

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

**Citation:** Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario v. Tse, 2026 ONRCDSO 7

**Date:** 2026-04-21

**File No.:** 24-1055

**BETWEEN:**

Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario

-and-

Dr. Jeffrey Tse  
Registration No. 52710

**FINDING AND PENALTY REASONS**

**RESTRICTION ON PUBLICATION**

In the matter of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario and Dr. Tse 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 the Agreed Statement of Facts in this matter.

**PANEL MEMBERS:**

Judy Welikovitch, (Chair)  
Noha Gomaa, Professional Member  
Vivan Hu, Public Member  
Nehal Al Tarhuni, Professional Member  
Luisa Ritacca, Subject Matter Expert

**APPEARANCES:**

Ahmad Mozaffari, for the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario  
Dr. Jeffrey Tse, Registrant (not present)

**Heard:** November 17, 2025, by videoconference

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**THE ALLEGATIONS**

[1] The College alleged that the Registrant, Dr. Jeffrey Tse, committed acts of professional misconduct as set out in the Notice of Hearing dated January 13, 2025. The allegations described below relate to one of three separate complaints received by the College in connection with the Registrant's closure of his practice and his

conduct around the closure. The Registrant did not participate in the hearings into these matters. The Panel addresses the other two complaints in separate reasons for decision. Notice of Hearing 24-1055 is appended to these reasons.

- [2] First, the College alleged that the Registrant contravened a standard of practice or failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession, contrary to paragraph 1 of Section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853/93 under the *Dentistry Act, 1991*, as amended (the "**Professional Misconduct Regulation**"). In particular, it was alleged that the Registrant did not retain ES's clinical and financial records for at least ten years after the date of the last entry in her patient record, and that the Registrant closed his practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without transferring ES's patient records to a legally authorised successor responsible for maintaining the security of her records and giving her access to her records.
- [3] Second, the College alleged that the Registrant committed an act of professional misconduct in that he discontinued needed dental services without reasonable cause, contrary to paragraph 16 of Section 2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation. In particular, it was alleged that the Registrant closed his practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without notifying his patient, ES, and making provision for her continuing orthodontic care.
- [4] Third, the College alleged that the Registrant committed an act of professional misconduct in that he failed to keep records as required by the regulations, contrary to paragraph 25 of Section 2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation. In particular, it was alleged that the Registrant did not retain ES's clinical and financial records for at least ten years after the date of the last entry in her patient record, and that the Registrant closed his practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without transferring ES's patient records to a legally authorised successor responsible for maintaining the security of her records and giving her access to her records.
- [5] Fourth, the College alleged that the Registrant committed an act of professional misconduct in that he failed to reply appropriately or within a reasonable time to a written enquiry made by the College, contrary to paragraph 58 of Section 2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation. In particular, it was alleged that the College made multiple written attempts to contact the Registrant in relation to ES's complaint, and the Registrant did not respond to any of the College's written enquiries.
- [6] Finally, the College alleged that the Registrant committed an act of professional misconduct in that he engaged in conduct or performed an act that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical, contrary to paragraph 59 of Section 2 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation. In particular, it was alleged that the Registrant closed his practice without notifying his patient and without making provision for her continuing orthodontic care and access to patient records; did not take reasonable steps to safeguard his patient's records; did not respond to the College's attempts to speak with him about ES's complaint; impeded the College's investigation by evading the College's attempts to communicate with him; and that

his conduct showed a disregard for the College's regulatory role and a pattern of ungovernability.

### **THE REGISTRANT'S PLEA**

- [7] The Registrant was not present at the hearing. Despite being given notice of the hearing, the Registrant did not attend and did not retain counsel to appear on his behalf. In accordance with subsection 6.3(2) of the Discipline Committee Rules of Procedure, the Chair entered a plea of not guilty on all allegations on behalf of the Registrant.

