

**IN THE MATTER OF PART 2 OF THE
LEGAL PROFESSION ACT, RSA 2000, c. L-8**

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF A SECTION 32 RESIGNATION APPLICATION
REGARDING CONNOR B. DIXON
A MEMBER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF ALBERTA**

Resignation Committee

John Evans, KC – Chair and Bencher
Mary Ellen Neilson – Lay Bencher
Dr. Riad Tarrabain – Lay Bencher

Appearances

Will Cascadden, KC – Counsel for the Law Society of Alberta
Jim Butlin, KC – Counsel for Connor B. Dixon

Hearing Date

February 5, 2026

Hearing Location

Virtual Hearing

RESIGNATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Overview

1. Connor B. Dixon was admitted as a member of the Law Society of Alberta (LSA) on June 8, 2020. On December 23, 2022, the LSA opened a complaint file arising from a self report by Mr. Dixon of him being charged with nine criminal code offences. Mr. Dixon pleaded guilty to 3 of the 9 criminal charges and was sentenced to two years probation. Shortly after sentencing Mr. Dixon breached the terms of his probation by consuming alcohol and relocating to Mexico. The LSA conducted an investigation of the complaints regarding Mr. Dixon's conduct. On August 12, 2025, a panel of the Conduct Committee directed that the matter of two citations be referred to a Hearing Committee:
 - 1) It is alleged that Connor B Dixon brought the legal profession into disrepute and that such conduct is deserving of sanction; and
 - 2) It is alleged that Connor B. Dixon failed to respond promptly and completely to communications from the Law Society and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

2. Mr. Dixon applied for resignation from LSA, pursuant to section 32 of the *Legal Profession Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.L-8 (*Act*). Because Mr. Dixon's conduct is the subject of citations issued pursuant to the *Act*, this Resignation Committee (Committee) was constituted to hear this application.
3. As of May 17, 2024, Mr. Dixon was an administratively suspended member of the LSA, for failure to pay LSA fees, and had not practised law since that date. At the time of the hearing Mr. Dixon had no disciplinary record with the LSA and was unaware of any open or pending Alberta Lawyers Indemnity Association (ALIA) claims against him.
4. After hearing the joint submissions of Mr. Cascadden, KC counsel for LSA and Mr. Butlin, KC, counsel for Mr. Dixon and upon reviewing the Statement of Admitted Facts in Support of an Application to Resign as a Member of the LSA (Agreed Statement), an email to the Committee from [JZ], an email to the Committee from Mr. Dixon, the joint exhibits, and upon hearing submissions of the LSA and Mr. Butlin, KC, the Committee allowed the application pursuant to section 32 of the *Act* with oral reasons, and advised that a written decision would follow. This is that written decision.
5. In addition, the Committee ordered Mr. Dixon to pay costs of the investigation in the amount of \$3,500.00.

Preliminary Matters

6. There were no objections to the constitution of the Committee or its jurisdiction, and a private hearing was not requested, so a public hearing into Mr. Dixon's resignation application proceeded.

Agreed Statement of Facts

7. The Agreed Statement was found to be in a form acceptable to the Committee. A summary of those facts is set out below.
8. On December 23, 2022, the LSA opened a complaint file arising from a self-report by Mr. Dixon of him being charged with nine criminal code offences. Mr. Dixon pleaded guilty to three of the nine criminal charges and was sentenced to two years probation. Shortly after sentencing Mr. Dixon breached the terms of his probation by consuming alcohol and relocating to Mexico.
9. The LSA conducted an investigation of the complaints regarding Mr. Dixon's conduct and on August 12, 2025, a panel of the Conduct Committee directed that the LSA that the matter of two citations be referred to a hearing committee.
10. Mr. Dixon, upon returning from Mexico in December of 2025, has cooperated with the LSA investigation.

11. Immediately upon returning from Mexico, Mr. Dixon fully engaged in the Alcoholic Anonymous Program (AA) and continues to be fully engaged in AA and continued sobriety.
12. Mr. Dixon admitted that his conduct resulting in three criminal code convictions and his subsequent conduct in breaching the terms of his probation brought the legal profession into disrepute and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

The Submissions of the Parties

13. Counsel for the LSA advised that the LSA supported the application of Mr. Dixon to resign pursuant to section 32 of the *Act*. In his submissions, LSA counsel identified the following aggravating and mitigating factors in relation to the two citations:
 - a) Aggravating Factors:
 - Serious LSA citations against Mr. Dixon
 - Serious criminal conduct
 - Failure to cooperate with the LSA investigation
 - b) Mitigating factors:
 - Cooperation with the LSA resignation process
 - Acknowledgement of culpability and acceptance of responsibility
 - Acknowledgement of alcohol addiction issues and participation in AA treatment
14. Counsel for the LSA in his submissions directed the Committee to the decision of the *Law Society of Alberta v. Ross*, 2025 ABLS 26, paragraphs 27 – 31 (Book of Authorities Tab 5) for the appropriate analysis to be applied to determine whether the section 32 resignation application should be accepted or rejected by the Committee.
15. Counsel for the LSA directed the Committee to paragraph 20 of the LSA Adjudicator Guideline – Resignations (Resignation Guideline) that sets out the test for acceptance of a resignation application:
 - a) The nature of the lawyer’s alleged conduct and whether it would likely result in disbarment if the matter were to proceed to a hearing and the citations proved; and
 - b) Whether there are disputed facts or other factors ... that would be taken into account by a Hearing Committee and which would mitigate against disbarment and make it an unlikely outcome if the matter were to proceed to a hearing.
16. Further, it was pointed out that, in accordance with paragraph 22 of the Resignation Guideline, the fundamental issue for a resignation committee is whether it is in the best

interests of the public and in the interests of the legal profession to permit a resignation in the face of serious unresolved conduct matters.

