DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE
ONTARIO COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

Indexed as: Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Kaitlyn Braun, 2026 ONCSWSSW 10

Date: 20260908

BETWEEN:

THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

- and -

KAITLYN BRAUN

PANEL:	Kimberley Westfall-Connor	Chair, Community Appointee
	Charlene Crews	Professional Member
	Carina Chan	Public Member

Appearances: Amy Block and Natasha Novac, counsel for the College
Kaitlyn Braun, the Registrant, self-represented
Andrea Gonsalves, Independent Legal Counsel to the Panel

Heard: August 10, 2026

DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION

[1] This matter came on for hearing by videoconference before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the "**Panel**") of the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (the "**College**") on August 10, 2026. The Panel announced our decision on the misconduct allegations, penalty and costs orally on the record at the hearing. These are our reasons for decision.

[2] The Registrant, Kaitlyn Braun, participated in the hearing by videoconference and was self-represented. She was accompanied by Sabrina Hallard, a member of her treatment team, whose presence was intended to facilitate the Registrant's compliance with conditions of her criminal sentence restricting her access to computers and devices with internet access. College counsel confirmed that it had no concerns with Ms. Hallard's attendance in that capacity, and the Panel was satisfied that her presence did not raise any procedural concern.

Publication ban

[3] At the outset of the hearing, College counsel advised that the material to be filed in this proceeding, including certified transcripts of the Registrant's related criminal proceedings, identifies certain of the Registrant's victims, and that a publication ban had been ordered in those criminal proceedings under s. 486.4 of the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46, protecting the identities of six of those victims. College counsel requested that the Panel order a publication ban mirroring the ban made in the criminal proceedings. The Registrant did not oppose the request.

[4] The Panel ordered a publication ban prohibiting the publication of any information that could disclose the identities of the six victims protected by the ban made in the criminal proceedings. Consistent with that order, and with the manner in which the parties' materials were prepared, we have not identified any of the Registrant's victims by name in these reasons.

The allegations

[5] In a Notice of Hearing dated June 18, 2024, Ms. Braun is alleged to be guilty of professional misconduct pursuant to the *Social Work and Social Service Work Act*, 1998, SO 1998, c 31 (the "**Act**") in that she is alleged to have engaged in conduct that contravenes the Act, Ontario Regulation 384/00 (the "**Professional Misconduct Regulation**"), Schedule "A" to By-law No. 66 of the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers, being the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers Code of Ethics (the "**Code of Ethics**"), and Schedule "B" to By-law No. 66 of the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers, being the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers Standards of Practice Handbook.

[6] The factual particulars of the allegations against the Registrant, as set out in the Notice of Hearing, are as follows:

> 1. You are, and were at all times relevant to the allegations, a registered social worker with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (the "College").
>
> 2. In or between June 2022 and March 2023, you engaged in conduct that was deceitful, misleading and/or dishonest, including:
>
> (a) engaging in conduct under false pretences that included that you had been sexually assaulted, that you were pregnant, and/or that you were experiencing a miscarriage or stillbirth;
>
> (b) obtaining services, or doula services, for support for a pregnancy that you knew to be false;
>
> (c) while you were naked or partially naked, you coerced a doula to perform a massage on you, including on your back or buttocks;
>
> (d) while you were shirtless, you used a breast pump in front of a doula;
>
> (e) you sent a photo of a stillborn baby to a doula that was providing services for support for a pregnancy that you knew to be false; and/or

(f) you, by deceit, falsehood, or other fraudulent means, defrauded one or more persons or doulas by not paying for services they provided.

3. In or between February 2023 and September 2023,[1] you engaged in conduct that was deceitful, misleading and/or dishonest, including:

   (a) you unlawfully caused a peace officer to enter upon an investigation by making a false statement that accused another person of having committed an offence;

   (b) you falsely accused a person of sexual assault;

   (c) you went to the Brantford General Hospital and had a sexual assault evidence kit performed on you when you had not, in fact, been sexually assaulted; and,

   (d) you provided a false statement to a peace officer while under oath.