### **THE EVIDENCE**

- [8] The College called two witnesses at the hearing: Dr. Jennifer Lipiec, a Team Lead and Dental Consultant in the Investigations unit of the College's Professional Conduct and Regulatory Affairs department, and the patient/complainant, ES. In addition, the College tendered several documentary exhibits, including an Affidavit of Kristina Formosi, sworn November 6, 2025, documenting the College's attempts to contact the Registrant, and the Certificate of the Registrar, confirming that Dr. Tse remains a member of the College but is currently suspended for non-payment of fees.

#### ***Dr. Jennifer Lipiec***

- [9] Dr. Lipiec testified that she had been with the College for approximately 6.5 years and held her current role for 5.5 years. She oversaw a team of four investigators, two dental analysts, and four administrative assistants. Prior to her role at the College, Dr. Lipiec was an assistant dental professor at Tufts University and Columbia University and maintained private practice in New York City. She also maintained a part-time dental practice.
- [10] Dr. Lipiec testified that the College received a complaint from ES, a patient of the Registrant, regarding the abrupt closure of the Registrant's practice and her inability to obtain her records. Dr. Lipiec reviewed the various documents in her Witness Document Book with the Panel. She testified that, after receiving the complaint, she sent the Registrant an email on September 21, 2023, notifying him of the complaint and requesting a response. She sent a follow-up email on October 11, 2023. No response was received from the Registrant to either communication.
- [11] Dr. Lipiec testified that, by this time, the College had information from other complainants that the Registrant's practice had been permanently closed since June 2023, which was confirmed by online searches and a photograph of a sign posted on the door of the clinic. The Registrant's public register profile confirmed that he had been suspended for non-payment of fees effective February 1, 2024. Dr. Lipiec described multiple communications and memos to file documenting the failed attempts to contact the Registrant by email, telephone, and courier. The telephone number for the Registrant's office was no longer in service.

- [12] Dr. Lipiec testified that the College became aware that the Registrant may have opened a dental practice in Florida. A screenshot of the website for the Florida practice was entered into evidence. Dr. Tse's biography on the website indicated that the dentist had practiced in Toronto for over 20 years and listed affiliations with the RCDSO, the Royal College of Dentists of Canada, and the Ontario Dental Association, which led Dr. Lipiec to conclude it was the same individual. Dr. Lipiec attempted to contact the Registrant at the Florida practice by email and telephone in August 2024 but received no response from him. A letter was also couriered to the Florida practice, but the delivery was refused.
- [13] Dr. Lipiec testified that on October 24, 2024, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee formed an intention to refer the matter to the Discipline Committee. The Registrant was notified of this decision by email and given an opportunity to make written submissions. No response was received. Dr. Lipiec testified that the Registrant never responded to any communications from the College and never provided any information about the whereabouts of ES's patient records.
- [14] Dr. Lipiec testified regarding the College's Guidelines on Dental Recordkeeping (November 2019), the Guidelines on Electronic Records Management (March 2012), and the Practice Advisory on Release and Transfer of Patient Records. She testified that the Registrant had obligations to retain patient records for at least ten years from the last chart entry, to maintain records in a secure manner, and to ensure continuity of care and proper transfer of records upon closure of a practice. There was no evidence that the Registrant had complied with any of these obligations.

### ***The Patient, ES***

- [15] The second witness was ES, the complainant. ES testified that she was 41 years old, held a master's degree in occupational therapy, and worked as a paediatric occupational therapist. She testified that she began seeing the Registrant in November 2021 for orthodontic treatment. She had braces placed in December 2021, and the course of treatment was approximately 18 months in total.
- [16] ES testified that the Registrant removed her braces and placed her on retainers on May 19, 2023. She was scheduled for a follow-up appointment on November 10, 2023. As part of her treatment plan, she was to see the Registrant six months after she started wearing retainers and then for yearly follow-ups thereafter. She also had questions about some gaps in her teeth that required further attention.
- [17] ES testified that she found out the Registrant's clinic was closed in June 2023, when a friend who lived near the clinic noticed a sign posted on the door stating that the office was permanently closed. ES was not notified by the Registrant about the closure. She was not provided with any information about how to access her records or about continuity of care. She tried calling the office after June 2023 but did not receive a response. She never heard from the Registrant after her final appointment in May 2023.

