

**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. Randall James William Webster (CPSO #26343)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant was referred to the Respondent, a gastroenterologist, for assessment of chronic constipation. The Respondent saw the Complainant on a single occasion. The Complainant 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 about the Respondent's conduct and communications during an appointment in May 2018. In particular, the Complainant is concerned about:

- **the Respondent's manners and how she was handled during an intimate examination**
- **the Respondent's removal of her clothing without telling her about what he was doing**
- **the Respondent's movement of her body without asking her to move herself or asking her permission to move her body for her**
- **the Respondent's lack of communication.**

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of May 8 and August 22, 2019. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to inappropriate behaviour during an intimate patient examination involving a rectal examination. The Committee also accepted a signed undertaking from the Respondent, which is posted on the College's public register.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee noted the following in reaching its decision:

- The allegation of sexual abuse during an assessment of symptoms of constipation, including a rectal examination, if true, is extremely serious. However, other factors indicate a referral to the Discipline Committee was not warranted. These factors include: the Respondent's denial that there was a sexual component to the examination; the examination as documented was clinically indicated for assessment of the Complainant's symptoms of abdominal pain and constipation; the Respondent has

no history of complaints similar in nature to the allegations made by the Complainant. The Committee also noted the Respondent's apology for any misunderstanding regarding the way the examination was conducted and for the distress and confusion this caused.

- Based on the information in the investigative record, the Committee did have significant concerns about the Respondent's behaviour during a rectal examination of a patient, and, in particular, his poor communication and inappropriate disrobing and positioning of the Complainant. On this basis, the Committee determined that it was appropriate to caution the Respondent.