4. On or about December 7, 2023, you pled guilty to, and were found guilty of, criminal offences contrary to sections 140(1)(a), 173(1)(b), 362(1)(a), and 380(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*, RSC 1985, c C-46 (the "*Criminal Code of Canada*"). These included:

   (a) one (1) count of public mischief contrary to s. 140(1)(a) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*;

   (b) four (4) counts of doing an indecent act contrary to s. 173(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*;

   (c) eleven (11) counts of obtaining by false pretense contrary to s. 362(1)(a) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*; and,

   (d) five (5) counts of fraud contrary to s. 380(1)(b) of the *Criminal Code of Canada*.

5. The criminal offences involved thirteen (13) victims. The doula victims were located in Ontario, Alberta, and/or the United States of America. The doula victims suffered emotionally, mentally, and/or financially as a result of your conduct.

6. On or about February 14, 2024, you received a conditional sentence of two years less one day on all convictions, concurrently, followed by three years of probation. You were required, as part of your conditional sentence, to be confined to your home and not to possess or use any computer or device with internet access (including access to social media applications), among other things.

[7] The College alleges in the Notice of Hearing that, by reason of engaging in some or all of the conduct outlined above, the Registrant is guilty of professional misconduct as set out in ss. 26(2)(a) and (c) of the Act, as follows:

[1] The Notice of Hearing reads "In or between September 2023 and February 2023...". Based on common sense and on the evidence in the ASF, the Panel understands this to be a simple administrative error in that the two months, February 2023 and September 2023, were inadvertently transposed. We have made the correction in these reasons. The error did not affect the Panel's decision and the parties were in agreement

(a) In that you violated **Section 2.28 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation** by contravening the Act or regulations or by-laws.

(b) In that you violated **Section 2.29 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation** by contravening a federal, provincial or territorial law or a municipal by-law in circumstances where the purpose of the law or by-law is to protect public health and/or is relevant to your suitability to practise.

(c) In that you violated **Section 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation** by engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the profession that, having regard to all circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable and/or unprofessional.

Registrant's position

[8] The Registrant admitted each of the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing. The Panel conducted an oral plea inquiry at the hearing. In addition, in the Agreed Statement of Facts filed by the parties , the Registrant confirmed her understanding of the nature of the allegations against her, that she was voluntarily admitting to the allegations, and that she understood the consequences of doing so. The Panel was satisfied that the Registrant's admission was voluntary, informed and unequivocal.

The evidence

[9] The evidence was tendered by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts ("**ASF**"). Before the ASF was marked as an exhibit, College counsel brought two corrections to the Panel's attention, which the Panel made on the record with the Registrant's agreement. The relevant parts of the ASF, incorporating those corrections, are as follows:

A. Background

1. At all relevant times, Kaitlyn Braun (the "**Registrant**") was a social worker registered with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (the "**College**").

2. The Registrant obtained a Bachelor's Degree in Social Work from Wilfrid Laurier University in 2020. She first registered with the College as a Social Worker on December 15, 2020.

3. From October 21, 2021 to July 18, 2022, the Registrant was employed at Haldimand & Norfolk Women's Services ("**HNWS**") as a "Residential Counsellor."

B. Events Prior to the Registrant's Criminal Convictions

4. On August 17, 2022, the College received a report of termination regarding the Registrant from HNWS. The report outlined various concerns from the reporter regarding the Registrant's conduct while employed at HNWS, including concerns that she had made an inappropriate/threatening comment to a colleague and fabricated and/or lied about several things, including telling the organization that her mother was in a coma and later died.

5. Beginning in October of 2022, the College began receiving information from doulas citing concerns that the Registrant had been faking pregnancy and/or labour and obtaining services from them under false pretences.

