

**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. Jason Kevin Dorfman (CPSO #52310)  
(the Respondent)**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Patient has a history of visual impairment, congenital nystagmus, and pseudophakia in both eyes. The Patient was referred to the Respondent for consideration of laser vision correction surgery. The Respondent declined to perform surgery at the Patient's second appointment. The Complainant (the Patient's spouse) contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's conduct.

**COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS**

**The Complainant is concerned that the Respondent behaved in an unprofessional manner when caring for the Patient in his office on September 19, 2018. Specifically, the Complainant is concerned that the Respondent, without explanation, walked out of the Patient's scheduled appointment for laser surgery.**

**COMMITTEE'S DECISION**

A Surgical Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of April 18, 2019. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to the importance of respectful communications.

**COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

The Respondent's history with the College is significant, and concerning, especially related to communications issues, and in the past the Committee directed that he complete a specified continuing education and remediation program (SCERP) that included a communications course.

The Committee was troubled by the Complainant's description of the Respondent's behaviour towards the Patient, walking away from the Patient at the second appointment and stating, "I can't help you," without further explanation. Although the Respondent may have been justified in his view that laser surgery would not help the Patient, his response did not in any way dispel the Committee's concern about the abrupt and dismissive manner in which the Respondent treated the Patient at their second encounter when delivering this news. The Committee's concern was amplified when considering the encounter in conjunction with the Respondent's clear history of communications difficulties. It was further concerning to the Committee that

the Respondent should have behaved in such a way towards a patient despite having the benefit of completing a communications course in the last several years.

The Committee was concerned about the Respondent's behaviour toward the Patient but also with his potential to behave in a similar fashion towards future patients, which would be unacceptable. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Committee determined that it would be appropriate to caution the Respondent so that he might reflect adequately on the seriousness with which the Committee takes this issue.