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. Raj Ramanna (CPSO #62993)
(the Respondent)

INTRODUCTION

The Patient contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's conduct during vaginal rejuvenation treatment. Specifically, the Patient was concerned that the Respondent made sexual comments about the condition of the Patient's vagina and dating again after her partner's passing.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of February 13, 2025. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to maintaining professional boundaries and his communication with patients.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The College's *Boundary Violations* policy states that physicians must not make comments about a patient's sexual history, behaviour, or performance except where the information is relevant to the provision of care.

The Respondent denied that his comments were sexual in nature. He advised that his comments about the condition of the Patient's vagina and her personal life were of a clinical nature and not made in reference to sexual function. However, a person present during the procedure advised that the Respondent made a comment which connected the condition of the Patient's vagina following treatment to her romantic prospects, supporting the Patient's recollection. Making such a comment was not relevant to the care the Respondent provided and was contrary to the *Boundary Violation* policy.

The Committee also considered that the Respondent has a history of complaints with the College raising similar issues, including concerns about the Respondent's communication, professionalism, and maintaining professional boundaries.

While the Respondent reflected on ways in which his communication could be improved, the Committee was still concerned that the Respondent continued to show

poor judgement in his communication with patients and did not maintain appropriate boundaries in this case despite previous interventions on these subjects. As such, the Committee determined that it was appropriate to caution the Respondent.

This is a summary of the Committee's decision as it relates to the Caution disposition.