6. On March 15, 2023, the College received a report by email from Constable Victoria Logan of the Brantford Police Service, advising that a number of criminal charges had been laid against the Registrant.

C. The Registrant's Criminal Convictions

7. On December 7, 2023, the Registrant pled guilty to, and was ultimately convicted of, the following twenty one (21) criminal charges:

   (a) four (4) counts of doing an indecent act with an intent to insult or offend contrary to section 173(1)(b) of the Criminal Code of Canada, RSC 1985, c C-46 (the "Criminal Code");

   (b) eleven (11) counts of obtaining by false pretenses with intent to defraud contrary to s. 362(1)(a) of the Criminal Code;

   (c) five (5) counts of fraud under $5,000.00 contrary to section 380(1)(b) of the Criminal Code; and

   (d) one (1) count of public mischief contrary to section 140(1)(a) of the Criminal Code.

8. The criminal convictions set out at paragraph 7 of this Agreed Statement of Facts are based upon the facts read by Crown Attorney Joshua Mociak into the record in the transcript of proceedings held on December 7, 2023 (the "Admitted Facts"). A certified copy of the December 7, 2023 transcript of proceedings, including the Admitted Facts, is attached at Tab "A" to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

9. The Registrant admits each of the Admitted Facts as set out in the December 7, 2023 transcript of proceedings, without amendment or alteration, for the purposes of this Agreed Statement of Facts.

D. Background to the Registrant's Criminal Convictions

10. As set out in the Admitted Facts, the Registrant's criminal conduct occurred over the period between June 2022 and March 2023. The Registrant entered her guilty plea willingly and was aware of the implications of doing so.

    (a) Convictions for indecent acts, obtaining by false pretences, and fraud

11. The Registrant's criminal convictions arising from Information #0211-998-23-21000992 dated March 31, 2023 ("Information #1") are the counts described at subparagraphs 7(a)-(c), above and are convictions for committing indecent acts, obtaining by false pretences, and fraud. A certified copy of Information #1 is appended at Tab "B" to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

12. These convictions involved twelve (12) doula victims located in Ontario, Alberta and the United States.

13. A doula is an individual who provides guidance and emotional support to a person during labour, whether virtually or in person.

14. During the relevant time period, and as set out in the Admitted Facts, the Registrant wilfully sought the assistance of doulas for false pregnancies/stillbirths resulting from alleged sexual assault(s). In particular, the Registrant obtained services from the doulas under false pretences by advising the doulas that she was pregnant when she was not and obtaining services based on that falsehood.

15. The Registrant contacted doulas and indicated that she was between 20-41 weeks pregnant and required assistance with delivery of the fetus. In each instance the doula was in constant contact with the Registrant and the doulas believed that they were fulfilling their legitimate career responsibilities with a mother who was experiencing a stillbirth. In some instances, the victims attended to the Registrant for multiple days, in person, while she imitated being in labour.

16. The Registrant also:

- coerced a doula or doulas to perform massages on her while she was naked or partially naked, including but not limited to massaging her back and buttocks;
- used a breast pump in front of a doula or doulas while shirtless; and
- sent a photo of a stillborn baby to a doula or doulas that was providing her with services for a pregnancy that she knew to be false.

17. With respect to at least four (4) doulas, the Registrant did not pay or did not pay in full for the services provided, causing financial loss.

18. Each victim was left emotionally and mentally traumatized after discovering that the Registrant's pregnancy was fictitious.

(b) Conviction for public mischief

19. Also during the relevant time period, and as set out in the Admitted Facts, on February 21, 2023, the Registrant contacted the Brantford Police Service and reported that she had been sexually assaulted.

20. The Registrant attended at Brantford General Hospital to have a sexual assault evidence kit performed on her.

21. On February 22, 2023, the Registrant provided a sworn videotaped statement to police detailing the sexual assault. That same day, the Registrant sent an email to a Brantford Police Service detective stating that she had lied about the sexual assault. The Registrant also stated, "I understand that this was wrong. I also understand that I was under oath and you can now charge me."

