was thus both credible and reliable.
- [73] When asked how she felt as a result of Takvorian's conduct on June 21, McD replied that she "felt horrible, shamed; it traumatized me."
- [74] Takvorian's denials in the face of this evidence were simply not credible.
- [75] The Panel found that Takvorian's own evidence regarding his disdain for McD was consistent with Taylor's and McD's evidence. He acknowledged that he did not think McD was a good fit for Bridlewood. He did not like her chairside manner, he found her loud and he alleged that she used the F-word in front of patients, although this was not put to McD in cross-examination. He also alleged that he sent a letter to Dr. Li regarding his concerns about McD, but this letter was not produced by him.
- [76] In addition to the oral evidence, the Panel was provided with a copy of a letter dated June 23, 2021 entitled "Final Warning", as described above. This letter, sent two days after the events of June 21, 2021, is entirely consistent with and supports Taylor's and McD's evidence. While Takvorian testified that he did reply to this letter, he did not produce a response in evidence at the hearing.
- [77] The June 23 letter reinforces both the credibility and reliability of Taylor's and McD's evidence. The Panel found that their evidence was believable and in harmony with the preponderance of probabilities.
- [78] For these reasons, the Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that the events alleged to have occurred on June 21, 2021, did occur.
- [79] The Panel took note that Takvorian received an email from McD on June 10, 2021 that he viewed as inappropriate; that it was for this reason he said that he did not wish to work with McD. He also testified that he received a "love letter" from McD, which McD admitted having sent. The timeline for the receipt of this letter was not made clear to the Panel, nor was it an exhibit at the hearing.

- [80] Regardless of any such conduct by McD, Takvorian is a professional and he is expected to conduct himself according to the standards of the profession. His receipt of the email and the letter does not excuse unprofessional conduct.
- [81] Registrants of the College would expect that dentists comport themselves in a professional manner, meaning that they respond to challenges in the workplace in a measured and respectful way. Takvorian's conduct failed to meet this standard: rather than expressing his preference for working with someone other than McD in a reasoned and rational way, he became angry, he threw down his shoes, he slammed the pocket door, and "ranted" at Taylor during which time he referred to McD as "white trash." Both Taylor and McD testified that Takvorian twice pushed forcefully on the door to the back room to prevent McD from entering, with both witnesses describing the act as "slamming." Taylor testified that later in the day on June 21, Takvorian was in the back room with McD and that he was yelling at her.
- [82] None of the behaviours described fall within the parameters of "professional conduct." Further, Takvorian's behaviour could not be characterized as a temporary lapse in professional judgment. His improper conduct continued throughout the day on June 21, 2021, and was extreme.
- [83] For these reasons, the Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that Takvorian engaged in conduct or performed an act that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by registrants of the profession as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional and unethical, contrary to section 2(59) of the Misconduct Regulation.

Alleged Particulars Relating to Events of October 14, 2021

- [84] On or about October 8, 2021, an administrative staff person at Bridlewood called a patient ("**Patient S**") to remind him of his appointment with Takvorian on October 14, 2021. The appointment was for a crown cementation. Taylor testified that Patient S told the staff person that he did not wish to be seen by Takvorian since neither Takvorian nor his assistant, Lena, were vaccinated against COVID-19. According to Taylor, Patient S said that Takvorian and Lena had been talking about this during his previous visit and that he would have left had Takvorian not been in the middle of a crown preparation. Taylor sent an email to Takvorian on October 8, 2021, explaining Patient S's request to see a different dentist for the cementation and the reasons he gave for that request (Exhibit 3).
- [85] On October 12, 2021, Taylor sent Takvorian a second email in which she informed him that Patient S was booked for a crown cementation "with Dr. Sukhi [**Sukhi**", another associate dentist at Bridlewood], as per his request" (Exhibit 4).
- [86] In direct examination by the College, Taylor did not give any evidence about having sent these emails to Takvorian. Her evidence was that she called Patient S on October 12, 2021, to remind him of his appointment, at which time he advised her that he did not want to see Takvorian. She thereupon spoke with Sukhi, who agreed to perform the crown cementation if Tavorian had no objection.