- [18] ES testified that she went to her regular dentist for follow-up care. She was unable to obtain her records from the Registrant's office.

## **DECISION**

- [19] The Panel considered the documentary evidence and the oral evidence of Dr. Lipiec and the patient, ES. The Panel found that the College proved all five allegations of professional misconduct as set out in the Notice of Hearing on a balance of probabilities.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

- [20] The Panel carefully considered the evidence before it. The evidence established that the Registrant closed his practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without notifying his patient ES, who was an active patient with ongoing orthodontic care needs and a scheduled follow-up appointment. The Registrant did not make any provision for ES's continuing orthodontic care, did not provide her with access to her patient records, and did not transfer her records to a legally authorized successor. ES's evidence was consistent with the documentary evidence filed, which established the Registrant's failure to respond to his patient and to the College. ES's evidence was credible and reliable. She had good recollection of her interactions with the Registrant. She answered questions in a thoughtful manner. She expressed reasonable concern about the Registrant leaving his practice and her inability to access her records.
- [21] Dr. Lipiec provided clear and credible evidence that established that the College made extensive and repeated attempts to contact the Registrant by email, telephone, courier, and mail over a period of more than two years, both at his Ontario address and at his apparent Florida practice. The Panel found Dr. Lipiec and the documentary evidence she reviewed to be persuasive. We are satisfied that the Registrant did not respond to any of the College's communications. When a courier package was sent to his Florida practice, the delivery was refused. The Panel drew a reasonable inference from the Registrant's complete failure to respond that he was deliberately evading the College's attempts to communicate with him.
- [22] Given the closure of the Registrant's clinic and his unresponsiveness to the College's communications, the Panel drew the reasonable inference that the Registrant failed to retain ES's clinical and financial records as required. There was no evidence before the Panel that the Registrant had retained or maintained the records, and no evidence that any records had been transferred to a successor or otherwise made available. The office was permanently closed, with a sign posted on the door. The office telephone number was no longer in service. The Registrant failed to respond to all requests for ES's records.
- [23] The Panel found, on a balance of probabilities, that the Registrant contravened the College's Guidelines on Dental Recordkeeping (November 2019), the Guidelines on Electronic Records Management (March 2012), and the Practice Advisory on Release and Transfer of Patient Records. These documents have been treated as

standards of practice in previous decisions by this College (*RCDSO and Davis, 2023 ONRCDSO 9, RCDSO and Yarascavitch, 2023 ONRCDSO 10, and RCDSO and Segura, 2023 ONRCDSO 7*). The Registrant's obligations included retaining patient records for at least ten years after the date of the last entry, maintaining records in a secure manner, and ensuring the proper transfer of records upon closure of a practice.

- [24] With respect to the allegation of disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical conduct, the Panel found that the Registrant's conduct, taken as a whole, demonstrated a serious disregard for his professional obligations and for the College's regulatory role. The Registrant abandoned his patient without notice or explanation, failed to make any provision for her continuing care, failed to safeguard her patient records, and deliberately evaded all attempts by the College to communicate with him. This conduct demonstrated a pattern of ungovernability.

### **PENALTY SUBMISSIONS**

- [25] College counsel submitted that the appropriate penalty was a reprimand and revocation of the Registrant's certificate of registration. Counsel submitted that the Registrant had effectively abandoned his patient without any communication, leaving her to her own devices, unable to obtain her records or access continuing care. Counsel submitted that the Registrant had completely ignored the College and its regulatory authority, that being a member of the College is a privilege and not a right, and that the Registrant no longer deserved that privilege.
- [26] College counsel submitted that the evidence established that the Registrant had completely disregarded the rules and standards of practice of the College and had completely abandoned his dental practice. Counsel emphasized the need for both specific and general deterrence, submitting that the Registrant had shown no willingness to be governed. There were no mitigating factors: the Registrant had not participated in the process at all, there was no witnesses called and there was no evidence of remorse.
- [27] College counsel also sought costs in the amount of \$9,951.79, representing approximately two-thirds of the actual legal and hearing costs incurred by the College in this matter. The Affidavit of Dayna Simon was entered in support of the costs request.

