The Law Society of Saskatchewan

MAPA MUDIYANSELAGE MAHENDRA BANDARA MAPAGUNARATNE
HEARING DATE: August 17, 2015
DECISION DATE: September 30, 2015
***Law Society of Saskatchewan v. Mapagunaratne*, 2015 SKLSS 7**

IN THE MATTER OF *THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT, 1990*
AND IN THE MATTER OF
MAPA MUDIYANSELAGE MAHENDRA BANDARA MAPAGUNARATNE,
OF TORONTO, ONTARIO

DECISION OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE FOR THE LAW SOCIETY OF SASKATCHEWAN

INTRODUCTION

1. This matter has come before a hearing panel of the Admissions and Education Committee (the "A & E Committee") of the Law Society of Saskatchewan ("LSS") pursuant to Rule 176 of *The Rules of the Law Society of Saskatchewan* ("Rules"). Mr. Mapagunaratne (the "Applicant") has applied to be a Student-at-Law. The Executive Director of the LSS in a letter dated May 27, 2015 referred Mr. Mapagunaratne's application to this hearing panel of the A & E Committee to determine whether Mr. Mapagunaratne meets the suitability requirements of the Rules and whether his admission as a Student-at-Law is inimical to the best interests of the public, the members or would harm the standing of the legal profession generally, as set out in Rule 176 of the *Rules*.

FACTS

2. Much of the evidence considered by this panel of the A & E Committee is undisputed and found in a partial Agreed Statement of Facts and Admission, dated August 5, 2015.

3. Mr. Mapagunaratne was previously a lawyer in Sri Lanka for approximately 12 years prior to his immigration to Canada in or around 2007.

4. In 2012, Mr. Mapagunaratne became a permanent resident of Canada.

5. Since 2010, Mr. Mapagunaratne has been employed by a lawyer in the City of Toronto, Ontario.

6. In August, 2012, Mr. Mapagunaratne obtained a Certificate of Qualification from the National Committee on Accreditation for the Federation of Law Societies of Canada.

7. After obtaining his Certificate of Qualification, Mr. Mapagunaratne unsuccessfully took the Law Society of Upper Canada licencing examinations. He had obtained an exemption from the articling requirement from the Law Society of Upper Canada.

8. After failing to pass the Law Society of Upper Canada's licensing examinations, Mr. Mapagunaratne brought an application dated August 27, 2013 for admission as a student-at-law to the Law Society of Manitoba. Mr. Mapagunaratne indicated that he decided to seek admission to the Law Society of Manitoba because it was a CPLED jurisdiction, as opposed to an examination-based jurisdiction. The Applicant indicates that the examination format employed by the Law Society of Upper Canada was foreign to him and that CPLED was more consistent with what he was accustomed to in Sri Lanka.

9. In a letter dated September 1, 2013, Mr. Mapagunaratne sought an exemption from the Manitoba CPLED program and the articling requirement. Mr. Richard Porcher, Director of Admissions and Membership of the Law Society of Manitoba, wrote to the Applicant on September 12, 2013 explaining that, even if Mr. Mapagunaratne were exempted from Manitoba's usual bar admission requirements he would still be required to practice under the supervision of a member of the Law Society of Manitoba.

10. A series of emails were thereafter exchanged between Mr. Porcher and the Applicant. Mr. Porcher continued to advise the Applicant that, should he obtain an exemption from the articling requirement, he would be required to practice under the supervision of a member of the Law Society of Manitoba. Mr. Porcher further indicated that a supervisor would not be able to fulfill their duties online.

11. Notwithstanding the emails from Mr. Porcher advising the Applicant that no final decisions with respect to an exemption from articling had been made and that, if the Applicant obtained an exemption from the articling requirement, the Applicant would need to be employed by a supervisor who was a member of the Law Society of Manitoba.

12. On September 18, 2013, the Applicant wrote to a Winnipeg lawyer and indicated, *inter alia*:

a. The Law Society of Manitoba had shown an inclination to exempt him from articling;
b. The process of his Application to become a Student-at-Law had been stalled since he did not have a supervisor;
c. Unless he obtained a supervisor within a week, he would not be able to catch up missed CPLED modules;
d. Being a supervisor would only involve occasional meetings for around 15 to 20 minutes until CPLED was over.

13. In an email of September 19, 2013, the Applicant wrote again to the same lawyer in Winnipeg and indicated:

a. He had received an exemption from articling; and
b. As a supervisor, the lawyer would not be required to employ the Applicant.

