IN THE MATTER OF PART 3 OF THE
***LEGAL PROFESSION ACT*, RSA 2000, c. L-8**

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING
THE CONDUCT OF KRISTY KALIN
A MEMBER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF ALBERTA

Single Bencher Hearing Committee
Kelsey Meyer, KC – Chair

Appearances
Sakeb Nazim – Counsel for the Law Society of Alberta (LSA)
Alain Hepner, K.C. – Counsel for Kristy Kalin

Hearing Date
October 2, 2026

Hearing Location
Virtual Hearing

HEARING COMMITTEE REPORT

Overview

1. Kristy Kalin was admitted as a member of the LSA on July 31, 2020. Her present status with the LSA is Active/Practicing. She does not have a disciplinary record with the LSA.

2. The following citations (Citations) arise from conduct that occurred in September and October 2024. The Citations were directed to hearing by the Conduct Committee Panel on September 23, 2026:

    1) It is alleged that Kristy Kalin signed a false certificate regarding the use of video conferencing technology to sign an affidavit and improperly altered an affidavit, and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

    2) It is alleged that Kristy Kalin misled the Court and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

3. On June 25, 2026, Ms. Kalin entered into a Statement of Admitted Facts, Exhibits and Admissions of Guilt (Agreed Statement), admitting to the conduct giving rise to the Citations and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

4. The Conduct Committee found the Agreed Statement acceptable. Accordingly, pursuant to section 60(4) of the *Legal Profession Act* (*Act*), it is deemed to be a finding of this Hearing Committee (Committee) that Ms. Kalin's conduct is deserving of sanction in relation to the above Citations.

5. On October 2, 2026, the Committee convened a hearing into the appropriate sanction.

6. Pursuant to section 72(1) of the *Act*, if a hearing committee finds that a member is guilty of conduct deserving of sanction, the Committee shall either: (a) order that the member be disbarred, (b) order that the membership of the member be suspended during the period prescribed by the order, or (c) order that the member be reprimanded. Pursuant to section 72(2), in addition to an order under subsection (1), the hearing committee may also make other orders as specified therein, including but not limited to an order for payment of a penalty, and an order requiring the payment to the LSA of all or part of the costs of the proceedings, each within the time prescribed by the order.

7. LSA counsel advised, during the hearing and by email correspondence after the hearing, that the LSA and Ms. Kalin had reached agreement on sanction and costs, as follows:

    1) a reprimand;
    2) a fine of $4,500.00; and
    3) costs of $3,500.00.

    (Joint Sanction Submission).

8. After reviewing all of the evidence and exhibits and hearing the joint submissions of the LSA and Ms. Kalin, for the reasons set out below, the Committee has determined that the Joint Sanction Submission is appropriate.

Preliminary Matters

9. 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 the appropriate sanction proceeded.

Agreed Statement of Facts/Background

10. After the commencement of proceedings in relation to Ms. Kalin's conduct, LSA counsel submitted the Agreed Statement. A summary of the Agreed Statement is as follows:

1) Ms. Kalin was retained by Client ME to assist him with proceedings against a client who was represented by AM as legal counsel.

2) As part of the proceedings, Client ME was directed to file a supplemental affidavit by September 13, 2024.

3) On September 6, 2024, Ms. Kalin commissioned Client ME's supplemental affidavit (Affidavit #1). Affidavit #1 falsely indicated it was sworn remotely, by way of videoconferencing technology, in three separate places.

4) On September 13, 2024, after Ms. Kalin's assistant, SG, attempted to file Affidavit #1 with the Court of King's Bench of Alberta (the Court), the Court replied that Affidavit #1 must have "wet ink signature" and that electronic or computer-generated signatures were not acceptable.

5) Ms. Kalin then removed, or permitted SG to remove, the markings on Affidavit #1 indicating it was digitally signed by Client ME to make the digital initials and signature look like a wet ink signature (as altered, Affidavit #2).