17. LSA counsel also referred the Committee to the *Law Society of Alberta v. Ralh*, 2023 ABLs 9 (Book of Authorities Tab 3) and the *Law Society of Alberta v. Prithipaul*, 2018 ABLs 17 (Book of Authorities Tab 4) as reference points to contextualize and put in to perspective the nature and extent of the conduct required for a disbarment and that Mr. Dixon's conduct fell well below that level.
18. Mr. Butlin, KC concurred with the submissions of LSA counsel and pointed out that Mr. Dixon's application, admissions and cooperation prevented the need for a lengthy hearing thereby saving time, costs and inconvenience.

Costs Submissions

19. LSA counsel prepared an itemized breakdown of the costs incurred by LSA for these proceedings which totals \$5,087.25 incl of GST (Exhibit 11 – Estimated Statement of Costs).
20. LSA counsel referred the Committee to the decision of the *Law Society of Alberta v. Scott*, 2025 ABLs 21 (Book of Authorities Tab 8) paragraphs 40 - 56 regarding cost awards and the Committee's discretion relating to cost awards following the recent Alberta Court of Appeal decision in *Charkhandeh v. College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258 (*Charkhandeh*).
21. Mr. Butlin, KC suggested that cost of \$2,500.00 would be more appropriate given the *Charkhandeh* decision, given that costs in disciplinary proceedings should be awarded based on the wording of the statute, and the principles set out in the reasons of the *Charkhandeh* decision.
22. In following the law set out in *Charkhandeh* the Committee's decision to award costs in disciplinary proceedings are premised upon 4 key issues:
 - 1) Where should the costs burden fall?
 - 2) Application of the relevant factors when awarding costs
 - 3) Limits on quantum of costs
 - 4) Types of costs that can fairly be imposed on the professional

Analysis

23. The issue to be determined by this Committee was whether it was in the best interests of the public to permit Mr. Dixon to resign pursuant to section 32 in the face of serious unresolved conduct matters. Under the *Act*, a member may apply to resign under either section 32 or section 61. There is a material distinction between these applications.

Pursuant to section 61 of the *Act*, the member's resignation amounts to a deemed disbarment if accepted. Under section 32 of the *Act*, the application is merely one of resignation.

24. The resignation application in this case was made pursuant to section 32 of the *Act*. The Committee was not asked to consider whether a resignation under section 61 would be appropriate, and the application was therefore considered under only section 32. Nonetheless, in considering whether to accept the section 32 resignation application, the Committee determined that the conduct would not have resulted in disbarment if the matter had proceeded to a hearing and the citations were proved.
25. Additionally, LSA counsel supported the application by Mr. Dixon for resignation pursuant to section 32 of the *Act* served the public interest. As such, the Committee considered this to be tantamount to a joint submission and therefore deserving of deference unless it brought the administration of justice into disrepute or was otherwise contrary to the public interest.
26. Resignation committees of the LSA have permitted members who faced serious conduct proceedings to resign pursuant to section 32 where the public interest may still be served without requiring either a public hearing into outstanding citations or a deemed disbarment. In those cases, resignation committees were satisfied that the member's conduct had been investigated and that certain mitigating factors existed that offer understanding and even explanation for the member's conduct.

Decision

27. The Committee finds that the Agreed Statement is in an acceptable form.
28. Based on the evidence established by the Agreed Statement, the Committee determined that it was in the best interests of the public to accept the application of Mr. Dixon to resign pursuant to section 32 of the *Act*, effective February 5, 2026.
29. Pursuant to section 32(2) of the *Act*, Mr. Dixon's name will be struck off the roll. The roll shall reflect that Mr. Dixon's application under section 32 of the *Act* was allowed on February 5, 2026.

Costs Award

30. The Committee has reviewed the costs of hearing this application, as prepared by the LSA. The Committee has considered the factors set out in the *Charkhandeh* decision in determining that Mr. Dixon must pay costs of these proceedings in the amount of \$3,500.00 prior to any application for reinstatement.

Concluding Matters

31. The exhibits, other hearing materials, and this report will be available for public inspection, including the provision of copies of exhibits for a reasonable copy fee, except that identifying information in relation to persons other than Mr. Dixon will be redacted and further redactions will be made to preserve client confidentiality and solicitor-client privilege (Rule 98(3)).
32. A Notice to the Profession was ordered to be issued, which was on February 6, 2026.
33. A Notice to the Attorney General is not required.

Dated May 29, 2026.

John Evans, KC

Mary Ellen Neilson

Dr. Riad Tarrabain