22. On September 15, 2023, the police received a biology report from the Centre for Forensic Sciences after submitting evidence from the sexual assault kit that the Registrant had completed. The results of the biology report showed no DNA other than from the Registrant.

23. On October 27, 2023, the Brantford Police Service laid Information # 0211-998-23-21003353 against the Registrant ("Information #2") in relation to her false report of a sexual assault to police. A certified copy of Information #2 was provided to the College. A copy of Information #2 is appended at Tab "C" to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

24. The Registrant's criminal conviction for public mischief arising from Information #2 is the count described at subparagraph 7(d), above.

E. Sentencing & Impact of Offences on the Registrant's Victims

25. On February 14, 2024, the Registrant was given a conditional sentence of two years less one day on all convictions, concurrently, followed by three years of probation. The Registrant was required to be on house arrest with GPS monitoring for the duration of the sentence, to not possess or use any computer or device that had internet access (including access to social media applications), and to refrain from contacting the victims of her crimes. She was also sentenced to mandatory dialectical behavioural therapy (DBT) counselling. Certified copies of the transcripts of proceedings from the sentencing hearing held on January 17, 2024 and continued on February 14, 2024 are collectively appended at Tab "D" to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

26. At the sentencing hearing, victim impact statements were read into the record by the victims and the Crown. Those statements are found at Tab "D".

27. The Honourable Justice Gee indicated that the 21 offences committed by the Registrant caused significant, long-lasting harm to the Registrant's victims. Many of the victims now have trust issues and all have sought counselling. Some of the victims have reduced their workload while others left the doula profession entirely. The Registrant's victims suffered financially because of the Registrant's deception.

28. Justice Gee further noted that, while all of the Registrant's offences were troubling and serious, the public mischief charge (in which the Registrant made false accusations of sexual assault while under oath) was particularly serious. The Registrant accused [C1] of sexual assault and attended the hospital, had a sexual assault examination completed, and attended the police station and gave a videotaped statement, under oath, to police. It was only some time later, after her interview, that the Registrant contacted the investigating officer to advise that she had lied. This had a profound impact on [C1], who herself had been a victim of abuse in the past. [C1] now suffers from PTSD and moved to another part of the country to begin anew.

F. Admissions of Professional Misconduct

29. The Registrant admits that her conduct, as described above and as set out in the Admitted Facts, was deceitful, misleading and dishonest. She further admits that this conduct was relevant to her suitability to practice and that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional.

30. Based on the admitted facts set out above, the Registrant admits that she is guilty of professional misconduct as set out in subsections 26(2)(a) and (c) of the Social Work and Social Service Work Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c 31 (the "Act"):

    (a) In that she violated Section 2.28 of the O. Reg. 384/00: Professional Misconduct (the "Professional Misconduct Regulation") by contravening the Act or regulations or by-laws;

    (b) In that she violated Section 2.29 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation by contravening a federal, provincial or territorial law or a municipal bylaw in circumstances where the purpose of the law or by-law is to protect public health and/or is relevant to her suitability to practice; and

    (c) In that she violated Section 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation by engaging in conduct or performing an act relevant to the practice of the

> profession that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable and/or unprofessional.

Decision of the panel

[10] The College bears the onus of proving the allegations against the Registrant on a balance of probabilities, using clear, cogent and convincing evidence. Having carefully considered that onus and standard of proof, the admissions of the Registrant, the evidence contained in the ASF, and the submissions of the parties, the Panel found that the Registrant committed the acts of professional misconduct as alleged in each of allegations (a), (b) and (c) in the Notice of Hearing. With respect to allegation (c), the Panel found that the Registrant's conduct would reasonably be regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional. The Panel announced its decision orally on the record at the hearing.

