ONTARIO REGISTERED PSYCHOTHERAPISTS DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL

Citation: *College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario v. Ladouceur,* 2026 ONRPDT 12
Date: September 14, 2026
Tribunal File No.: 26-002-RP

BETWEEN:

College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario

College

- and -

Selena-Jo Ladouceur

Registrant

FINDING AND PENALTY REASONS

Heard: July 30, 2026

Panel:
Jennifer Scott (panel chair)
Andrew Benedetto (registered psychotherapist)
Steven Boychyn (public)
Kathleen Hewitt-Blackie (registered psychotherapist)
Jason King* (public)

*Mr. Jason King was initially a member of the panel but was unable to participate in the reasons process. The remaining panel members give the decision pursuant to s. 4.4 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

Appearances:
Emily Graham, for the College
Jordan Stone, for the registrant

RESTRICTION ON PUBLICATION

Pursuant to Rule 2.2.2 of the HPDT Rules of Procedure and ss. 45-47 of the Health Professions Procedural Code, no one shall publish or broadcast the names of clients or any information that could identify clients or disclose clients' personal health information or health records referred to at a hearing or in any documents filed with the Tribunal. There may be significant fines for breaching this restriction.

Introduction

[1] The registrant, Selena-Jo Ladouceur, obtained her certificate of registration from the College of Registered Psychotherapists and Registered Mental Health Therapists of Ontario (College) in the Qualifying class (meaning that she had not yet completed all requirements to transition to full independent practice) in March 2022 and the Registered Psychotherapist class in December 2022. She provided psychotherapeutic treatment to Client A between September 2023 and March 2025.

[2] One month after their therapeutic relationship ended in March 2025, the registrant and Client A developed a friendship. Their relationship became sexual in June 2025. The registrant ended the relationship with Client A in September 2025.

[3] We found that the registrant engaged in sexual abuse of a client and disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional conduct, and contravened the standards of practice of the profession. We ordered revocation of the registrant's certificate of registration, a reprimand, reimbursement for therapy and counselling for Client A with security to guarantee payment, and costs to the College. These are our reasons.

Evidence of misconduct

[4] Client A is a police officer specializing in intimate partner violence investigations. During an 18-month period, the registrant provided psychotherapy to Client A on issues that he was experiencing regarding his divorce from his former spouse and their co-parenting struggles, and other romantic relationships he had entered into following his separation from his former spouse. Their final appointment was on March 25, 2025.

[5] In April 2025, the registrant contacted Client A for advice on how to support another client who had experienced intimate partner violence and was going to be interviewed by the police. In May 2025, Client A asked the registrant out on a date. They began dating and by the end of May, they told each other they had developed feelings and loved one another.

[6] In June 2025, the registrant told her then spouse that she wanted a separation. This led to an altercation between them, and the registrant temporarily left her home for safety reasons. She called Client A and he invited her to stay at his house overnight. She accepted the invitation.

[7] In mid-June 2025, the registrant and Client A engaged in a sexual relationship for the first time. Between June and July 2025, the registrant and Client A exchanged photographs—some of a sexual nature—and intimate text messages.

[8] In July 2025, the College received a complaint about the registrant's conduct with Client A. The complaint was not made by Client A.

[9] Between April and September 2025, the registrant was experiencing emotional distress arising from the breakdown of her marriage and the conduct of her former spouse. Client A, because of his professional expertise in intimate partner violence, gave her a feeling of security, safety, and support.

[10] The registrant ended her relationship with Client A by September 2025, after receiving notice of the College's investigation.

[11] The registrant began therapy in October 2025 and continues to receive therapy to address the psychological distress that she experienced in connection with the misconduct in this case.

Finding

[12] Under s. 1(6) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, SO 1991, c. 18 (Code), Client A remained the registrant's client for a minimum of one year following the end of their therapeutic relationship. The sexual relationship between the registrant and Client A took place during that one-year period. We note that today, a person remains a client for a minimum of five years after the therapeutic relationship ends, in recognition of the seriousness of engaging in a sexual relationship with a client (Ontario Regulation 202/25 made under the *Psychotherapy Act, 2007,* SO 2007, c. 10, Sched. R).

[13] The relationship between the registrant and Client A included sexual intercourse. This constitutes sexual abuse under s. 1(3)(a) of the Code. Sexual abuse is an act of professional misconduct under s. 51(1)(b.1) of the Code. Engaging in a sexual relationship with a client is also clearly disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional conduct, defined as professional misconduct in Ontario Regulation 317/12 made under the *Psychotherapy Act*, s. 1, para. 52 (Professional Misconduct Regulation).

[14] The registrant's conduct contravened the standards of practice of the profession, namely the General Conduct and Undue Influence and Abuse standards. This is misconduct under para. 1 of s. 1 of the Professional Misconduct Regulation. These standards require the registrant to practise psychotherapy with integrity and professionalism, and prohibit sexual relationships with clients. This prohibition reflects a foundational principle of the profession. The therapeutic relationship is characterized by trust, dependency, and unequal power. Psychotherapists are expected to understand the unconscious dynamics that can arise between client and therapist and to ensure that these dynamics are never exploited or allowed to develop into personal or sexual relationships. The responsibility for maintaining appropriate boundaries rests entirely on the psychotherapist.

[15] We find the registrant's sexual relationship with Client A constitutes sexual abuse and disgraceful, dishonourable and unprofessional conduct, and contravenes the standards of practice of the profession.

Penalty

[16] The Tribunal must reprimand the registrant and, where the sexual abuse consists of certain kinds of sexual conduct (including sexual intercourse), must revoke the registrant's certificate of registration. Because the sexual abuse in this case included sexual intercourse, revocation of the registrant's certificate is mandatory under s. 51(5)(3) of the Code.

[17] We accepted the jointly proposed penalty of a reprimand and revocation of the registrant's certificate of registration. Given the mandatory nature of the penalty, it is unnecessary to consider whether the joint submission on penalty meets the legal test for acceptance.

Counselling

[18] Section 85.7 of the Code requires the College to establish a program to provide funding for therapy and counselling for persons alleging sexual abuse by a registrant. In this case, the parties jointly submit that there should be an order that the registrant reimburse up to $17,940 for funding under that program, and post $2,000 in security to guarantee payment. It is reasonable for the College to recover money paid under the program from the registrant.

Costs

[19] The parties' submission on costs is reasonable and based on the tariff rate for a half-day hearing.

[20] The costs and the security for counselling can be paid in quarterly installments.

Order

[21] At the conclusion of the hearing, we made the following order:

Penalty

1. The Tribunal requires the registrant to appear before the panel to be reprimanded.

2. The Tribunal directs the Registrar to revoke the registrant's certificate of registration effective immediately.

Costs

3. The Tribunal requires the registrant to pay the College costs in the amount of $4,700, by paying the College in quarterly installments (i.e. every three (3) months over two (2) years of $587.50 each), beginning thirty (30) days after the date of the Tribunal's order.

Reimbursement for Therapy and Counselling

4. The Tribunal requires the registrant to reimburse the College $17,940 for funding provided for therapy and counselling under s. 85.7 of the Health Professions Procedural Code.

5. The Tribunal requires the registrant to post security acceptable to the College to guarantee the payment of the amounts in paragraph 4 in the amount of $2,000, by paying the College in quarterly installments (i.e. every three (3) months) over two (2) years of $250 each), beginning thirty (30) days after the date of the Tribunal's order.

6. Any amount of security provided by the registrant pursuant to paragraph 5 that has not been used by July 16, 2030 will be returned to the registrant.