14. The Applicant sent similar email correspondence to at least two other lawyers in Winnipeg.

15. The Applicant's emails were reported to the Law Society of Manitoba. Mr. Porcher ultimately concluded in a decision dated October 23, 2013, that the Applicant's admission as a student-at-law to the Law Society of Manitoba was denied on the ground that he had failed to rebut the presumption that he is not of good moral character and a fit and proper person to be admitted. The principal issue was the misleading emails sent by the Applicant to counsel in Winnipeg.

16. The Applicant appealed Mr. Porcher's decision to a panel of the admissions and education committee of the Law Society of Manitoba (the "Manitoba Hearing Panel"). In a decision dated May 7, 2014, the Manitoba Hearing Panel denied the Applicant's appeal finding no error on the part of Mr. Porcher and further finding that the Applicant had failed to rebut the presumption that the Applicant is not a person of good moral character and a fit and proper person to be admitted.

17. Before the Manitoba Hearing Panel's decision had been rendered, on January 20, 2014, the Applicant brought an application to be admitted as a student-at-law in Saskatchewan.

18. In completing the Application for Admission as Student-at-Law, Form A-1, the Applicant answered one of the questions as follows:

> 6)(c) Have you been refused admission as a student-at-law or articling clerk in any other jurisdiction?
>
> Yes ☐ No ☑
>
> (If answered in the affirmative, give full details on a separate sheet).

19. The answer to this question is clearly false. Yet, the Applicant solemnly declared the truth and completeness of the information given in Form A-1 and the same was properly notarized.

20. The Applicant's application for admission to the LSS was approved. The Applicant started the CPLED course and completed two modules. In May, 2014, Ms. Jody Martin, the Deputy Director of Admissions and Education for the Law Society of Saskatchewan, discovered the Applicant's history in Manitoba and the inaccurate responses given on Form A-1. As a result, Ms. Martin revoked the Applicant's status as a student-at-law. The Applicant was advised of the decision by way of a letter dated May 28, 2014. The Applicant did not seek a judicial review of the decision of Ms. Martin.

21. The Applicant re-applied to seek status as a student-at-law on May 26, 2015. His application has been referred to this hearing panel of the A & E Committee for consideration.

22. After the hearing and with the consent of counsel for the LSS, the Applicant filed a letter from John Erickson, dated September 17, 2015. The hearing panel has reviewed and considered this letter in reaching its decision.

III. PRELIMINARY ISSUE

23. The Applicant brought a preliminary application requesting a publication ban or, alternatively, anonymization of the decision. Some of the arguments advanced by the Applicant are:

a. The Law Society of Manitoba anonymizes their admissions and education decisions, including the appellate decision of May 7, 2014;
b. Anonymizing the decision allows him a certain level of privacy;
c. Publication of the decision would affect his reputation and his ability to find future employment; and
d. As a non-member of the LSS and a member of the public, his privacy interests are different than members of the LSS.

24. Mr. Huber, on behalf of the LSS, opposes the application for a publication ban or anonymization of the decision. He argues:

a. Rule 184 of the Rules provides that A & E Committee hearings are to be held in public and anonymizing the decision runs counter to the "public" nature of the hearing;
b. The standard practice of the LSS is to publish the names of parties in A & E Committee decisions. He points to the decisions in *LSS v. Burns*, 2013 LSS 3, and *LSS v. DeMaria* (2011);
c. The Applicant was able to obtain admission to the LSS in 2014 in part because the decision of the Law Society of Manitoba was anonymous; and
d. There is no compelling reason to anonymize the decision. The principal concern of the LSS is the protection of the public and the anonymization of the decision runs counter to that goal.

25. At the hearing of this matter, the Hearing Panel advised the Applicant that the application for anonymization was denied with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

26. In the professional regulation context, there have been a number of decisions where regulators have considered the issues of publication bans and anonymizing decisions. Those decisions have generally concluded that:

a. The onus lies on the Applicant to justify the publication ban or the anonymization of the decision;
b. The justification for such requests must go beyond private embarrassment or emotional distress; and
c. To obtain an order, an applicant must demonstrate that:
    i. an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to the administration of justice; and
    ii. the benefits outweigh the effects on the right to free expression and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

See, for example, *LSUC v. Xynnis*, 2014 ONLSAP 9, paragraphs 32 to 34 and *C.(J.) v. Health Professions Review Board*, 2014 BCSC 372, paragraphs 13 to 26.

