



## Discipline Hearing Summary

### Diaram Deokharan

This matter was heard by a Panel of the Discipline Committee (the “Panel”) of the College of Medical Laboratory Technologists of Ontario (the “College”) on May 27, 2026.

### Allegations

The Allegations against Diaram Deokharan (“the Registrant”) were set out in the Notice of Hearing (“NOH”) dated November 7, 2025, and reads as follows:

At the material times, Diaram Deokharan (the “Registrant”), was a duly registered member of the College of Medical Laboratory Technologists of Ontario (the “College”), working as an instructor at an educational institution in Toronto, Ontario which offers a Medical Laboratory Technology educational program.

1. It is alleged that between in or about 2016 and in or about 2024, the Registrant offered private tutoring classes, for money, to prepare candidates for the National Examination. Many candidates who took the Registrant’s course were internationally educated health professionals enrolled in bridging programs. The Registrant communicated to students that if they took his course, they would pass their exams.
2. The Registrant obtained information about actual questions on the National Examination from students who had recently attempted it. When Exam Questions were obtained, the Registrant then shared that information with students in his tutoring classes who were about to attempt the National Examination, to try to increase their chances of passing the National Examination.

### Alleged Professional Misconduct

1. It is alleged that the above conduct constitutes professional misconduct pursuant to Clause 51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, and as defined in the following paragraph of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 752/93 made under the *Medical Laboratory Technology Act, 1991*:
  - a. Paragraph 20 (Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of medical laboratory technology that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by the members as



- disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional);
- b. Paragraph 24 (Participating in advertising or endorsing a product or service for consideration); and
- c. Paragraph 26 (Practising the profession in a conflict of interest).

### **Registrant's Admission of Professional Misconduct**

The Registrant admitted that the Agreed Facts constitute professional misconduct pursuant to:

1. clause 51(1)(c) of the *Health Professions Procedural Code*, being Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, more particularly, the following paragraphs of section 1 of Ontario Regulation 752/93 under the *Medical Laboratory Technology Act, 1991*:
  - a. Paragraph 20 (Engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of medical laboratory technology that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by the members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional); and/or
  - b. Paragraph 24 (Participating in advertising or endorsing a product or service for consideration); and
  - c. Paragraph 26 (Practising the profession in a conflict of interest).

The Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF") and admission of professional misconduct included a plea inquiry in which the Registrant stated that he understood fully the nature of the allegations against him; understood that by admitting the allegations, he waived his right to require the College to prove the case against him and the right to have a hearing; understood that the decision of the Committee and a summary of its reasons, including reference to his name, would be published in the College's Annual Report and any other publication or website of the College; understood that any agreement between him and the College with respect to the penalty proposed does not bind the Discipline Committee. The Registrant stated that having the opportunity to receive legal advice, executed the ASF and Admission of professional misconduct voluntarily.

### **Penalty**

The Panel was presented with a Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs. The Joint Submission was signed by the Registrant and College counsel and set out the parties'



joint proposal. The Panel accepted the Joint Submission and accordingly made the following order:

1. The Registrant is required to appear before a panel of the Discipline Committee immediately following the hearing of this matter to be reprimanded, with the fact of the reprimand and the text of the reprimand to appear on the public register of the College.
2. The Registrar is directed to suspend the Registrant's certificate of registration for a period of six (6) months, to commence on the date of this Order.
3. The Registrant will provide proof, acceptable to the Registrar, that he has notified any current employer(s) of the decision, by providing any current employer(s) with a copy of the Panel's Order, the Notice of Hearing, the Agreed Statement of Facts, and the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs, within 30 days of the date of this Order.
4. The Registrant is required to pay the College costs in the amount of \$30,000.00, which can be paid in 24 monthly installments of \$1,250.00, with the first payment due 90 days from the date of this Order, and every subsequent payment due monthly.

## **Reprimand**

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Registrant stated that he was prepared to receive the reprimand ordered by the Panel. Accordingly, the panel delivered the reprimand.

The following reprimand was delivered by the Panel:

As Chair of this Panel, and speaking on behalf of the Panel as a whole, I wish to address you directly regarding the seriousness of the findings made in this matter.

As a public member of this Panel, I have come to appreciate the high degree of professionalism, integrity, and responsibility demonstrated by the vast majority of members of this profession. We, as the Panel, know that the public places significant trust in medical laboratory technologists, and that trust depends in part on confidence that those entering the profession have met the required standards honestly, fairly, and through demonstrated competence.

The integrity of the national certification process is foundational to maintaining public confidence in the profession and in the self-regulatory system that governs it.



This was not an isolated lapse in judgement. The conduct occurred over an extended period of time and involved deliberate actions that were inconsistent with the expectation of professionalism, integrity, and ethical conduct expected of members of this profession.

The Panel is particularly concerned that the conduct involved the sharing and use of confidential examination content for personal financial gain, and that it occurred in the context of preparing candidates seeking entry into the profession. Conduct of this nature risks undermining confidence in both the examination process and the profession more broadly.

The penalty is significant and we believe that it will send an unequivocal message to the profession and the public that behaviour such as yours will not be tolerated and will be met with serious consequences.

This Panel hopes that you will take this opportunity to reflect carefully on your professional obligations, the importance of maintaining the integrity of the profession, and the trust placed in Registrants by the public, students, colleagues, and the profession itself.