

**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. Iram Kareemi Zando (CPSO# 59919)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Respondent saw the Complainant at a walk-in clinic in July 2019.

The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concerns about the Respondent's conduct.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned that the Respondent was rude and unprofessional when she told the Respondent she had been experiencing fatigue and felt she needed blood work ordered.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

An Internal Medicine Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of March 9, 2020. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to communications and professionalism. The Committee also asked the Respondent to submit a written report summarizing the College's Practice Guide and the College policy *Physician Behaviour in the Professional Environment*, describing how they are applicable to the Respondent's situation and how the Respondent has made, or plans to make, changes to her practice and improve her interactions with patients going forward.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

According to the Complainant, when she attended the walk-in clinic with fatigue and believing she needed bloodwork, the Respondent was unprofessional and aggressive in her manner.

The Respondent told the College that she was not unprofessional or aggressive with the Complainant, but rather stated that she would not agree to do bloodwork without first reviewing the Complainant's symptoms. She never intended to make the Complainant feel insulted or uncomfortable.

The Committee is limited to a paper review of information and is not in a position to determine with certainty whether the Respondent was unprofessional in her communications with the Complainant.

Having said that, given the Respondent's history of College complaints and/or investigations in which her professionalism and communications were at issue, including other investigations reviewed at the same meeting as this matter, the Committee was left with the impression that a concerning pattern of behaviour was arising.

In July 2019, following several other investigations, the Committee ordered the Respondent to complete a specified continuing remediation and education program (SCERP) consisting of courses in medical record-keeping and communication, a period of clinical supervision and a reassessment three months following completion of the clinical supervision.

At that time, the Committee did not require the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person. However, in the current matter the Committee was of the view that it would be appropriate to do so, to impress upon her the Committee's concerns about the number of complaints and investigations in which concerns about her professionalism and communications have been at issue.

In addition, the Committee noted that while speaking with the College investigator during the course of this investigation, the Respondent indicated her intent to take a communication course but said that she had not yet signed up and was concerned the course would not help, because the issue was the patients. The Respondent's comments raised questions for the Committee about her insight into the deficiencies in her communications and suggested she had not reflected on how she might be perceived by patients and how she might improve her patient interactions. This too led the Committee to conclude it was appropriate to require the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned, as outlined above.