

NOTICE OF PUBLICATION BAN

In the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario and Dr. Swaran Kaur Syan, this is notice that the Discipline Committee ordered that no person shall publish or broadcast the names of Dr. Syan's patients or any information that could disclose the names or identities of patients under subsection 45(3) of the Health Professions Procedural Code (the "Code"), which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, S.O. 1991, c. 18, as amended.

Subsection 93(1) of the Code, which is concerned with failure to comply with these orders, reads:

Every person who contravenes an order made under ... section 45 or 47... is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable,

- (a) in the case of an individual to a fine of not more than \$25,000 for a first offence and not more than \$50,000 for a second or subsequent offence; or
- (b) in the case of a corporation to a fine of not more than \$50,000 for a first offence and not more than \$200,000 for a second or subsequent offence.

**Indexed as: Ontario (College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario) v.
Syan, 2015 ONCPSD 23**

**THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE COLLEGE
OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF ONTARIO**

IN THE MATTER OF a Hearing directed
by the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee of
the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario
pursuant to Section 26(1) of the **Health Professions Procedural Code**
being Schedule 2 of the ***Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991***,
S.O. 1991, c. 18, as amended.

B E T W E E N:

THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF ONTARIO

- and -

DR. SWARAN KAUR SYAN

PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. P. POLDRE (CHAIR)
P. GIROUX
DR. M. DAVIE
DR. E. ATTIA (Ph.D.)
DR. P. CASOLA

Hearing Date: April 14, 2015
Decision Date: April 14, 2015
Release of Written Reasons: June 10, 2015

PUBLICATION BAN

DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION

The Discipline Committee (the “Committee”) of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario heard this matter at Toronto on April 14, 2015. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee stated its finding that the member committed an act of professional misconduct and delivered its penalty and costs order with written reasons to follow.

THE ALLEGATIONS

The Notice of Hearing alleged that Dr. Syan committed an act of professional misconduct:

1. under paragraph 1(1)2 of Ontario Regulation 856/93 made under the *Medicine Act, 1991* (“O. Reg. 856/93”), in that she has failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession.

The Notice of Hearing also alleged that Dr. Syan is incompetent as defined by subsection 52(1) of the Code.

RESPONSE TO THE ALLEGATIONS

Dr. Syan admitted the allegation of professional misconduct in the Notice of Hearing, that she failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession. Counsel for the College withdrew the allegation of incompetence in the Notice of Hearing.

THE FACTS

The following facts were set out in an Agreed Statement of Facts and Admissions that was filed as an exhibit and presented to the Committee:

PART I – AGREED FACTS

Background

1. Dr. Swaran Kaur Syan (“Dr. Syan”) is a family physician who graduated from medical school at Punjabi University in 1978. She has held a certificate of registration

authorizing independent practice from the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the “College”) since December 3, 1996.

2. At all relevant times with respect to the facts described below, Dr. Syan maintained a solo practice in City 1, Ontario. Dr. Syan joined a Family Health Organization in City 1 on June 19, 2013 and now practices in a group setting with cross-coverage between physicians.

Investigation into Dr. Syan’s clinical care

3. On her 2011 Registration Renewal with the College, Dr. Syan responded affirmatively to the question “Since April 1, 2010, have you made a settlement of any lawsuit involving a patient or someone acting on behalf of a patient?”

4. The College requested further information from Dr. Syan about her affirmative answer. Dr. Syan advised that a patient of her family practice had a myocardial infarction while enrolled in a clinical research study for hypertension medication. Dr. Syan was a sub-investigator for the study and had referred the patient for the clinical research study. The matter was settled on behalf of Dr. Syan (60%) and a Health Care Company (40%); the Health Care Company was the manufacturer of the clinical research study medication and the sponsor of the study.

5. The College considered this information and commenced an investigation under s. 75(1)(a) of the Code in order to obtain a broader view of Dr. Syan’s practice including her enrollment of patients in clinical research studies.

6. The College retained Dr. X, a specialist in family medicine, to provide an opinion on Dr. Syan’s care. Dr. X reviewed a total of 25 charts in the course of the s. 75(1)(a) investigation.