27. A publication ban or an order granting an anonymization of a decision has been described as an "exceptional" order: *F.(V.) v. T.(S.)*, 2010 BCSC 1874, paragraph 19.

28. In the case at bar, the Applicant has not demonstrated that there is anything exceptional or extraordinary that would justify a publication ban or anonymization of the decision. The concerns of the Applicant are private concerns of embarrassment and the effect on his professional reputation. Those concerns are found in virtually any case involving professional regulators and their members or applicants for membership. To accede to the Applicant's request, any member or applicant would be justified in seeking anonymity because they would face personal embarrassment.

29. The primary duties of the LSS, as enshrined in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of *The Legal Profession Act*, are to act in the public interest and to protect the interest of the public. Publication of decisions allows the public to see that the LSS is meeting its obligations as a self-governing profession. Thus, publication provides a certain degree of accountability and transparency to the LSS, which is necessary to fulfill the LSS's mandate.

30. Given that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to the administration of justice, his request for a publication ban or anonymization is denied.

IV. THE APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION

A. The Applicable Rules and Interpretation of those Rules

31. The portions of the Rules applicable to the case at bar state:

> 176. (1) This section applies to the following applications in this Part of the Rules:
>
> (a) admission as a Student-at-law;
>
> …
>
> (2) In any application under this Part, applicants have the onus of proving that:
>
> (a) they are Suitable to Practise;
>
> (b) they are competent to perform the required duties, as applicable; and
>
> (c) granting the application would not be inimical to the public interest or the members and would not harm the standing of the legal profession generally.

32. The term "Suitable to Practice" is defined in Rule 149, which states:

> "Suitability to Practise" means honesty, governability, financial responsibility and respect for the rule of law and the administration of justice and "suitable to practice" has a corresponding meaning.

33. As set out above, the Applicant has the onus of establishing that he meets the requirements of Rule 176(2)(a) to (c). The primary issues in this particular case are:

a. Honesty;
b. Respect for the administration of justice;
c. Governability; and
d. Whether granting the application would be inimical to the public interest or the members and would harm the standing of the legal profession generally.

34. The test, set out at Rule 176(2), is wider in scope than the traditional "good character" requirement found in other jurisdictions, although good character is certainly part of the consideration. The Honourable Madam Justice Schwann in *Demaria v. Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2013 SKQB 178, described the "inimical to the public interest or the members" test as follows:

> 61 … [A]ssessment of good character must be undertaken with the primary object of public interest and protection in mind viewed through the touchstones of integrity, knowledge, skill, proficiency and competence.
> …
> 63 While Rule 180(1)(b) does not specifically invoke the words "good character", I agree with the Law Society's submission that consideration of good character inherently lies within this broad spectrum of inquiry. The breadth of this Rule directs the Law Society to consider and assess whether prospective applicants could be harmful to the interests of the public or the standing of the profession.

35. The wider scope of the "inimical to the public interest or the members" test was described in *Law Society of Saskatchewan v. Burns*, 2013 SKLSS 3, as follows:

> 82. No case law has been provided to this Committee that helps define the factors to be considered in assessing whether an applicant's admission to the legal profession or as a student-at-law is "inimical to the best interests of the public or the members or would harm the standing of the legal profession generally". However, the purpose of the admissions process, like discipline, is to ensure public protection, the maintenance of professional standards and generating public respect for and confidence in the legal system and lawyers who are integral to that system. Therefore, without limiting the various factors that a panel may take into account, it is open for this Committee to consider Mr. Burns' competence, his integrity and his demonstrated judgment or lack thereof in his interactions with members of the public and the legal profession.

36. Thus, the mandate of this hearing panel is to determine whether the Applicant has met the onus of establishing that he meets the test of good character, as well as determining whether there are other factors that would make his admission inimical to the interests of the public or the members.

B. The Factors Relevant to "Good Character"

37. What constitutes good character has been considered on a number of occasions. In *Birman v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2006 ONLSCHP 0032*, the hearing panel made the following comments about assessing good character:

> [12] Because the Act contemplates that a person's character may change, it of course, follows that misconduct may demonstrate the absence of good character when that misconduct occurred, but not necessarily at a later date when the application for admission is brought or considered. Accordingly, even where misconduct has been admitted or otherwise proven, the Panel needs to consider, inter alia:
>
> (a) the nature and duration of the misconduct;
> (b) whether the applicant is remorseful;
> (c) what rehabilitative efforts, if any, have been taken, and the success of such efforts; and
> (d) the applicant's conduct since the proven misconduct.

