

**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. Kris Ching Wai Cheng (CPSO #111566)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The College received information which raised concerns about the Respondent's delegation of controlled acts as medical director of a beauty clinic offering cosmetic procedures such as Botox and other injections (the Clinic). Subsequently, the Committee approved the Registrar's appointment of investigators to conduct a review of the Respondent's practice in this area.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A General Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of January 8, 2020. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to his failure to comply with the College's policy, *Delegation of Controlled Acts*. The Committee also requested that the Respondent provide a written report with respect to his review of the policy and explaining the risks of failing to meet the policy and how he would change his practice going forward to ensure he is in compliance with the policy.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee reviewed the medical directives from the Clinic that the Respondent provided and found them to be very general and inadequate in terms of what is required under the College's policy. In the Committee's opinion, the Respondent failed to comply with multiple aspects of the College's policy. There was no regular assessment of the procedures being performed on patients, the skills of the delegates when interacting with patients, or the results achieved (i.e. no ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the acts being performed to ensure the currency of the delegates knowledge and skills, and to ensure the delegation process was safe and effective). In addition, it would appear that the Respondent did not meet most of the patients who attended the Clinic and did not have an established doctor-patient relationship with the patients, as the policy requires.

The Committee saw no documentation of the assessment of the skills of the delegates or their training, the specific delegation to the individuals performing the delegated acts, and the ongoing quality assessment of their skills, including chart audits. While the Respondent stated that he was available at all times by telephone, he only visited the Clinic infrequently, and provided very poor supervision to his delegates.

In the Committee's opinion, the Respondent's very arms-length relationship with the Clinic had the potential to put patients at risk. As such, the Committee concluded that it was appropriate to caution the Respondent, as set out above.