### **PENALTY DECISION**

- [28] The Panel ordered that the Registrar be directed to revoke the Registrant's certificate of registration immediately. The Panel further ordered that the Registrant be required to appear before the Panel to be reprimanded within ninety (90) days of the Order becoming final. The Panel ordered the Registrant to pay costs to the College in the amount of \$9,951.79.

## REASONS FOR PENALTY DECISION

- [29] The Panel accepted the penalty submissions of the College. The Panel considered the following factors in arriving at the appropriate penalty:
- a. Protection of the public is the paramount consideration. The evidence before the Panel established that the Registrant has completely disengaged from the regulatory process and has shown no willingness to be governed by the College. The Registrant's conduct demonstrated a total disregard for his professional obligations, the welfare of his patients, and the authority of the College. The College cannot exercise its public protection mandate where a Registrant has disengaged from the regulator's oversight responsibilities.
  - b. The Registrant abandoned his patient ES without notice, without making any provision for her continuing orthodontic care, and without providing access to her records. He closed his practice abruptly and appears to have relocated to Florida without fulfilling any of his professional obligations in Ontario. His conduct left his patient without the ability to access her records or continue her care.
  - c. The Registrant's complete failure to engage with the College's investigation and these proceedings demonstrates that he has no interest in being subject to the regulatory authority of the College. He did not respond to the complaint, did not provide patient records, did not communicate with the College, refused delivery of correspondence, and did not attend the hearing. There are no mitigating factors. The Registrant has shown no remorse, has offered no explanation for his conduct, and has provided no evidence of potential rehabilitation.
- [30] In these circumstances, revocation is the appropriate and proportionate penalty. The public cannot have confidence that the Registrant will respect the authority of the College or comply with the standards of the profession. Revocation serves both the purpose of specific deterrence, by removing the Registrant's ability to practise dentistry in Ontario, and general deterrence, by sending a clear message to the profession that this type of conduct will not be tolerated.
- [31] A reprimand is also appropriate to formally express the Panel's disapproval of the Registrant's conduct.
- [32] The Panel also ordered costs in the amount of \$9,951.79, which represents approximately two-thirds of the College's actual legal and hearing costs in this matter. The Panel was satisfied that the costs sought were reasonable.

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



April 21, 2026

---

Judy Welikovitch  
Chair, Discipline Committee Panel

---

Date

## APPENDIX

24-1055

**IN THE MATTER OF** a Hearing of a panel of the Discipline Committee of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario held pursuant to the provisions of the Health Professions Procedural Code which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, Statutes of Ontario, 1991, Chapter 18 (“Code”) respecting one **DR. JEFFREY TSE**, of the City of Richmond Hill, in the Province of Ontario;

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *Dentistry Act* and Ontario Regulation 853, Regulations of Ontario, 1993, as amended (“Dentistry Act Regulation”).

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, Chapter S.22, as amended; 1993.

To: Dr. Jeffrey Tse  
Richmond Hill Orthodontics  
650 Hwy 7 East, Suite 101  
Richmond Hill ON L4B 2N7

### NOTICE OF HEARING

#### TAKE NOTICE THAT IT IS ALLEGED THAT:

1. You committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the *Code* in that, in 2023 and/or 2024, you contravened a standard of practice or failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession, contrary to paragraph 1 of Section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853/93 under the *Dentistry Act, 1991*, as amended (“*Professional Misconduct Regulation*”).

Particulars:

- You did not retain ES’ clinical and financial records for at least ten years after the date of the last entry in her patient record.
  - You closed your practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without transferring ES’ patient records to a legally authorized successor responsible for maintaining the security of her records and giving her access to her records.
2. You committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the *Code* in that, in 2023 and/or 2024, you discontinued needed dental services without reasonable cause, contrary to paragraph 16 of Section 2 of the *Professional Misconduct Regulation*.

Particulars:

- You closed your practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without notifying your patient, ES, and making provision for her continuing orthodontic care.
3. You committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the *Code* in that, in 2023 and/or 2024, you failed to keep records as required by the

regulations, contrary to paragraph 25 of Section 2 of the *Professional Misconduct Regulation*.