7. Upon review of the patient charts, Dr. X noted a number of areas where Dr. Syan’s general family practice and her enrollment of patients in clinical research studies was unsatisfactory, including:

- With regard to record-keeping:
 - Dr. Syan's handwritten progress notes were difficult to read and sometimes illegible;
 - Progress notes were not always in SOAP format and it was difficult to identify patients' subjective concerns, patient history, physical findings, diagnoses, treatment plans, and what medications were being refilled;
 - The patients' Cumulative Patient Profiles were not up-to-date or accurate;
 - There was no accurate list of current medications for patients including duration and dosages;
 - Documentation of physical examinations was often limited to pulse rate and blood pressure;
 - There were no diabetes flowsheets for patients with diabetes;
 - There were no narcotics monitoring agreements for patients who were prescribed narcotics and benzodiazepines¹;
 - A review of lab, specialist and hospital reports revealed a number of diagnoses not documented on Dr. Syan's charts;
- With regard to overall care:
 - Dr. Syan's care seemed to rely on medication prescribing and referrals and failed to address the patient as a person;
 - There was a failure to monitor the side-effects of medications and to consider the effects of poly-pharmacy;

¹ Dr. X reviewed the 25 charts in two tranches. In response to Dr. X's comments on the first set of charts reviewed, Dr. Syan changed her practice and was in the process of implementing narcotics monitoring agreements at the time Dr. X reviewed the second set of charts.

- Patients appeared to be over-investigated and treated for some conditions while other conditions were rarely followed;
- There was a failure to routinely conduct age-appropriate preventive screening;
- Narcotics and benzodiazepines were prescribed with no clear diagnosis;
- With regard to the enrollment of patients in clinical research studies:
 - Patients were enrolled in research studies for which they did not clearly meet the study criteria;
 - Specialists were not aware of patients' enrollment in research studies in which they would be receiving medications;
 - It was not possible to determine from a patient's family practice chart whether the patient was enrolled in a clinical research trial, when enrollment in the trial had taken place, what medications the patient was on in the course of the trial, and when or whether the patient's participation in the trial had ended.

8. Dr. X specified that the deficiencies in Dr. Syan's practice did not arise because Dr. Syan's patient charts were handwritten rather than electronic, but were rather indicative of a general failure to meet the standard of practice of the profession of a family physician in the care and treatment of her patients.

Patient A

9. Patient A was a patient of Dr. Syan's from June to November 2012, at a seniors' residence in City 1. Patient A's daughter complained that Dr. Syan failed to adequately investigate or treat her mother's ongoing health concerns.

10. The College retained Dr. X to provide an independent opinion in this matter. Dr. X opined that Dr. Syan's care of Patient A fell below the standard of practice of the profession. In particular, Dr. X stated that:

The doctor appears to have been available for office appointments but to have provided care that, at times, falls below the standard expected and charting that is consistently brief, lacking in essential components, does not document medications, and is, overall, sub-standard.

Patient B

11. Patient B was seen by Dr. Syan at a walk-in clinic in December 2012 when he sought care for his elbow after a fall in the bush. Patient B's wife complained that Dr. Syan failed to order an x-ray. Dr. Syan diagnosed an olecranon bursitis and aspirated 20cc of blood.

12. Patient B attended upon another physician 10 days later and was subsequently found to have an elbow fracture for which he required surgery.

13. The College retained Dr. X to provide an independent opinion in this matter. Dr. X opined that Dr. Syan's care of Patient B fell below the standard of practice of the profession. Dr. X noted that:

With [this patient's] history and findings the first diagnosis to consider would be... a fracture and an x-ray would be a standard investigation. Olecranon bursitis can arise acutely from an injury and might be one of several differential diagnoses to consider however the diagnosis that must be ruled out, because it must be treated if present, is a fracture.

Fluid from a cyst or an enlarged olecranon bursa would generally be serous in nature. The tap yielded blood, which should have been another "red flag" that this was not a cystic lesion as the doctor had thought.