Reasons for decision

[11] The College made three allegations of professional misconduct against the Registrant, each arising from the same course of criminal conduct. Although the Registrant did not perpetrate her crimes in the course of a social work practice, and although none of her victims were her clients, the Panel agreed with the parties that her conduct was relevant to her suitability to practise social work and to the profession as a whole.

(b) Contravening a federal law relevant to suitability to practise (s. 2.29 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation)

[12] We will first deal with allegation (b). Allegation (b) required the Panel to determine, first, whether the Registrant contravened a federal, provincial or territorial law or municipal by-law, and second, whether that contravention is relevant to her suitability to practise.

[13] There was no dispute on the first question. On December 7, 2023, the Registrant was convicted of twenty-one counts under the Criminal Code, a federal statute: four counts of doing an indecent act, eleven counts of obtaining by false pretences, five counts of fraud, and one count of public mischief. The Registrant's admissions, together with the fact of her convictions, are conclusive of this element of the allegation.

[14] On the second question, the Panel accepted the submissions of College counsel that the Registrant's convictions are relevant to her suitability to practise social work, notwithstanding that her crimes were not committed in the course of her professional practice and did not involve her clients. As the Divisional Court has observed: "It is well-established that actions of members of a profession in their private lives may in some cases be relevant to and have an impact on their professional lives – including where the conduct is not consistent with the core values of a profession and/or where there is a need for a regulated profession to maintain confidence of the public in the profession and not be seen to condone certain types of conduct by its members." (*Dr. Jha v College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario*, 2022 ONSC 769 (Div Ct), at para 119; see also *Peterson v College of Psychologists of Ontario*, 2023 ONSC 4685 (Div Ct), at para 54.)

[15] The Registrant's crimes strike at the core values of the social work profession: honesty, integrity, and respect for the intrinsic worth of all people. Over a period of months, the Registrant fabricated pregnancies and, in some cases, false claims of sexual assault, in order to solicit the

practical and emotional support of doulas — individuals who, like social workers, provide care and support to those they believe to be in need. She exploited her victims' trust and empathy, in some cases requiring them to attend on her, unpaid, over multiple days while she feigned labour, and in some cases subjecting them to further indignities, including coercing massages while she was partially or fully unclothed, using a breast pump in their presence, and sending them a photo of a stillborn baby. In a separate but related course of conduct, she falsely reported to police that she had been sexually assaulted, underwent a sexual assault evidence kit, and gave a sworn videotaped statement, before admitting that she had fabricated the entire account.

[16] This conduct did not merely happen to involve deceit; it was deceit, sustained and repeated, deployed for the Registrant's own emotional purposes and at profound cost to her victims, several of whom left the doula profession altogether or reduced their practice as a result. The Panel agrees with the parties that this conduct, though it occurred outside the scope of the Registrant's social work practice, is plainly relevant to her suitability to practise. The College met its onus on allegation (b).

(c) Conduct reasonably regarded by registrants as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional (s. 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation)

[17] Turning next to allegation (c), s. 2.36 of the Regulation is a basket clause directed at how the Registrant's conduct would be viewed by other registrants, having regard to their special knowledge, training and experience, rather than by the public at large. Unprofessional conduct need not involve dishonesty; it reflects a serious or persistent disregard for one's professional obligations. Dishonourable conduct involves an element of moral failing, of which fraud, theft and deceit are examples. Disgraceful conduct is more severe still—conduct that shames the member and, by extension, the profession as a whole, and that casts serious doubt on the member's moral fitness to discharge the higher obligations the public expects of a professional.

[18] The Registrant's conduct meets all three descriptions. It was unprofessional in that it reflected a sustained disregard, over many months, for the values of honesty and integrity that registrants are expected to demonstrate. It was dishonourable in that it involved a pattern of deliberate, repeated deceit directed at multiple victims. And it was disgraceful in that its cumulative effect—twenty-one criminal convictions, thirteen victims, and a fabricated allegation of sexual assault against a person who had herself previously been a victim of abuse—casts serious doubt on the Registrant's moral fitness to practise as a social worker. The Registrant knew, or ought to have known, the wrongfulness of her conduct throughout; she ultimately admitted to police that she had fabricated her sexual assault allegation.

