

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee
(the Committee)**
(Information is available about the complaints process [here](#) and about the Committee [here](#))

**Dr. Allyson Enid Koffman (CPSO #71137)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

On several occasions, the Complainant attended the clinic where the Respondent (Family Medicine) works. Health Care Connect then advised the Complainant they were rostered to the Respondent, whom the Complainant said they had never met.

The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's conduct.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned that, without their knowledge or consent, they were rostered as the Respondent's patient, when they have never met nor received care from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of April 8, 2021. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to rostering a patient without their knowledge, and where neither verbal nor written consent was obtained for the rostering.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Respondent explained that the Complainant's rostering took place as a result of a misunderstanding, and that she had understood another physician had spoken with the Complainant about the Respondent's willingness to take the Complainant on as a patient.

While the record showed that the Respondent had one brief visit with the Complainant, she did not document any discussion about rostering at that time, nor is there other documentation in the record about any conversations regarding the Complainant being rostered to the Respondent or about the Complainant's consent to such rostering.

The College's Discipline Committee had made a finding in 2017 with respect to the Respondent's management of patient rostering, leading to an Order that included a four-month suspension and individualized coaching. In light of this history, the Committee

was concerned that the Respondent would accept a new patient without having a specific conversation with that patient about rostering (including documenting this in the record). It would have been expected that the Respondent would have been meticulous in relation to patient rostering given the prior Discipline finding.

The events in this case demonstrated a lack of insight on the part of the Respondent and suggested to the Committee that her previous pattern around patient rostering had not been remedied.

The Committee concluded that it was appropriate to require the Respondent to appear before the Committee to be cautioned, as set out above.