38. A hearing panel is to consider the character of an applicant at the date of the hearing. As noted above, good character may change over time and a hearing panel can consider rehabilitative efforts. As noted in *Law Society of Upper Canada v. Preyra,* 2000 CanLII 24383 (ON LST):

> The onus is on the applicant to prove that he is of good character at the time of the hearing of the application. The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. The relevant test is not whether there is too great a risk of future abuse by the applicant of the public trust, but whether the applicant has established his good character at the time of the hearing on a balance of probabilities. The test does not require perfection of certainty. The applicant need not provide a warranty or assurance that he will never again breach the public trust. The issue is his character today, not the risk of his re-offending.
>
> It is important not to confuse the good character requirement for admission with notions about forgiveness or about giving an applicant a second chance. The admissions panel is not in the forgiveness business, the test to be applied is clear, and the admissions panel is to determine if the applicant is of good character today. *The Law Society Act* does not permit an admissions panel to apply any test other than that relating to the applicant's good character at the time of the hearing.

39. The hearing panel agrees with counsel for the LSS that a person's character does not change overnight. A hearing panel must consider the length of time between the misconduct and the application or hearing and determine whether enough time has passed and enough efforts at rehabilitation have been made in order to say that an individual's character has changed since any prior misconduct.

40. It is noted, for example, that Alan Preyra, the applicant in the aforementioned decision, was admitted as a student-at-law in 2003 after having been denied in 2000. In the 2003 decision

(*Law Society of Upper Canada v. Preyra*, 2003 CanLII 48959), Mr. Preyra was able to demonstrate that he had changed his life, made significant rehabilitative efforts and showed exemplary behaviour for almost four years. Mr. Preyra was able to demonstrate his good character at the time of his second application and, thus, was admitted to the Law Society of Upper Canada.

C. The Applicant's Position and Argument

41. The Applicant invited the hearing panel to consider several factors in assessing whether he met the test for admission to the LSS:

a. In Manitoba, the Applicant acknowledges misrepresenting his status with the Law Society of Manitoba to prospective employers. The Applicant indicates that he was acting out of fear of not obtaining the services of a supervisor. He was concerned about not becoming a lawyer in Canada and improving his economic situation;

b. While the Applicant admits that he acted untruthfully in Manitoba and regrets having done so, the Applicant indicates that the situation is completely different in Saskatchewan. The Applicant indicates that his failure to properly complete Form A-1 in his January 20, 2014 application to the LSS and to disclose his issues with the Law Society of Manitoba was not deliberate. Rather he says that he did not read all of the questions on the LSS form. He simply ticked all of the boxes "no" and did not read the questions after the first part of the form. The Applicant invited the hearing panel to contact the notary public who would allegedly confirm that the Applicant did not read the questions. The Applicant indicates that he is disappointed in his "lack of care" in completing the LSS application for admission;

c. The Applicant has taken remedial measures to address the issues that caused him to act in the manner that he did in Manitoba. In 2015, the Applicant successfully completed a 12-week paralegal course in Ontario through George Brown College entitled "Ethics and Professional Responsibility". The Applicant further attended an Ethics Forum presented jointly by the Canadian Bar Association and the Federation of Law Societies of Canada in March, 2015;

d. There has been a 2-year gap since the Applicant had his issues in Manitoba. The Applicant indicates that he has had time to reflect on his behaviour. Further, he has spoken to his employer and mentor, a lawyer in Toronto, about the importance of due diligence, due care and attention in every task in the legal profession;

e. The Applicant thought it notable that he was co-operative while he was attending CPLED, particularly in his dealings with Jody Martin;

f. The Applicant has been truthful with potential employers in Saskatchewan about his status and the fact that he desires to reside in Ontario following (or perhaps during) articles;

g. There were several letters presented to the hearing panel from lawyers in Ontario who attested to the Applicant's integrity, candour, courtesy and professionalism.

D. Decision of the Committee

42. The hearing panel does not consider the Applicant to have met the onus of establishing that he is Suitable to Practice, as defined in the Rules, or that his admission would not be inimical to the interests of the public or the members and would not harm the standing of the legal profession generally.

