

## SUMMARY

### DR. THOMAS PETER JASKOT (CPSO# 24242)

#### 1. Disposition

On November 1, 2018, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (the Committee) required general practitioner Dr. Jaskot to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to his failure to abide by the College's policy on *Block Fees and Uninsured Services*.

#### 2. Introduction

A family member of the Patient contacted the College to express concerns about Dr. Jaskot, including that he billed the Patient a fee of \$20 which he advised "goes towards the secretary and his new office, to offset cuts by the government."

Dr. Jaskot advised that the block fee he charges patients is not mandatory, and that patients receive the same uninsured services whether they pay the block fee or not. He further explained that his reason for instituting block fees approximately two years prior was in response to increased costs and a decrease of OHIP payments. He indicated that patients do not receive a receipt unless they ask for one, and that he records payments by a "dot" in the patient's chart, as he did in this case.

#### 3. Committee Process

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee, consisting of public and physician members, met to review the relevant records and documents related to the complaint. The Committee always has before it applicable legislation and regulations, along with policies that the College has developed, which reflect the College's professional expectations for physicians practising in

Ontario. Current versions of these documents are available on the College's website at [www.cpsso.on.ca](http://www.cpsso.on.ca), under the heading "Policies & Publications."

#### **4. Committee's Analysis**

The Committee was concerned by Dr. Jaskot's lack of proper financial recordkeeping, and noted that placing a dot on a chart was not an acceptable method of documenting that a patient has made a payment. As per the policy noted above, physicians should give patients an itemized receipt for any payments made, including block fees, whether the patients request a receipt or not, and make clear what the payment covers.

Overall, the Committee was of the view that Dr. Jaskot's billing practices were not appropriate, and contravened many aspects of the above noted policy. For example, he did not give receipts for all payment, did not provide a list of services that the block fees covered, and did not have the patient sign an agreement with respect to block fees. The Committee was also left with the impression that there may have been a lack of clear communication with the Patient around the block fee issue, as suggested by the Patient's lack of understanding of what he was paying for in this case. In addition, the Committee noted that there was no documentation in the record that made clear that the block fee payment was optional.

While the Committee appreciated the steps Dr. Jaskot has reportedly taken to bring his practice in line with College policy, it noted that in addition to this complaint it had before it another public complaint and an investigation (involving information from several patients) which raised similar concerns with respect to block fees and uninsured services. The Committee was therefore concerned that this information suggested a concerning pattern of inappropriate billing practices.

Based on the above, the Committee required Dr. Jaskot to attend at the College to be cautioned on his failure to abide by the College's policy on *Block Fees and Uninsured Services*.