6) On September 17, 2024, SG asked AM if she would consent to a fiat to allow Affidavit #2 to be filed after the stipulated deadline.

7) AM did not consent to the fiat because Affidavit #2 was digitally signed by Client ME and contained neither a wet ink signature nor wet ink initials on each page.

8) On September 18, 2024, SG sent AM another revised affidavit (Affidavit #3). AM pointed out that despite SG's assertion that Affidavit #3 was newly signed, it contained a handwritten file number not reflected on Affidavit #1 or Affidavit #2, and Client ME's digital initials were also still visible on Affidavit #3.

9) On September 19, 2024, Ms. Kalin and AM exchanged emails regarding Ms. Kalin's intent to proceed with a request for a fiat. Ms. Kalin offered to amend the date of Affidavit #3 since it was not updated. AM responded with an email and a letter setting out all her concerns regarding the improper execution of Affidavit #1, Affidavit #2 and Affidavit #3. She objected to Ms. Kalin's proposed course of action to alter the dates in Affidavit #3 and wanted the affidavit to be corrected and re-sworn, did not consent to the fiat, and asked that Ms. Kalin provide copies of her email and letter to the sitting Justice.

10) On September 24, 2024, SG emailed the Court a desk application requesting a fiat and a new version of Client ME's supplemental affidavit, sworn on September 23, 2024 (Affidavit #4). The email said that AM consented to the fiat.

11) AM replied to SG and the Court stating that she had not been served with the documents, nor did she consent to the fiat.

12) Shortly afterwards, SG asked the Court to disregard her prior email and served AM with a copy of the supplemental affidavit that Client ME swore that same day on September 24, 2024, in person (Affidavit #5).

13) AM opposed a fiat with respect to Affidavit #5 as paragraph 17 of Affidavit #5 incorrectly stated that it was sworn remotely by video technology.

14) On September 24, 2024, Client ME stated under oath that he did not attend before Ms. Kalin via video or in person to swear Affidavit #1 and three subsequent iterations of that affidavit, as described below (Affidavit #2, Affidavit #3 and Affidavit #4). Rather, he signed and emailed them back to Ms. Kalin after discussions over the phone.

15) On September 25, 2024, SG served AM with a revised affidavit with reference to remote signing struck out (Affidavit #6).

16) On September 25, 2024, AM responded with a letter pointing out that Affidavit #6 "follows five previous copies, each improperly executed or impermissibly altered" and that her concerns were relevant to the request for consenting to the fiat. Accordingly, AM requested that Ms. Kalin provide her with the original paper copies of all versions of the supplemental affidavit served on her to date.

17) On October 3, 2024, Ms. Kalin emailed AM and advised her that she did not think that the previous versions of the supplemental affidavit were relevant and she would be making an *ex parte* application to the Court on the following day to obtain a fiat notwithstanding AM's lack of consent.

18) On October 4, 2024, AM responded to Ms. Kalin that she was unable to attend as she was not provided proper notice, and that she opposed the application due to serious ethical concerns as a result of being provided with several versions of Client ME's supplemental affidavit which were "… variously altered, back-dated, and falsely purported to be sworn before a Commissioner via video-link." AM also requested that Ms. Kalin provide the presiding Justice with copies of AM's email, as well as her letters of September 19 and 25, 2024, outlining her objections.

19) On October 4, 2024, Ms. Kalin appeared in Court before the Justice and advised that she was making an *ex parte* application for a fiat to file Affidavit #6.

20) Although Ms. Kalin admitted to the Court that the initial Affidavit #1 was improperly sworn, she did not discuss the circumstances regarding the swearing of the subsequent versions.

21) Ms. Kalin did not provide the Justice with copies of AM's email dated October 4, 2025, or her letters dated September 19 and 25, 2024, as AM had requested.