[19] The parties jointly submitted that the Registrant's conduct meets all three elements of s. 2.36, and the Panel agrees. The College met its onus on allegation (c).

(a) Contravening the Act, regulations or by-laws (s. 2.28 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation)

[20] Section 2.28 operates as a "belt and suspenders" provision: because a finding under either s. 2.29 or s. 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation necessarily constitutes a contravention of the Regulation, which is made under the Act, a finding under either of those provisions supports a finding under s. 2.28 as well. Having found that the Registrant's conduct contravened both s. 2.29

and s. 2.36 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation, the Panel finds that she also contravened s. 2.28. The College met its onus on allegation (a).

Penalty submissions

[21] The parties were in agreement on the issue of penalty. They presented to the Panel a Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs (the "**Joint Submission**") asking this Panel make an order as follows.

> 1. The Registrant shall be reprimanded by the Discipline Committee, either in writing or via electronic hearing;
>
> 2. The findings and the order of the Discipline Committee shall be published, in detail or in summary, with the name of the Registrant, online and/or in print, including in the official publication of the College, on the College's website, and on the College's public register, together with the Registrant's Undertaking and Acknowledgment (defined below); and
>
> 3. The Registrant shall pay costs to the College in the amount of $5,000.00, payable $200.00 on the date of the Panel's order, $200.00 on the 15th day of every month between September and December 2026, with the balance payable within five years of the Panel's order.

[22] The Joint Submission also set out the parties' agreement that, if the Joint Submission were accepted, the order would be effective immediately, with no appeal or judicial review of the decision or order to any forum.

[23] The parties also filed an Undertaking, Agreement and Acknowledgement signed by the Registrant (the "**Undertaking to Resign**"). In the Undertaking to Resign, the Registrant undertook, among other things, to:

- resign from the College and permanently surrender her certificate of registration;
- refrain from engaging in the practice of social work or social service work, and from holding herself out as qualified to do so, in Ontario;
- permanently refrain from re-applying to the College for registration or seeking reinstatement of her certificate; and
- refrain from engaging in the practice of social work or social service work in any jurisdiction.

[24] Both parties urged the Panel to accept the Joint Submission, having regard to the Undertaking to Resign. College counsel emphasized that the proposal serves the purposes of penalty—public protection, maintenance of public confidence in the profession's capacity to regulate itself, and specific and general deterrence—and reflects the aggravating and mitigating circumstances of the case, as well as the principle of proportionality.

[25] College counsel submitted that the Registrant's Undertaking to Resign exceeds what the Panel itself could order, in two respects: it results in a permanent resignation, whereas a registrant

whose certificate is revoked retains a statutory right to apply for reinstatement; and it commits the Registrant never to practise in any jurisdiction, which is beyond the territorial reach of any order the Panel could make. These measures ensure that the public is protected.

[26] College counsel identified the following aggravating factors: the Registrant's misconduct was not isolated but repeated, over many months, against numerous victims; her conduct preyed on the empathy and professional dedication of her victims; and the impact on those victims, several of whom left their profession or reduced their practice, was significant. College counsel identified the following mitigating factors: the Registrant cooperated with the College's process throughout, admitting the facts and the misconduct, entering into the ASF and the Joint Submission, and, through the Undertaking to Resign, acknowledging that she is not fit to practise social work and will not do so again.

[27] College counsel referred the Panel to prior decisions of this Discipline Committee in which a permanent undertaking to resign, combined with a reprimand, publication and costs, was accepted following a registrant's admission of serious misconduct: *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Schauber*, 2021 ONCSWSSW 4; *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v DeJonge*, 2024 ONCSWSSW 9; and *Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers v Fellows*, 2025 ONCSWSSW 5.