Section 37 Order and Subsequent Supervision

14. On November 11, 2014, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee directed the Registrar to impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on the certificate of registration of Dr. Syan pursuant to s. 37 of the Health Professions Procedural Code, which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991* (the “Section 37 Order”). A copy of the Section 37 Order is attached at Schedule 1 to this Agreed Statement of Facts.

15. In accordance with the terms of the Section 37 Order, Dr. Syan has seen approximately ten patients a week, with supervision, since the imposition of the Section 37 Order.

16. The College has received regular reports from Dr. Syan’s supervisors. The reports received from Dr. Syan’s supervisors indicate that Dr. Syan has displayed an appropriate level of medical knowledge and clinical judgment in her care and treatment of patients, that her record-keeping is improving and she has followed the recommendations of her supervisors.

PART II – ADMISSIONS

Dr. Syan admits the facts in paragraphs 3-13 above and admits that, based on these facts, she engaged in professional misconduct by having failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession in respect of her care and treatment of 20 patients, including Patient A and Patient B.

FINDING

The Committee accepted as true all of the facts set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts and Admissions. Having regard to these facts, the Committee accepted Dr. Syan’s admission and found that she committed an act of professional misconduct in that she failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession.

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING PENALTY

The following facts were set out in an Agreed Statement of Facts Regarding Penalty:

1. Dr. Syan's relevant history with the College includes the following facts:
2. In July 2008, Dr. Syan completed the Medical Record-Keeping Course.
3. In February 2011, in response to a complaint about Dr. Syan's care of a patient, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee of the College (the "ICRC") cautioned Dr. Syan to maintain adequate and legible records and directed that she complete the Medical Record-Keeping course for a second time and be re-assessed by the College.
4. In September 2012, Dr. Syan completed the Medical Record-Keeping course for a second time. The reassessment directed by the ICRC in February 2011 was commenced in May 2014 but has not been completed.
5. Dr. Syan is currently completing a preceptorship in record-keeping in her non-surgical cosmetic medicine practice and will be reassessed in this area of her practice upon completion of the preceptorship. This preceptorship is scheduled to be completed in July 2015.

PENALTY AND REASONS FOR PENALTY

Counsel for the College and counsel for the member made a joint submission as to an appropriate penalty and costs order.

The Committee is cognizant of the clear requirement of the law that where adversarial parties make a joint submission, the Committee must accept such a proposal unless to do so would be contrary to the public interest and would bring the administration of justice into disrepute. Additionally, in considering the appropriateness of a proposed penalty order, the Committee must take into account the governing principles of penalty, including public protection, proportionality, denunciation of the misconduct, and maintaining the public's confidence in the profession's ability to self-regulate in the public interest. The Committee must also consider whether the proposed penalty serves to

provide specific deterrence to the member and general deterrence to the profession at large regarding such behaviour. Where appropriate, a penalty should aim to provide rehabilitation for the member as well.

The Committee was satisfied that these core principles of penalty are met with the proposed order, and accepted the joint submission.

Dr. Syan has no prior discipline findings. Also, Dr. Syan has cooperated with the College investigation. Her admission to the allegation of professional misconduct has spared witnesses from testifying and has saved College resources. These are mitigating factors.

However, the Committee was dismayed to learn that, although Dr. Syan has not been disciplined previously, there is a history of concerns regarding her record-keeping. The independent expert retained by the College identified multiple concerns regarding Dr. Syan's record-keeping in her review of 25 patient charts and in relation to Patient A. The fact that she has taken the record-keeping course, now on two occasions, causes concern for the Committee. It is very important for all physicians, and especially those working in a walk-in setting, to have complete, organized, legible charts so that other health care providers who are involved in the patient's care are able to rely on what is charted as a useful, accurate, and complete record of the patient's condition and the care provided.

In addition to the charting deficiencies, the College expert identified far reaching concerns regarding Dr. Syan's general care of patients, her research study practices and a failure to maintain the standard of practice in failing to order an x-ray to rule out a fracture in relation to Patient B. These pervasive concerns call for a serious sanction.

The significant penalty of a two month suspension of Dr. Syan's certificate of registration will demonstrate to Dr. Syan, and the profession as a whole, the seriousness of her failure to meet the standard of care of the profession. The public reprimand ordered serves to denunciate the misconduct.

