1	THE LAW SOCIETY OF MANITOBA and
2	ALLAN PHILLIP BAKER
3	REASONS
4	
5	
6	PANEL MEMBERS: G. Mitchell, Q.C. (Chair)
7	K. Bueti
8	K. Molloy
9	
10	
11	COUNSEL FOR THE LAW SOCIETY OF MANITOBA:
12	R. Kravetsky, Esq.
13	
14	COUNSEL FOR THE MEMBER:
15	Self Represented
16	
17	
18	Hearing held at The Law Society of Manitoba,
19	219 Kennedy Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba, February 17, 2017
20	
21	
22	FOUR SEASONS REPORTING
23	91 Ashford Drive
24	Winnipeg, Manitoba R2N 1K7
25	(204) 256-2343



THE CHAIRPERSON: This is a matter of allegations of misconduct against member Allan Phillip
Baker brought by The Law Society relating to the citation dated the 1st of September, 2016, and involves allegations around a particular real estate transaction involving several vendors of property, including L , who is a resident of California and not a resident of Manitoba.

There was an element to the transaction that required that the member deal with any CRA implications of capital gain for a nonresident.

Mr. Baker was aware of the requirement, sent the proper documents to his clients, including the client in California, but did not process the matter with the amount of dispatch that was required in the circumstances, and because of delays there was a CRA penalty and some interest that was owed.

As pointed out by counsel for the Society, there are three elements to the misconduct. One, is the undue delay in processing the transaction; secondly, a failure adequately to communicate to his clients, issues around that delay; and, thirdly, noncompliance with a trust condition that was part of the transaction.

The member has admitted the misconduct. He has explained the circumstances that although it was the first time he had dealt with the issue of a nonresident vendor,

he was aware of what the requirements were, knew what needed to be done, and just delayed getting to it because of perhaps more urgent matters in the rest of his practice.

He has said to us that he is running a sole practice without any administrative support and, in effect, doing everything himself. He keeps tabs on what needs to be done in his practice by maintaining a to-do list, and in this case what needed to be done was on that list but just was neglected for an undue period of time.

Although it is not an insignificant matter in the range of issues that come before the discipline committee, it is at the lower end of the scale of seriousness, and for that reason the Society has agreed with the member, Mr. Baker, that a reprimand, together with an order of costs of \$3,000 would be the appropriate disposition of these charges.

Mr. Kravetsky has explained to us why, from the perspective of The Law Society, it is an adequate penalty, has provided us with precedent cases and sentencing principles to support that, and I think has very fairly given us a balanced picture of the seriousness of the incident, but also the mitigating factors, including the restitution that Mr. Baker has provided and made his client whole for the delay and anxiety that his clients experienced as a result of the way he handled the file.

1	We believe that he has learned from the
2	incident, and from The Law Society while dealing with the
3	incident. We agree that a reprimand is a significant event
4	in the practicing history of a member, and perhaps do not
5	need to say that if there was a similar incident we would
6	not be talking about a reprimand, and there would be a more
7	serious disposition if it happened in a short time.
8	The member has a discipline history, but it is
9	so old that it is probably not material to this incident.
10	So for all of those reasons the panel accepts
11	the recommendation, and orders that Mr. Baker be
12	reprimanded and be ordered to pay costs to the Society in
13	the amount of \$3,000.
14	Because there is a financial element to the
15	disposition I would ask you, Mr. Baker, how much time you
16	might require to fulfil the disposition and pay the costs?
17	MR. BAKER: I would be asking for one year.
18	THE CHAIRPERSON: One year to pay the \$3,000?
19	To February 17, 2018. Do you have any concerns with that,
20	Mr. Kravetsky?
21	MR. KRAVETSKY: I don't, and unless the panel
22	or Mr. Baker require it to be part of the formal
23	disposition, we can deal with it through the CEO's power to
24	extend time. Sometimes that gives us a little more
25	flexibility as the thing goes forward. But, yes, it's

1	certainly acceptable for the Society on that length of time
2	to pay.
3	MS. BUETI: No issue.
4	MR. MOLLOY: That's fine.
5	THE CHAIRPERSON: In that case we will do as
6	you have suggested, Mr. Kravetsky, and leave it to The Law
7	Society to deal with the collection issue, and the record
8	will indicate that Mr. Baker has asked for that year
9	MR. KRAVETSKY: And that the Society has agreed
10	to it.
11	THE CHAIRPERSON: And that the Society has
12	agreed, thank you. Are there any other matters you want us
13	to deal with this morning?
14	MR. KRAVETSKY: I have nothing else.
15	MR. BAKER: No.
16	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for all your work
17	in preparing this, and for your organized way in which you
18	have presented the case in a fair and balanced way. So,
19	good morning to all.
20	MR. KRAVETSKY: Good morning.
21	MR. BAKER: Good morning.
22	
23	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDE AT 10:25 A.M.)
24	

Т	
2	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	
4	
5	I, MIKE BRUCE, Court Reporter, do hereby certify
6	that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 to 5, are a true and
7	accurate transcript of the reasons herein as recorded by me
8	to the best of my skill and ability.
9	
10	m. Bruse
11	Mike Bruce
12	Court Reporter
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

THE PRECEDING 6 PAGES CONSTITUTE THE DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF MANITOBA RENDERED THE 17th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2017, IN THE MATTER OF:

ALLAN PHILLIP BAKER

Grant Mitchell, Q.C., Chair

Katherine Bueti

Kenneth Molloy