[28] College counsel referred the Panel to the test for departing from a joint submission set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in *R v Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43, as applied in the professional discipline context in *Ontario College of Teachers v Merolle*, 2023 ONSC 3453 (Div Ct): a joint submission should not be rejected unless doing so would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest—a stringent threshold that guards against a panel "reverse engineering" the penalty it might have imposed absent an agreement, and that recognizes the public interest in encouraging negotiated resolutions, including by sparing complainants and witnesses the burden of testifying.

[29] The Registrant made no submissions opposing the Joint Submission.

Penalty decision

[30] Having considered the findings of professional misconduct, the evidence, the submissions of the parties, and the Registrant's Undertaking to Resign, the Panel accepted the Joint Submission and made an order in accordance with its terms, set out above at paragraph 21. The Panel's order was announced orally on the record at the hearing.

Reasons for penalty decision

[31] The Panel understood that it should accept the Joint Submission unless satisfied that doing so would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest. That threshold is not met here.

[32] The Registrant's permanent resignation, and her undertaking never to seek reinstatement in any jurisdiction, achieve the central purpose of a penalty order in this context—protection of the public—more effectively than any order the Panel could itself impose. Because the Registrant will never again be entitled to hold herself out as a social worker anywhere, there is no need for a further order restricting her practice.

[33] The reprimand allows the Panel to convey directly to the Registrant, and to the profession, its condemnation of her conduct, and serves both specific and general deterrence. Publication of the Panel's decision and order, including the Undertaking to Resign, with the Registrant's name, promotes transparency and reinforces to the profession the seriousness of the consequences that flow from conduct of this kind.

[34] The penalty is proportionate and reflects the aggravating and mitigating factors identified by the parties. The Registrant's conduct was not an isolated lapse but a sustained pattern of deception carried out against numerous victims over many months, compounded by a fabricated allegation of sexual assault against a person who had herself previously been victimized.

[35] Victim impact statements were read into the record at the Registrant's sentencing hearing. College counsel highlighted several passages from the victim impact statements in her submissions. The statements will not be quoted at length in these Reasons but the Panel notes that in his reasons for sentence, Justice Gee, who listened to all the victim impact statements, stated:

> The 21 offences committed by the accused Kaitlyn Braun have caused significant long-lasting harm to her victims. The trauma caused to them was expressed clearly and eloquently in their victim impact statements … Many now have trust issues. It has impacted their ability to carry out their duties in their chosen profession as doulas. All have had to seek counselling and most are still seeing counsellors to help them heal. Some have left the profession entirely; others have reduced their workload significantly. And all have suffered financially because of Ms. Braun's deception.

[36] One victim, herself a doula, stated that the Registrant "exploited [her] compassion and manipulated [her] in ways that have left everlasting emotional, physical and financial scars," and that she had incurred close to $6,000 in uncompensated time and expenses. Another described developing a diagnosis of complex post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of her involvement with the Registrant, including panic attacks, flashbacks and night terrors, and financial hardship that nearly cost her family their home. A third stated: "Kaitlyn Braun has made me afraid to do the work I am so passionate about. I am afraid of trusting social workers. I am afraid of gaining new clients. I am afraid of being triggered at a birth. I am afraid to grow my business. I am afraid. I am afraid. I am afraid." That victim added that, on learning the Registrant was a licensed social worker, she "no longer trust[ed] social workers."

[37] With respect to the public mischief conviction, Justice Gee observed that the victim of that offence "never did anything" to warrant the Registrant's accusation, and that the Registrant "didn't just make a casual or offhand allegation"—she attended hospital for a sexual assault examination and gave a sworn videotaped statement to police before, some time later, admitting she had lied. Justice Gee noted that this had "a profound impact" on a victim who "herself had been the victim of abuse in the past" and who "now suffers PTSD, and moved to another part of the country to begin anew."

