

**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. Suman Kumar Koka (CPSO #88116)
Family Medicine
(the Respondent)

INTRODUCTION

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

The Patient attended a walk-in clinic with gastrointestinal concerns, and to have a form completed and a prescription refilled.

The Patient was concerned that care was provided by a person who introduced herself as "Dr. Koka" but was not a physician, and that individual then completed the form and prescription incorrectly and did not send a referral. The Complainant was also concerned with the Respondent's office administration in that the telephone is not answered, and it is not possible to leave a message, and the Respondent inappropriately terminated care.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of April 8, 2026. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to appropriate delegation and office administration, and to comply with and structure his practice in accordance with the College documents, *Professional Obligations: Delegation of Controlled Acts, Availability and Coverage, Medical Records Documentation, Prescribing Drugs, Third Party Medical Reports, and Ending the Physician-Patient Relationship*.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

As a result of this investigation, the Committee had concerns about the Respondent's delegation processes and office administration. In general, the Respondent failed to comply with and structure his practice in accordance with the College's policies, particularly with respect to failing to appropriately oversee a delegate. The Committee also had concerns about the Respondent not ensuring his telephone was answered or accepted voicemail, and with the manner in which he terminated the Patient's care.

When delegating care, physicians are responsible for ensuring the standard of care is met and that delegation does not compromise the patient's health, safety and quality of care. This includes that the Respondent provide effective supervision and ensure that individuals to whom he delegates have the knowledge, skill, and judgment to perform the delegated acts competently, and that there are consistent practices for consent and documentation when delegating care.

In this case, the Respondent provided inadequate oversight of the Physician Assistant (PA) candidate. It appears based on the documentation that the PA candidate came up with a diagnosis/assessment of the Patient, recommended treatment, issued a prescription and completed a form without a patient-physician relationship being established before or after the encounter, and without any input from the Respondent. In particular, the documentation in the chart shows that the PA candidate made decisions on behalf of the Respondent but there is no indication the Respondent reviewed and signed off on those decisions.

When delegating, physicians must ensure that the individuals to whom they are delegating accurately identify themselves and their role in providing care to patients. The Committee is limited to a review of documents and is unable to know if the PA candidate introduced herself as "Dr. Koka" or failed to explain that she was not a doctor. In this case, the chart note did not show that consent was obtained from the Patient for the assessment to be done by the PA candidate or the Patient was given the option to discuss their concerns with a physician.

There were numerous other deficiencies in the Patient's chart note. For example, it was not clear the Respondent was aware of the encounter, reviewed the case or signed off on the care. The chart was disorganized and showed a complete lack of understanding of the subjective-objective-assessment-plan (SOAP) approach to medical recordkeeping. This reflects insufficient oversight by the Respondent as supervisor of the PA candidate to ensure the delegate is competent and has the knowledge, skill and judgement to perform the delegated task.

The PA candidate issued a prescription in the Respondent's name without discussing the case with the Respondent. The PA candidate also completed a form incorrectly and as a result the Patient was denied the benefit. The Respondent should ensure that all requirements are met when completing third-party medical reports and that delegates recognize the limitations of their roles.

The Respondent acknowledged that Clinic staff do not answer the telephone as they are too busy, and patients are expected to attend in person during business hours. As set out in the College policy, *Availability and Coverage*, the Respondent is expected to ensure he has an office telephone that is either answered or where voice messages can be left, and the latter are reviewed and responded to in a timely manner.

The Committee was concerned that the Respondent abruptly terminated the Patient's care without meeting the requirements in the College policy *Ending the Physician-Patient Relationship*.

The Committee's concerns were elevated given the Respondent's history of College complaints and/or investigations where deficiencies have been identified in his delegation practices. The Committee is concerned that these deficiencies have continued in spite of prior education and direction from the Committee.

The Committee is satisfied a caution and undertaking as set out above will address our concerns with the Respondent's practice.