- [87] Taylor testified that she then spoke with Takvorian and that he became upset. He said that a patient should not be able to choose who does their dental work. Takvorian wanted to speak with Patient S, but Taylor advised that the patient did not want to speak with him.
- [88] Taylor testified that on October 14, 2021, when Patient S arrived for his appointment, she let both Takvorian and Sukhi know. Takvorian said that he would speak to the patient, but Taylor informed him that Patient S did not wish to speak with him. Again, Takvorian was upset. He asked: "who does he think he is? Maybe he should go elsewhere?"
- [89] Taylor testified that Takvorian blamed McIntosh another Bridlewood employee, for Patient S requesting a different dentist. Takvorian expressed that he thought McIntosh was trying to "sabotage" him, to "limit his production," and turn patients against him. She gave evidence that Takvorian made a threatening remark about McIntosh, saying that he would "decapitate her" if it did not stop. At the time, Taylor cautioned Takvorian, saying "you do realize that you can't talk that way?". She testified that Takvorian had expressed similar sentiments about McIntosh in the past, but nothing to that extent.
- [90] On the evidence of both Taylor and Takvorian, Sukhi was present in the room during the October 14 interaction but she was not called by either party to testify. Taylor gave evidence that upon Takvorian making this threat, Sukhi appeared to be shocked; that she looked at Taylor, left the back room and went to the front.
- [91] McIntosh then went to the back room and asked Taylor why Sukhi told her not to go back there. Taylor told her simply that she was "taking care of it."
- [92] Taylor noted that she did not think Takvorian would follow through with this threat; that sometimes "we say things in anger that we don't mean."
- [93] Nevertheless, she testified that she was concerned enough about Takvorian's statement that she went to her car and called her regional manager to inform him about the incident. The regional manager said that he would take care of it. She asked whether she should send McIntosh home and the regional manager said no. Taylor prepared a report about the incident. She testified that her regional manager called human resources and that they called Taylor the next morning. She said that they followed all the proper documentation and reporting channels immediately.
- [94] On cross-examination, Taylor was asked whether she had emailed Takvorian about Patient S's desire to be treated by Sukhi. She stated that she did not email him, that she told him.
- [95] When presented with Exhibit 3, she responded that "I probably emailed him but I spoke to him as well." She acknowledged that her memory today is not as clear as it was four years ago. She said "I know we talked more than once over the course of the week. He wasn't at the office every day and if he wasn't there, we would email." Her evidence was that "this was four years ago; I remember what the patient told me; I don't remember everything."
- [96] Taylor did not recall that she had asked Takvorian to call Patient S. When presented with Exhibit 4, she posited that since Takvorian worked only on Mondays and Tuesdays, that "maybe I emailed him."

- [97] Takvorian agreed that he had had a conversation with Taylor in the kitchen about Patient S and that Sukhi was present. He explained that the reason he was concerned about Sukhi cementing Patient S's crown was because there were professional liability issues if another dentist takes over mid-procedure. It was not clear whether this was mentioned during the conversation between Takvorian and Taylor and/or in Sukhi's presence. As described above, Taylor's evidence was that Takvorian was angry and threatened to "decapitate" McIntosh if she did not stop sabotaging his practice. Again, Takvorian simply denied that the incident occurred. He offered no alternate explanation of events or his rationale for having been upset.
- [98] It was the October 14 incident that led to Takvorian's dismissal from Bridlewood on October 21, 2021. Takvorian testified that Ross Lynch from Dentalcorp, an owner of the Bridlewood practice, did an investigation. Takvorian participated in an interview for the investigation and said that the allegation was false—that it never happened.
- [99] Takvorian sent an email to Mr. Perez, a lawyer at Dentalcorp, on October 26, 2021, five days after his dismissal from Bridlewood, which was made an exhibit at the hearing. In the email, Takvorian wrote the following:
- "I do not concur nor agree with this pseudo allegation/incident, it simply never occurred. It's all fabricated and concocted preposterous lies, and a defamation of my personality and character...
- ...As I mentioned this ample of times to Ted Tai and Ross Lynch, Bridlewood has not been a safe environment for me as a health care provider to practice nor for the safety of my patients..."
- [100] Upon consideration of the oral and documentary evidence, the Panel found that Taylor's version of events was credible and reliable. She testified that after the incident occurred, she called her regional manager and that an investigation was carried out, which Takvorian admits. The fact of the investigation supports that an incident that warranted an investigation occurred on October 14, 2021.
- [101] Taylor's evidence was internally consistent. When, due to the passage of time, she could not remember something, she said so. She was very clear and confident in the things she did remember, and readily acknowledged when she did not remember something. For example, after testifying that she spoke with Takvorian about Patient S, she was shown an email that she sent to the Registrant about the patient. She readily acknowledged that she could have sent the email, although she did not remember doing so. She was sure that she had spoken to him but explained the context that would have led to her sending the email, as well. Taylor was, overall, a credible witness.
- [102] Taylor testified that Takvorian had previously complained to her that McIntosh was attempting to "sabotage" his practice through her interactions with patients. He blamed McIntosh for his schedule not being full since patients were scheduled by her at the front desk.
- [103] Taylor's evidence about Takvorian's anger was in harmony with the preponderance of probabilities present in this case. Her evidence was consistent with evidence that

Takvorian was angry with McIntosh and that when he became angry, he became aggressive. In this case, he threatened to “decapitate” McIntosh if her alleged sabotage of his practice did not stop. Taylor was confident in her recollection that Takvorian used the word “decapitate”. It is a striking word, leaving vivid impressions, and it is a word Taylor would be likely to remember. The Panel found it plausible and believable that Takvorian’s stated threat to “decapitate” an employee concerned Taylor enough for her to get her regional manager involved and that it precipitated a workplace investigation.