22) Ms. Kalin also did not advise the Justice of AM's specific objections to each version of the supplemental affidavit. She only told the Court that the reason why AM did not consent to the fiat was because the materials contained a reference to being sworn remotely, when the current version that she was trying to file (i.e., Affidavit #6) was sworn in person.

23) Ms. Kalin admits that she signed a false certificate regarding the use of video conferencing technology to sign an affidavit, and improperly altered an affidavit, and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

24) Ms. Kalin admits that she misled the Court and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

11. The Conduct Committee found the Agreed Statement acceptable on August 20, 2026. Pursuant to section 60(4) of the *Act*, each admission of guilt in the Agreed Statement is deemed to be a finding by this Committee that Ms. Kalin's conduct is deserving of sanction under section 49 of the *Act*.

12. As provided by section 60(3) of the *Act*, once the Agreed Statement was accepted by the Conduct Committee, the hearing into the appropriate sanction could be conducted by a single Bencher. As a result, I was appointed to conduct the sanction hearing.

Submissions on Sanction

13. As noted, the LSA and Ms. Kalin made a Joint Sanction Submission.

14. LSA counsel referenced the LSA Pre-Hearing and Hearing Guideline (Guideline) regarding joint submissions on sanction,[1] which sets out, among other things:

1) A hearing committee must give significant deference to a joint submission on sanction;

2) Notwithstanding that, a hearing committee is not bound by a joint submission;

3) The Supreme Court of Canada sets out a public interest test for assessing the acceptability of joint submissions in a criminal law context, which has been widely adopted by professional discipline tribunals across Canada, and is appropriate and should be applied in LSA conduct proceedings.[2] The public interest test requires the decision—maker to consider the following, which the Supreme Court of Canada recognized sets an "undeniably high" but justified threshold:

[1] Pre-Hearing and Hearing Guideline of the Law Society of Alberta, June 3, 2022, as amended (Guideline), paras 207-215.

[2] Guideline, *supra* note 1, paras 210-211 (referencing *R v Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43 at para 34). See *Law Society of Alberta v Goldsworthy*, 2025 ABLS 22 at paras 15-16 and the decisions cited therein.

i. Is the joint submission so markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the offence and the offender that the joint submission would be viewed as a breakdown in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system?

ii. Would the joint submission cause an informed and reasonable person to lose confidence in the constitution of the courts?

iii. Is the joint submission so unhinged from the circumstances of the offence and the offender that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the justice system had broken down?

(the Public Interest Test).

15. LSA counsel referenced several authorities in support of the Joint Sanction Submission:

1) *Law Society of Alberta v Scott*, 2025 ABLS 21, wherein a member caused or permitted a false affidavit to be filed with the Court and failed to be candid with the LSA, and such conduct was held to be deserving of sanction. The member entered into an agreed statement of admitted facts and exhibits and admission of guilt, and the member and the LSA submitted a joint submission on sanction. The hearing committee issued a reprimand, a fine in the amount of $10,000.00, payable within 10 months of the hearing date, and $5,033.50 in costs, based on a joint submission on sanction.

2) *Nielsen (Re)*, 2007 LSBC 35, wherein a member altered an exhibit to his client's affidavit after it was sworn, without the client's knowledge or consent, and caused it to be filed with the court as if it was genuine, when he knew it was not. Further, the member submitted a consent order to the court for entry knowing his client had not consented to it. The member admitted his professional misconduct. The hearing panel issued a reprimand, a fine in the amount of $10,000.00, and costs in the amount of $5,000.00, which disciplinary action was consented to by the member.

3) *The Law Society of Manitoba v Warren*, 2022 MBLS 11, wherein a member filed a petition for divorce showing his client's wife as the petitioner, despite the fact that the wife was not the member's client. The petition stated that the respondent husband was "unrepresented", which was false. The member signed two documents indicating he had witnessed signatures on the same, which was false in each case, and filed those documents with the court. The member also completed an affidavit of service in which he swore he had served the petition on the husband, which was false. The member deposited trust funds into his personal account and into the general bank account for his practice, and failed to

comply with the applicable "know your client rule". The member admitted the allegations set out in the citation were true and amounted to professional misconduct. The discipline hearing panel directed a fine of $5,000.00 and costs in the amount of $4,000.00.

4) *Law Society of Alberta v Reeder*, 2026 ABLS 14, wherein the member improperly commissioned and affidavit and failed to correct an improperly commissioned affidavit with the court in a timely manner, which was held in each case to be conduct deserving of sanction. The member admitted to an agreed statement of facts and agreed to a joint submission on sanction. The member had been subject to prior discipline by the LSA. The hearing committee in that case accepted a joint submission on sanction for a reprimand, a fine of $4,500.00, and costs in the amount of $3,500.00.

5) *Wong (Re)*, 2012 LSBC 15, wherein the member arranged for his client to sign the sworn or jurat part of the document before the whole document was finalized or completely filled out, at a time when the client was not physically present before the lawyer and then arranged for an associate to administer the oath to the client over the telephone, contrary to the applicable professional conduct handbook. There had been other occasions when the member took this approach to affidavits. The member admitted the conduct and that it constituted professional misconduct. The hearing panel directed a fine of $3,500.00 and costs in the amount of $3,000.00.

6) *Law Society of Alberta v Magnan*, 2014 ABLS 24, wherein the member misled or attempted to mislead another lawyer, and the court by suppressing documents which ought to have been disclosed, and in both cases, the conduct was deserving of sanction. At the time of the hearing, Ms. Magnan was a suspended member of the LSA, the suspension having arisen as a result of other matters. Ms. Magnan did not attend the hearing. No remorse or demonstration of responsibility was expressed. The hearing committee directed a reprimand, a fine of $2,000.00, and costs of $6,000.00.

16. LSA counsel noted that unlike the present case, the decisions in *Scott* and *Nielsen* involved deceit or some other motive, and that in the case of *Scott*, the member failed to be candid with the LSA.

17. LSA counsel noted that the decision in *Reeder* is most similar to the circumstances of the present case, but that in the *Reeder* case, the member had been subject to prior discipline and had not misled the court.

18. LSA counsel noted that Ms. Kalin had been cooperative with the LSA, which avoided a contested hearing. Ms. Kalin does not have a disciplinary record with the LSA.

19. Counsel for Ms. Kalin provided information on Ms. Kalin's professional background, and characterized the conduct complained of in the Citations as "clearly an error in judgment". He advised that Ms. Kalin's remorse is palpable; she is extremely remorseful. She is now practicing family law in a small firm and has other people within the firm that she can discuss matters with.

20. With respect to costs, LSA counsel referenced the Estimated Statement of Costs marked as Exhibit 8 at the hearing, in the total amount of $4,593.75, which provides a breakdown of those costs, and does not include all of the costs incurred by the LSA in relation to the Citations. For example, the Estimated Statement of Costs does not include any costs of the investigation.

21. Counsel for the LSA and Ms. Kalin confirmed that the Joint Sanction Submission included a joint submission for an award of costs of $3,500.00.

Decision on Sanction and Costs

22. The Committee is not bound by a joint submission on sanction. That said, a Committee is required to give significant deference to a joint submission and should not depart from a joint submission on sanction unless it would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or is otherwise contrary to the public interest.

23. The approach taken by both Ms. Kalin and the LSA in dealing with this matter through the Agreed Statement and the Joint Sanction Submission avoided an unnecessary contested hearing, witness inconvenience, and process costs.

24. With respect to the application of the Public Interest Test in this case, and in consideration of the Guideline and authorities provided by LSA counsel, the Agreed Statement, the Joint Sanction Submission, and the submissions of LSA counsel and of Ms. Kalin, I find that:

    1) the Joint Sanction Submission is not so markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the Citations that the joint submission would be viewed as a breakdown of the LSA's conduct system;

    2) the Joint Sanction Submission would not cause an informed and reasonable public to lose confidence in the institution of the LSA;

    3) the Joint Sanction Submission is not so unhinged from the circumstances of the Citations and the member that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the LSA's conduct system had broken down.

25. As such, I accept the Joint Sanction Submission.

26. As noted above, although not addressed at the hearing, pursuant to section 72(1) of the *Act*, this Committee delivers the following reprimand to Ms. Kalin:

> Ms. Kalin:
>
> You have admitted guilt to two citations. Specifically, you have admitted that you signed a false certificate regarding the use of video conferencing technology to sign an affidavit, that you improperly altered an affidavit, that you misled the Court, and that such conduct is deserving of sanction. Those citations are serious. The integrity of legal documents is one of the many structures that upholds public confidence in the administration of justice, and as such, even a casual breach of that structure must be treated seriously.
>
> In these matters, you put your professional reputation and integrity at risk. In making these comments today and in expressing this reprimand today, I urge you to constantly have at the forefront of your mind and your practice the integrity required of all of us as members of this profession and the diligence that we all must demonstrate to protect our clients' interests and to maintain our reputation and the reputation of this profession.
>
> The Pre-Hearing and Hearing Guideline of the LSA requires that hearing committees take a purposeful approach to sanctioning a member who has been found guilty of conduct deserving of sanction. The fundamental purpose of sanctioning is the protection of the best interests of the public and the protection of the reputation and standing of the legal profession generally.
>
> As a Member of this Law Society, you will be expected to look at what you have done to determine whether or not you can improve on what has happened, learn from this particular matter, and, of course, to move forward.
>
> Ms. Kalin, I acknowledge your cooperation with the LSA leading up to today and resolving these complaints by admitting guilt, by proceeding with a single-Bencher hearing, and agreeing to a joint submission on sanction and costs. Your admissions and cooperation have permitted these citations to be resolved on a more efficient basis, which is not just a benefit to you, but is a benefit to the public and to the LSA.
>
> In concluding, I wish you the best as you move forward from these circumstances and thank you for your attendance today.

27. With respect to costs, I have considered the factors to be addressed in an award of costs by a professional disciplinary body as set out in the 2025 decision of the Court of

Appeal of Alberta in *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*,[3] including that the quantum of costs sought in the Joint Sanction Submission of $3,500.00 is reasonable having regard to the nature of the investigation, the allegations and the haring process, and is proportionate to the issues involved, the circumstances of the member, and the overall burden it places on the member, particularly with regard to the breakdown of the LSA costs as set out in the Estimated Bill of Costs marked as Exhibit 8 at the hearing, the fact that the Estimated Bill of Costs is not comprehensive of all costs incurred by the LSA with respect to this matter, and that the proposed costs award of $3,500.00 is part of the Joint Sanction Submission agreed to by the LSA and by Ms. Kalin.

28. In accordance with the Joint Sanction Submission, which I have accepted, I direct that Ms. Kalin pay a fine of $4,500.00, and I grant an award of costs against Ms. Kalin in the amount of $3,500.00.

29. Counsel for Ms. Kalin requested that Ms. Kalin have until October 1, 2027 to pay the fine and the costs award. LSA counsel had no objection to this request. I direct that Ms. Kalin has until October 1, 2027 to pay the fine and the costs award.

Concluding Matters

30. No notice to the Attorney General is required.

31. No Notice to the Profession is required or appropriate in this case.

32. The Exhibits marked during the hearing, 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 Ms. Kalin will be redacted and further redactions will be made to preserve client confidentiality and solicitor-client privilege (Rule 98(3)).

Dated October 13, 2026.

Kelsey Meyer, KC

[3] *Charkhandeh v College of Dental Surgeons of Alberta*, 2025 ABCA 258 at paras 132, 136, 137, 138, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, and 149.