

**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. Jayant Bhatt (CPSO #26042)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant was referred to the Respondent at the Stress Counselling and Mental Health Clinic for assessment of her stress and anxiety following a traumatic incident. They had one telephone appointment in June 2022.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned regarding the Respondent's professional communication during a telephone appointment in June 2022. Specifically, the Respondent spoke to her in a disrespectful and insensitive manner, using a threatening tone and without considering trauma-informed care.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of June 7, 2023. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to practicing outside his scope of practice and not maintaining accurate and thorough medical records.

The Committee also decided to accept an undertaking from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

As part of this investigation, the Committee retained an independent Assessor who is a general internist. The Assessor acknowledged that the Complainant and the Respondent provided different versions of what occurred during the telemedicine appointment.

The Assessor concluded that if one were to hold the events as described by the Complainant to be true, then the Respondent did not meet the standard of practice for the profession due to significant deficiencies in oral communication skills and professional behaviour.

If one were to hold the events as described by the Respondent to be true, the Respondent provided care at the standard of practice of the profession based on what would be reasonably expected of a general internist. However, they also indicated that

this is not the type of care the Complainant needed, given her recent traumatic experience.

The Assessor opined that stress counselling is not within the scope of practice of an internal medicine specialist. They further opined that whether one accepts the Complainant's or the Respondent's version of events, by practicing outside his scope of practice and not providing appropriate and timely support to the Complainant, he put the Complainant at risk.

The Assessor also concluded that, whether one accepted the Complainant's or Respondent's version of events, the Respondent displayed a lack of skill and judgement in working with patients dealing with stress related to a traumatic event and in having deficient record keeping. The Respondent had advised that he was unable to find the handwritten note he made during his appointment with the Complainant.

The Committee agreed with the Assessor's conclusion that the Respondent's care and conduct demonstrated a lack of skill and judgement and exposed the Complainant to potential harm. On that basis, the Committee decided to require the Respondent to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent with respect to his professionalism and communication.