43. The Applicant in the recent past has had two significant issues with law societies that call into question his integrity, respect for the administration of justice and governability. The Applicant admits having acted inappropriately in Manitoba. However, the Applicant fails to appreciate the seriousness of failing to advise the LSS of his prior issues in Manitoba when seeking admission in 2014.

44. As noted in *Law Society of Saskatchewan v. Kumar*, 2013 SKLSS 4:

> It goes without saying that in situations where the Member has provided false or misleading information to the Law Society, the Society's ability to regulate the profession and to govern its membership in accordance with its statutory mandate is obstructed. Furthermore, regulatory bodies cannot protect the public in any meaningful way if they are not privy to accurate information concerning their Members. From the viewpoint of the Membership in a professional society, the issue is one of integrity. Members must be candid and honest in dealing with their professional society in order to enable the society to function. The importance of integrity in the practice of law cannot be understated and as stated in the Law Society of Saskatchewan's Code of Professional Conduct commentary to Chapter 1, "Integrity is the fundamental quality of any person who seeks to practise as a member of the legal profession." and "The principle of integrity is a key element of each rule of the Code." It should be noted that it is not necessarily every false or misleading admission or omission that will automatically lead to severe penalties but serious breaches of integrity should result in serious penalties in order to maintain the integrity of the legal profession and the public's confidence in it.

45. The Applicant indicates that his actions in Saskatchewan were not deliberate. However, Form A-1 is a solemn declaration sworn or affirmed in front of a notary public. The Applicant's assertion that he simply did not read several questions is not credible. In determining that the Applicant's position is not credible, consideration was given to the following factors:

a. The Applicant had recently undergone an extensive hearing process in Manitoba and, as a result, would have been well aware of the importance of candour in dealing with law societies and the profession, generally;
b. The Applicant had answered questions appropriately throughout the rest of the form and provided the documents that were called for in Form A-1, which suggests that he had read the form in question; and

c. The document is a sworn declaration, which the Applicant would have reasonably known was required to be read in order to provide truthful answers.

46. Furthermore, even if the Applicant's position was accepted, it would call into question the Applicant's integrity, as he could not possibly affirm or swear to the contents of the form if he had not read the same. The fact that he would make a sworn declaration without reading the form would also demonstrate a lack of respect for the administration of justice.

47. The hearing panel, after considering the evidence and the decision from Manitoba, concludes that the Applicant deliberately sought to avoid advising the LSS of the Law Society of Manitoba decision to deny his application as a student-at-law in an effort to gain entrance in Saskatchewan. Accordingly, there remain today issues with integrity and suitability.

48. The Applicant's efforts at rehabilitation are commendable. However, the extent of those efforts is certainly not as substantial as in the case of *Preyra*, *supra*. Thus, those efforts do not give the hearing panel comfort that the Applicant now meets the test of "good character".

49. A further consideration for the hearing panel is that the issues of integrity have occurred quite recently. The false statements on the Saskatchewan application were made on January 20, 2014.

V. CONCLUSION

50. Having regard to the onus on Mr. Mapagunaratne and the evidence as outlined above, the Committee finds that Mr. Mapagunaratne has not met the onus of establishing that he is Suitable to Practice or that his admission would not be "inimical to the best interests of the public, the members or the standing of the legal profession" pursuant to Rule 176.

51. As a result, the Applicant's application for admission as a student-at-law is dismissed.

DATED at the City of Saskatoon, Province of Saskatchewan, this 30th day of September, 2015

_Sean M. Sinclair, Chair_____

_Heather J. Laing, Q.C._____

_Joel A. Hesje, Q.C._____

PARTIAL AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS AND ADMISSIONS

In relation to the Reapplication for Admission as a Student at Law Dated May 26th, 2015.

JURISDICTION

52. This proceeding arises out of an application by MAPA MUDIYANSELAGE MAHENDRA BANDARA MAPAGUNARATNE (the "Applicant") for Admission as a Student

at Law (the "Current Application") pursuant to Law Society of Saskatchewan Rule 151. By letter dated May 27, 2015 [**Tab 1**], the Executive Director of the Law Society of Saskatchewan referred the Current Application to the Admissions And Education Committee for a hearing pursuant to Rule 176(5)(d). The referral was occasioned by the Executive Director's knowledge of the Applicant's past involvement with the Law Society of Manitoba wherein the Applicant was denied entry as a student at law and further involvement with the Law Society of Saskatchewan which resulted in the Applicant's student at law status being revoked.