- [104] Takvorian’s evidence was that he did “not threaten to decapitate anyone, ever, at all.”
- [105] In an email sent to Mr. Perez at Dentalcorp on October 26, 2021, Takvorian referred to the allegation as a “pseudo allegation/incident” and said that it “simply never occurred. It’s all fabricated and concocted, preposterous lies, and a defamation of my personality and character.”
- [106] As the Panel found above, the October 26th email is consistent with the denials Takvorian gave in his evidence at the hearing. As a self-serving prior consistent statement, however, it has no probative value.
- [107] The Panel found that Takvorian’s denial that he threatened that he would “decapitate” McIntosh was simply lacking in credibility.
- [108] Upon consideration of the oral and documentary evidence, the Panel found that Taylor’s version of the events of October 14 was credible and reliable. It was internally consistent and it was in harmony with the overall preponderance of probabilities in the context of this case.
- [109] This was a second, credible incident of Takvorian’s explosive behaviour towards staff in the dental clinic. He had received a “Final Warning” from Dr. Li on June 23, 2021. The legal department at Dentalcorp investigated the October 14 incident and Takvorian was dismissed on October 21, 2021.
- [110] As the Panel found above in relation to the events of June 21, 2021, registrants of the College would expect dentists to conduct themselves in a professional and respectful manner. Again, Takvorian’s conduct failed to meet this standard. Rather than expressing his frustration in a respectful and reasoned way, he made a credible and concerning threat towards McIntosh.
- [111] This was a second incident of conduct that fell well outside the parameters of that which would be generally recognized by registrants as “professional misconduct.”
- [112] For these reasons, the Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that the allegation that Takvorian “threatened to ‘decapitate’ an office staff member” on October 14, 2021, was substantiated and that Takvorian thus committed professional misconduct. The Panel found that Takvorian’s conduct fell within the meaning of DDUU, and that it was contrary to section 2(59) of the Misconduct Regulation.

Other allegations

- [113] In addition to the foregoing allegations which are tied to specific dates, the particulars in the Notice of Hearing also allege more generally that in 2021, Takvorian “engaged in aggressive behaviour including slamming office doors and shouting” and that he “lunged at an office staff member and pushed an office chair at the staff member.” Based on the facts as found above, the Panel is satisfied that these behaviours occurred during the incidents that took place on June 21, 2021.
- [114] The evidence established that Takvorian also engaged in “aggressive behaviour including slamming office doors and shouting” on other occasions besides June 21 and October 14, 2021.
- [115] In this regard, Taylor testified that Takvorian would often slam doors. When pressed on how often this happened, she testified that it occurred “a few times.” She also testified that when Takvorian became angry, that he would slide the pocket door to the associates’ office with force.
- [116] The Panel found the evidence regarding these allegations was credible and reliable, that it was clear and cogent, and that ultimately, the facts were in harmony with the preponderance of probabilities in this case.

CONCLUSION

- [117] The Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that Takvorian committed professional misconduct in that he engaged in conduct that would, in the view of members of the dentistry profession, be viewed as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional and unethical. It based its decision on documentary evidence, the credible and reliable evidence of Taylor and McD, and findings that Takvorian’s denials of the behaviours alleged were lacking in credibility.
- [118] Taylor’s and McD’s evidence was imperfect, which is not surprising given that the events underlying the allegations occurred five years ago. Taylor may have forgotten that she emailed Takvorian about Patient S, but she was confident in her evidence that she also spoke to him. She recalled with clarity that in June 2021, Takvorian was angry and that he threw down his shoes, slammed the pocket door to the associates’ office, pushed with force on the back room door on two instances, both to prevent McD from entering, and that he referred to McD as “white trash.” Taylor testified with certainty that Takvorian threatened that he would “decapitate” McIntosh if she “sabotaged” his schedule again. This evidence was clear and cogent.
- [119] Takvorian denied the allegations completely. Nevertheless, his own evidence was that he did not think that McD was a good fit for Bridlewood, that he did not like her chairside manner, and that she swore in front of patients. The Panel did not find Takvorian’s denials to be credible in all the circumstances of this case.
- [120] In summary, while Taylor’s and McD’s evidence may have been imperfect, there were common threads that reinforced the credibility and reliability of their evidence. Further, the

documentary evidence of Dr. Li's "final warning" to Takvorian on June 23, 2021, supports the evidence of context and Takvorian's unprofessional conduct.

[121] In all the circumstances of this case, the Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that the College met its burden of proof.

I, Judy Welikovitch, sign these Reasons for Decision as Chairperson of this Discipline Panel.



August 11, 2026

Judy Welikovitch

Date

Chair, Discipline Committee Panel