Dr. Syan will have indefinite and significant terms, conditions and limitations placed on her certificate of registration. The Committee is satisfied that these terms will protect the public. The individualized education plan will provide Dr. Syan with an opportunity for

rehabilitation of her practice habits and will also provide a thorough protection of the public through regular supervision and reporting to the College. These reports will be reviewed and approved before her limited practice can be extended to seeing more patients over a period of at least one year, through the carefully laid out stipulations of the order. Finally, approximately six months after completion of the remediation program, Dr. Syan will undergo a reassessment by a College approved assessor. Dr. Syan will also be required to abide by all recommendations of the assessor and approximately twelve months later she will undergo a second reassessment. These reassessments will ensure continued protection of the public and that Dr. Syan is maintaining the standard of practice of the profession.

The Committee is aware that Dr. Syan did cooperate with the College investigation and did admit to the allegation of failure to maintain the standard of practice of the profession, which has made testimony from witnesses unnecessary and saved resources for the College. It is within the Committee's discretion to award costs. We are in agreement that it is warranted in this case to award the College the costs of one day of hearing.

ORDER

Therefore, having stated its findings of professional misconduct in paragraph 1 of its written order of April 14, 2015, the Committee ordered and directed on the matter of penalty and costs that:

2. Dr. Syan attend before the panel to be reprimanded.
3. the Registrar suspend Dr. Syan's certificate of registration for a period of two (2) months, commencing from April 14, 2015 at 11:59 p.m.
4. the Registrar impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on Dr. Syan's certificate of registration:
 - (a) For an indefinite period of time, Dr. Syan shall not be involved in clinical research studies in any manner, including but not limited to the enrollment

of patients in clinical research studies. While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall not be involved in clinical research studies in any manner, including but not limited to the enrollment of patients in clinical research studies;

- (b) For an indefinite period of time, Dr. Syan shall practice only in a group setting and/or as a member of a group of physicians with cross-coverage. While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall practice only in a group setting and/or as a member of a group of physicians with cross-coverage;
- (c) Dr. Syan shall, before June 14, 2015, deliver an undertaking in the form attached [to the Order] as Schedule “A” signed by a College-approved clinical supervisor, (the “Clinical Supervisor”), whose role shall be guided by the Individualized Education Plan (the “IEP”) attached [to the Order] at Schedule “B”. Commencing on the day that Dr. Syan resumes practice following her suspension, Dr. Syan may practice family medicine and/or walk-in medicine only with the supervision of the Clinical Supervisor. Dr. Syan shall be subject to this term, condition and limitation for a period of no less than twelve (12) months, and shall be released therefrom only upon receipt of satisfactory report(s) from her Clinical Supervisor and approval, in its sole discretion, by the College;
- (d) If Dr. Syan fails to retain a Clinical Supervisor as required above or if, prior to the completion of the required period of supervision above, Dr. Syan’s Clinical Supervisor is unable or unwilling to continue in that role, Dr. Syan shall within twenty (20) days deliver a new undertaking in the form attached [to the Order] as Schedule “A” signed by a new College-approved clinical supervisor, failing which she shall cease to practice family medicine and walk-in medicine until such time as she has retained a Clinical Supervisor and the fact that she has ceased to practice family medicine and walk-in

medicine shall be a term, condition and limitation on her Certificate of Registration until that time;

- (e) After Dr. Syan has delivered an executed Undertaking from a Clinical Supervisor to the College as described above in paragraph 4(c), Dr. Syan shall see patients in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice only in accordance with the Remediation Program described at subparagraphs 4(e)(i)-(viii) (the “Remediation Program”), until the Remediation Program has been completed:
 - i. Throughout the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan shall maintain an up-to-date log (the “Patient Log”) listing every patient seen by her in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice, including the patient’s name, date of birth, OHIP number, date of appointment or visit, and reason for visit. Dr. Syan shall maintain the original Patient Log and shall send a copy to the College at the end of every calendar month;
 - ii. In Phase One of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan shall see no more than a combined total of thirty (30) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice. Dr. Syan shall submit these patients’ charts and the Patient Log to the Clinical Supervisor for review and shall meet with the Clinical Supervisor at least once every seven (7) days to discuss the Clinical Supervisor’s review of her patients’ charts and any concerns arising therefrom, including with particular reference to the educational needs identified in the IEP attached [to the Order] at Schedule “B”. While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall see no more than a combined total of thirty (30) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice;