53. The circumstances surrounding the Applicant's past involvement with the Law Society of Manitoba and the revocation of his student at law status in Saskatchewan are the focus of the current proceeding and the assessment of the Current Application. Those circumstances are fully set out in this Agreed Statement of Facts and the attached documentation. The majority of the relevant documentation pertaining to this matter is contained within the Current Application filed by the Applicant dated May 26, 2015 [**Tab 2**]. The pages comprising Tab 2 are numbered consecutively from 1 to 129 at the top center of each page for ease of reference.

THE MANITOBA APPLICATION

54. The Applicant's difficulties arose first in Manitoba where on or about September 1, 2013, he applied for Admission as an Articling Student into the CPLED Program. As part of the Applicants Manitoba application he sought an exemption from the Articling requirement based on Foreign Practising Experience. The Applicant had made contact with the Director of Admissions and Membership, Richard Porcher at this time and had communications with him. Various details concerning the Applicant's Manitoba Applications, including supervision requirements associated with his commencement in Manitoba, were provided to the Applicant by Mr. Porcher in emails between September 12, 2013 and September 18, 2013. The Applicant received all of these emails and the information contained therein. As of September 18, 2013 the Applicant's matter was undetermined and Mr. Porcher suggested that the Applicant not contact any possible supervisors until decisions were made in relation to his application.

55. After receiving the emails from Mr. Porcher, the Applicant proceeded to email several Winnipeg lawyers on September 18 and 19, 2013 in an effort to secure a supervisor. In those emails the Applicant provided incorrect information to the recipients as to his status with the Law Society of Manitoba and in relation to the supervision requirements that Mr. Porcher had outlined.

56. Mr. Porcher became aware of the Applicant's correspondence to potential supervisors and came to the conclusion that the Applicant had been misleading. Mr. Porcher rendered a formal decision dated October 23, 2013 [**Page 35 of Tab 2**] in relation to the Applicant's Manitoba Application. The Applicant's Manitoba Application for admission as an articling student was denied on the basis of the Applicant's failure to meet the good character and fitness to practice requirement.

57. The Applicant appealed the decision of Mr. Porcher on October 27, 2013. The appeal was initially set to commence on December 18, 2013 but was adjourned and ultimately proceeded on February 13, 2014. In a written decision dated May 7, 2014 [**Page 88 of Tab 2**]

the Appeal Panel confirmed the decision of Mr. Porcher and refused to grant the Applicant status as a student.

58. The full details of the circumstances surrounding the denial of the Manitoba Application are contained in the Porcher decision and the Appeal Panel decision and are relied upon in the context of the Current Application and the current proceeding. Additional materials filed as part of the Applicant's current application package provide the Applicant's own position in relation to the Manitoba matters.

APPLICATION TO THE LAW SOCIETY OF SASKATCHEWAN IN 2014

59. On or about January 20, 2014 the Applicant signed and submitted an Application for Admission as a Student at Law with the Law Society of Saskatchewan (the "Original Application") [**Page 46 of Tab 2**]. At the time of his completing and filing of his Original Application in Saskatchewan, the Applicant had received the decision from Mr. Porcher denying his entry as a student at law in Manitoba on the basis of bad character. His appeal in relation to the Porcher decision was pending.

60. When the Applicant completed the Original Application the answered "No" to question 5(b) which reads as follows:

> **Have you been denied or revoked any license or permit, the procurement of which required proof of good moral character?**

61. When the Applicant completed the Original Application the answered "No" to question 6(c) which reads as follows:

> **Have you been refused admission as a student-at-law or articling clerk in any other jurisdiction?**

62. On the basis of his Original Application, including the inaccurate responses to questions 5(b) and 6(c), the Applicant was admitted as a student-at-law in Saskatchewan. The Applicant started the CPLED course and completed two modules. In May of 2014, Jody Martin, the Deputy Director of Admissions and Education for the Law Society of Saskatchewan, discovered the Applicant's history in Manitoba and the inaccurate responses on the Original Application. After this discovery, Ms. Martin revoked the Applicant's status as a student at law and advised the Applicant of her decision by way of a letter dated May 28, 2014 [**Tab 3**]. The Applicant did not seek a judicial review of the decision of Ms. Martin. Instead, the Applicant waited approximately one year before bringing the Current Application at Tab 2.