

**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. Mostafa Showraki (CPSO# 64418)
(Psychiatry)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's professionalism related to an assessment for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and charges for completing an assessment form.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned about the professionalism of the Respondent with respect to care he provided in 2021. Specifically, the Complainant is concerned that the Respondent:

- a) misled her into paying \$250 to complete an online comprehensive assessment form for ADHD, which was actually the Respondent's personal website, giving him full profit from the fee paid**
- b) offered to provide her medications for ADHD in the absence of any assessment, as she initially did not want to pay the assessment fee**
- c) created an online assessment tool as a Word document that included spelling errors and which was lacking any profile or information about ADHD to help navigate treatment, and told her that the assessment would provide her with a "fulsome picture of her ADHD profile", which is not what occurred.**

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A Mental Health Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of August 10, 2021. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to conflicts of interest. The Committee issued advice, to the Respondent to ensure comprehensive assessment, management, and documentation of adult ADHD.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee noted that, overall, the Respondent offered no meaningful rationale for his use of the unvalidated assessment form and the excess fees charged to a patient.

The Committee further noted that the Respondent's assessment of ADHD in an adult patient, including offering or prescribing medications without a thorough assessment, fell short of the expectations of the profession. The Committee opined that the Respondent provided poor care to a patient seeking help for a psychiatric condition. For this reason, the Committee decided to issue advice to the Respondent.

The Committee remarked that the Respondent's use of an assessment form, from which he profits, and which information he failed to disclose to the Complainant, was a clear breach of the Conflicts of Interest regulation (Part IV of the *Medicine Act, 1991*) and the College's policy on block fees and uninsured services. This troubled the Committee. The Committee's concern was bolstered by its awareness of the Respondent's history of prior complaints to the College. The Committee found it concerning that the Respondent would again be the subject of similar concerns to those raised in the past. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Committee determined that it was reasonable to caution the Respondent in person for conflicts of interest.