Particulars:

- You did not retain ES' clinical and financial records for at least ten years after the date of the last entry in her patient record.
  - You closed your practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without transferring ES' patient records to a legally authorized successor responsible for maintaining the security of her records and giving her access to her records.
4. You committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the *Code* in that, in 2023 and/or 2024, you failed to reply appropriately or within a reasonable time to a written enquiry made by the College, contrary to paragraph 58 of Section 2 of the *Professional Misconduct Regulation*.

Particulars:

- The College made multiple written attempts to contact you in relation to ES' complaint.
  - You have not responded to any of the College's written enquiries.
5. You committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the *Code* in that, in 2023 and/or 2024, you engaged in conduct or performed an act that, having regards to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical, contrary to paragraph 59 of Section 2 of the *Professional Misconduct Regulation*.

Particulars:

- You closed your practice, Richmond Hill Orthodontics, in or about June 2023, without notifying your patient ES and without making provision for her continuing orthodontic care and access to patient records.
- You did not take reasonable steps to safeguard ES' patient records by transferring them to an appropriate person responsible for maintaining the security and privacy of her records and/or giving her access to her records.
- You have not responded to the College's attempts to speak with you about ES' complaint.
- You are impeding the College's investigation by evading the College's attempts to communicate with you by email, by telephone, by mail and by courier service so the College can investigate ES' concerns.
- Your conduct shows a disregard for the College's regulatory role and a pattern of ungovernability.

Such further and other particulars will be provided from time to time, as they become known.

**AND TAKE NOTICE THAT** the said allegations respecting professional misconduct will be heard and determined by a panel of the Discipline Committee of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario ("panel") on a date and time to be agreed upon by the parties, or on a date to be fixed by the Chair of the Discipline Committee, at the offices of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario, 6 Crescent Road, Toronto, Ontario, M4W 1T1, or by electronic hearing as required. You are required to appear in person or by a legal representative before the panel with your witnesses, if any, at the time and place aforesaid.

ONCE A DATE IS FIXED, IF YOU DO NOT ATTEND ON THE FIXED HEARING DATE, THE PANEL MAY PROCEED IN YOUR ABSENCE AND YOU WILL NOT BE ENTITLED TO ANY

FURTHER NOTICE OF THE PROCEEDINGS. The *Code* provides that if a panel finds that you have committed an act of professional misconduct, it may make an order doing any one or more of the following:

- (1) directing the Registrar to revoke your certificate of registration;
  - (2) directing the Registrar to suspend your certificate of registration for a specified period of time;
  - (3) directing the Registrar to impose specified terms, conditions and limitations on your certificate of registration for a specified or indefinite period of time;
  - (4) requiring you to appear before the panel to be reprimanded;
  - (5) requiring you to pay a fine of not more than \$35,000.00 to the Minister of Finance;
- or any combination thereof.

Furthermore, the *Code* provides that if a panel is of the opinion that the commencement of these proceedings is unwarranted, it may make an order requiring the College to pay all or part of your legal costs.

The *Code* also provides that in an appropriate case, a panel may make an order requiring you, in the event the panel finds you have committed an act or acts of professional misconduct or finds you to be incompetent, to pay all or part of the following costs and expenses:

1. the College's legal costs and expenses;
2. the College's costs and expenses incurred in investigating the matter; and
3. the College's costs and expenses incurred in conducting the hearing.

If you have not done so already, you are entitled to and are well advised to retain legal representation to assist you in this matter.

You are entitled to disclosure of the evidence in this matter in accordance with section 42(1) of the *Code*. You or your representative may contact the prosecutor for the College, Ahmad Mozaffari, in this matter at:

Ahmad Mozaffari  
Steinecke Maciura LeBlanc  
401 Bay Street, Suite 2308, P.O. Box 23  
Toronto, ON M5H 2Y4  
Tel: 416.599.2200  
email: amozaffari@sml-law.com

You, or your legal representative, should familiarize yourself with your disclosure obligations under law, including section 42.1 of the *Code*.

DATED at Toronto, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2025.

Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario