



Type: Extraordinary Action (IC)

Name: Luke Mountjoy, ND

Location: Burnaby, British Columbia

Date of Action: March 16, 2026

Nature of Action: On March 16, 2026, a Panel of the Inquiry Committee (the “Panel”) of the College of Complementary Health Professionals (the “College”) ordered that Dr. Luke Mountjoy (the “Registrant”)’s practice of naturopathic medicine be subject to the following limit to protect the public during an investigation, pursuant to section 35(1)(a) of the *Health Professions Act* (the “Act”):

- a. The Registrant is prohibited from performing any banding or ligation procedures removing hemorrhoids, surgical removal of skin tags, and any other procedure on tissue below the dermis in the anorectal region.

Legal Framework: Section 35(1) of the *Act* authorizes the Panel to implement limits and conditions on practice to protect the public from harm before an investigation or discipline hearing is complete. This is not a final disposition, but an urgent, protective, and temporary measure that will remain in effect until the matter is concluded. Measures taken under section 35(1) of the *Act* pertain to allegations which are and remain unproven unless admitted by a registrant or determined by the Discipline Committee.

Reasons: The Order was made following complaints from two separate patients on whom the Registrant performed minor surgeries in the anorectal region who experienced post-operative complications. In regard to the complaints, the Panel found a *prima facie* case that the Registrant performed procedures that caused, or likely caused, the patients to develop abscesses, and failed to take sufficient post-operative action to detect or address infections. The Panel considered the alleged conduct serious and recognized the presence of factors that render the alleged conduct likely to recur.

The Panel was concerned that there is a risk of the alleged conduct being repeated if an interim order is not made. Having weighed the different options and the circumstances of this case and having considered the impact on the Registrant, the Panel concluded that the above-described limit on practice is proportionate and sufficient to protect the public during the investigation or pending a discipline hearing.