

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee
(the Committee)**

(Information is available about the complaints process [here](#) and about the Committee [here](#))

**Dr. Celeste Thirlwell (CPSO #76629)
Psychiatry
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The College received information raising concerns about the Respondent's practice, particularly regarding her compliance with the requirements of her specified education and remediation program (SCERP) and the interim order imposed on her practice under section 25.4 of the Code (the Order). Subsequently, the Committee approved the Registrar's appointment of investigators to conduct a broad review of the Respondent's practice.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of March 26, 2026. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to the importance of complying with educational requirements and interim measures ordered by the Committee.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

At a meeting in July 2021, the Committee directed that the Respondent complete a SCERP that required, among other things, that she maintain a log of all third-party reports she wrote.

In January 2024, the College received information from a third party involved in a landlord-tenant dispute, indicating that the Respondent had written letters on behalf of the tenant involved in the Landlord and Tenant Tribunal matter, who was her patient. The individual provided the College with copies of the letters the Respondent had written.

The College requested the Respondent's third-party report log to confirm that the letters the Respondent had written for the tenant were entered in the log. The two letters the College had received were not noted in the logs the Respondent provided. The Respondent advised the College that the omission was an oversight.

In November 2021, the Committee made an interim order under section 25.4(7) of the Code that required the Respondent to keep a log of all patient encounters (including in-

person, telemedicine and virtual encounters) and provide it to the College every two weeks.

Upon the request of the College in April 2024, the Respondent provided a list of all cannabis referrals she had written. From this list the College investigator selected 50 patients for review. The College also received the third-party referral letters for the patients selected, which included the date of the encounter and the date of the referral.

In May 2024, College staff compared the dates of the cannabis third-party referral letters with the logs required by the Order (all patient encounters) and the SCERP third-party report log. Staff found that none of the cannabis referral letter patients appeared on the logs required by the Order. Of the 50 cannabis referral patients:

- 30 patients did not appear on the SCERP third-party log
- 18 patients did appear on the SCERP third-party log
- The names of two patients matched names on the SCERP third-party log but for different dates of referral.

The Committee was of the view that the investigation provided clear indication that the Respondent did not comply with the requirement of the SCERP that she maintain a log of all third-party reports she wrote. Similarly, it was apparent to the Committee from the available information that the Respondent did not comply with the requirement under the Order that she maintain logs of all patient encounters.

The Committee was concerned about the Respondent's understanding of the importance of complying with educational requirements and interim measures ordered by the Committee and decided to require the Respondent to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned in this regard.

The Committee considered a more significant disposition in this matter, including referral to the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal, and might have chosen this option if the Respondent's certificate of registration had not already been revoked.

The Committee also noted that the concerns identified in the investigation would be relevant to any future consideration of the Respondent's suitability to practise. Should the Respondent apply for reinstatement of her certificate of registration, the issues raised in this investigation will be considered in all subsequent registration-related proceedings.