- iii. Also in Phase One of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan shall develop a continuing professional development plan (the “CPD Plan”), in conjunction with her Clinical Supervisor, addressing the educational needs identified in the IEP attached [to the Order] at Schedule “B”, to be submitted to the College for approval. The CPD Plan must include personal learning objectives and a plan to meet those objectives. The plan must meet the requirements for continuing professional development set by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada or the College of Family Physicians of Canada;
- iv. Upon approval by the College of the CPD Plan and if reports from the Clinical Supervisor indicate that it is appropriate to do so and if approved by the College, after a minimum of one (1) month in Phase One of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan may move to Phase Two of the Remediation Program, during which she shall see no more than a combined total of sixty (60) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice. Dr. Syan shall submit 50% of these patients’ charts, as selected by the Clinical Supervisor, and the Patient Log to the Clinical Supervisor for review and shall meet with the Clinical Supervisor at least once every seven (7) days to discuss the Clinical Supervisor’s review of her patients’ charts and any concerns arising therefrom, including with particular reference to the educational needs identified in the IEP attached [to the Order] at Schedule “B”. While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall see no more than a combined total of sixty (60) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice;
- v. If reports from the Clinical Supervisor indicate that it is appropriate to do so and if approved by the College, after a minimum of two (2) months in Phase Two of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan may move to Phase Three of the Remediation Program, during which she

shall see no more than a combined total of ninety (90) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice. Dr. Syan shall submit 25% of these patients' charts, as selected by the Clinical Supervisor, and the Patient Log to the Clinical Supervisor for review and shall meet with the Clinical Supervisor at least once every fourteen (14) days to discuss the Clinical Supervisor's review of her patients' charts and any concerns arising therefrom, including with particular reference to the educational needs identified in the IEP attached [to the Order] at Schedule "B". While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall see no more than a combined total of ninety (90) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice;

- vi. If reports from the Clinical Supervisor indicate that it is appropriate to do so and if approved by the College, after a minimum of three (3) months in Phase Three of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan may move to Phase Four of the Remediation Program, during which she shall see no more than a combined total of one hundred and twenty (120) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice. Dr. Syan shall submit 25% of these patients' charts, as selected by the Clinical Supervisor, and the Patient Log to the Clinical Supervisor for review and shall meet with the Clinical Supervisor at least once every thirty (30) days to discuss the Clinical Supervisor's review of her patients' charts and any concerns arising therefrom, including with particular reference to the educational needs identified in the IEP attached [to the Order] at Schedule "B". While Dr. Syan is subject to this restriction, the following statement shall appear on the public register: Dr. Syan shall see no more than a combined total of one hundred and twenty (120) patients per week in her family medicine and/or walk-in medicine practice;

- vii. If reports from the Clinical Supervisor indicate that it is appropriate to do so and if approved by the College, after a minimum of six (6) months in Phase Four of the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan may complete the Remediation Program;
 - viii. Throughout the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan shall cooperate with her Clinical Supervisor and shall abide by all recommendations of her Clinical Supervisor including but not limited to recommendations about her care, recordkeeping, practice improvements, practice management, and continuing education.
- (f) Dr. Syan shall consent to the disclosure by her Clinical Supervisor to the College and by the College to her Clinical Supervisor, of all information the Clinical Supervisor or the College deems necessary or desirable in order to fulfill the Clinical Supervisor's Undertaking and to monitor Dr. Syan's compliance with the Order.
- (g) Approximately six (6) months after completing the Remediation Program, Dr. Syan shall undergo a reassessment of her family medicine and walk-in medicine practice by a College-appointed Assessor (the "First Reassessment"). The assessment may include a review of Dr. Syan's patient charts, direct observations, and interviews with staff and/or patients and any other tools deemed necessary by the College. Dr. Syan shall abide by all recommendations made by the Assessor, and the Assessor shall report the results of the assessment to the College.
- (h) Approximately twelve (12) months following the completion of the First Reassessment, Dr. Syan shall undergo a second reassessment of her family medicine and walk-in medicine practice by a College-appointed Assessor (the "Second Reassessment"). The assessment may include a review of Dr. Syan's patient charts, direct observations, and interviews with staff and/or patients and any other tools deemed necessary by the College. Dr. Syan