[38] The statements describe lasting harm: diagnoses of post-traumatic stress and complex post-traumatic stress, disrupted careers, strained family relationships, and — in the words of one victim — a fear that now colours her work: "I am afraid of trusting social workers. I am afraid of gaining new clients. I am afraid of being triggered at a birth." These are serious aggravating factors. Weighed against them, the Registrant's cooperation throughout the discipline process—her admissions, her agreement to the ASF, and her Undertaking to Resign —are significant mitigating

factors that spared the College, the Registrant's victims, and this Panel the burden of a contested hearing.

[39] The facts of this case are unprecedented and the Panel appreciates the difficulty College counsel had identifying similar cases to establish the range of reasonable penalties. The Panel is satisfied that the jointly proposed penalty falls within the range of penalties this Discipline Committee has imposed in comparable cases involving a permanent undertaking to resign following an admission of serious misconduct: *Schauber*, *DeJonge* and *Fellows*, above.

[40] On costs, the parties jointly proposed an order in the amount of $5,000.00, payable on the schedule set out in the Joint Submission. The Panel agreed. That amount, and the proposed payment schedule—which takes into account that the Registrant remains in custody and is not currently employed—are consistent with costs orders made by this Discipline Committee in other uncontested matters.

[41] At the conclusion of the hearing, after confirming that the Registrant waived her right of appeal, the Panel delivered its reprimand orally to the Registrant, in accordance with paragraph 1 of the Panel's order. A copy of the reprimand is appended to these Reasons.

I, Kimberley Westfall-Connor, sign this decision as chairperson of the Panel and on behalf of the Panel members listed below.

Date: September 8, 2026

Signed: _____

Kimberley Westfall-Connor, Chair
Charlene Crews
Carina Chan

Appendix

Reprimand - Template

ONTARIO COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS v. Kaitlyn Braun

Kaitlyn Braun as part of its penalty order, this Discipline panel has ordered that you be given a reprimand.

The fact that you have received this reprimand will be part of the public portion of the Register and, as such, part of your record with the College.

You will be given an opportunity to make a statement at the end of the reprimand if you wish. This will *not* be an opportunity for you to debate the merits of our decision.

The panel has found that you have engaged in professional misconduct in several ways.

- you made repeated false representations that you were victim of sexual assault
- you reported a false sexual assault allegation to police, having a profound impact on an innocent victim, whom herself was a survivor of sexual assault
- you misled professional doulas by falsifying claims of sexual assault, pregnancy, labour, and stillbirth.
- your conduct violated their sexual integrity, preyed on their compassion and exploited their trust

Your misconduct is a matter of profound concern to this panel. You have brought discredit to the profession and to yourself. Public confidence in this profession has been put in jeopardy. You have let down the public, the social work profession, and yourself.

We need to make it clear to you that your conduct is unacceptable.

Of special concern to us is that:

- your conduct was not isolated. It involved a repeated and deliberate pattern of deception involving many victims

- on multiple occasions you falsely held yourself out as a victim of sexual assault which undermines the validity of the experiences of sexual assault survivors

- you misused and tied up valuable public services by accessing professional doula services, attending hospitals numerous times, making false report to police

- at least one of the doulas was providing professional services for the first time, and your conduct had lasting effects on their confidence, their sense of professional safety, and their ability to continue in their profession.

- your conduct affected the victims' ability to trust professionals and seek support in their own healing and with some ultimately leaving the field

Your willingness to work with the College reassures this panel that you have recognized the seriousness of your conduct.

We also want to make it clear to you that while the penalty that this panel has imposed upon you is a fair penalty, a more significant penalty will likely be imposed by another Discipline panel in the event that you are ever found to have engaged in professional misconduct again

As I advised you earlier, you will now be given an opportunity to make a comment if you wish to do so. I remind you that this is not an opportunity for you to review the decision or debate the correctness of the decision. Do you wish to make any comments?