shall abide by all recommendations made by the Assessor, and the Assessor shall report the results of the assessment to the College.

- (i) The First Reassessment and the Second Reassessment shall take the place of the reassessment directed by the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee of the College in February 2011.
 - (j) Dr. Syan shall consent to sharing of information among the Assessor(s), the Clinical Supervisor, and the College as any of them deem necessary or desirable in order to fulfill their respective obligations.
 - (k) Dr. Syan shall inform the College of each and every location where she practices family medicine and walk-in medicine, in any jurisdiction (her “Practice Location(s)”) within fifteen (15) days of this Order, and shall inform the College of any and all new Practice Locations within fifteen (15) days of commencing practice at that location, until the results of the reassessments of her practice have been reported to the College.
 - (l) Dr. Syan shall cooperate with unannounced inspections of her practice and patient charts by a College representative(s) for the purpose of monitoring and enforcing her compliance with the terms of this Order.
 - (m) Dr. Syan shall consent to the College making appropriate enquiries of the Ontario Health Insurance Program, the Narcotics Monitoring System and/or any person who or institution that may have relevant information, in order for the College to monitor her compliance with this Order and shall promptly sign such consents as may be necessary for the College to obtain information from these persons or institutions.
 - (n) Dr. Syan shall be responsible for any and all reasonable costs associated with implementing the terms of this Order.
5. Dr. Syan pay to the College costs in the amount of \$4,460.00, within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

At the conclusion of the hearing, Dr. Syan waived her right to an appeal under subsection 70(1) of the Code and the Committee administered the public reprimand.

**Indexed as: Ontario (College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario) v.
Syan, 2015 ONCPSD 23**

**THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE COLLEGE
OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF ONTARIO**

IN THE MATTER OF a Hearing directed
by the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee of
the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario
pursuant to Section 26(1) of the **Health Professions Procedural Code**
being Schedule 2 of the ***Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991***,
S.O. 1991, c. 18, as amended.

B E T W E E N:

THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF ONTARIO

- and -

DR. SWARAN KAUR SYAN

PANEL MEMBERS:

DR. P. POLDRE (CHAIR)
P. GIROUX
DR. M. DAVIE
DR. E. ATTIA (Ph.D.)
DR. P. CASOLA

Hearing Date:	April 14, 2015
Decision Date:	April 14, 2015
Reprimand Date:	April 14, 2015
Release of Written Reasons:	June 10, 2015

PUBLICATION BAN

TEXT of PUBLIC REPRIMAND
Delivered April 14, 2015
in the case of the
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF ONTARIO
and
DR. SWARAN KAUR SYAN

Dr. Syan, the Discipline Committee is disappointed that you have failed to improve your medical record-keeping after your July 2008 course, and is further dismayed that your second course in September 2012 did not influence your record-keeping sufficiently.

In the context of your practice, in which other practitioners must be able to comprehend your care of patients, the failure to improve record-keeping is incomprehensible and totally unacceptable. Our profession relies on continuing self-improvement, and education to ensure that patient trust and safety are paramount.

You have regrettably failed to demonstrate your own ability and willingness to improve your patient's care and the public expects much more of you.

The opinions of the expert reveal a global deficiency of many aspects of patient care which must be addressed. The significant future restrictions and supervision on your patient care practice are an indication of how serious your weaknesses currently are. They must be corrected.

The remediation proposed is an opportunity for you to demonstrate your commitment as a professional to the care of your patients and to rebuild respect for you as a member of the profession. The Discipline Committee trusts that you will not appear before the Committee again.