

**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. Entisar Ben Issa (CPSO # 82223)  
(the Respondent)**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Complainant accompanied her boyfriend (the Patient) to an appointment that he had with the Respondent (Internal Medicine). 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 behaved in a rude and condescending manner. Specifically the Respondent:**

- asked her to "shut the hell up" in response to her question regarding why her boyfriend would need an x-ray and not an ultrasound;
- attacked her by grabbing her arm and throwing her iPhone across the examination room onto the floor; and
- advised the police that she could not attend the clinic but that her boyfriend could go whenever he wanted – which made her feel isolated.

## **COMMITTEE'S DECISION**

A General Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of May 16, 2019. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to professional behaviour and communications.

## **COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

The Committee was faced with conflicting information from the parties as to the details of what transpired. However, it was clear from their accounts that an unfortunate and disruptive altercation ensued during the course of the Patient's visit. The Respondent acknowledged that she used the term "shut up" when speaking with the Complainant, although she phrased her remark differently than the statement attributed to her by the Complainant. The Committee felt that the Respondent demonstrated poor judgment, and an unprofessional and inappropriate choice of language, in her communication with the Complainant.

It was clear that the situation escalated, particularly after the Complainant began to record the Respondent. While the Committee found the video recording somewhat difficult to decipher, it

was evident that some sort of physical altercation took place (with each party purporting to have sustained injuries at the hands of the other) and the police were called to attend. The Respondent reported that she “tried to push the [Complainant’s] phone out of [her] face”, and the recording shows the Respondent approaching the Complainant but did not really assist the Committee in clarifying what actions the Respondent took. The Committee noted that physicians are expected to maintain professional composure even in situations that are difficult, and in the Committee’s opinion, there were several better options for the Respondent in these circumstances to try to de-escalate the situation. For example, she could have said she preferred that the Complainant not record the interaction and stepped out of the room for a moment; or, as she noted in her response, she could have excused herself and asked another physician to see the Patient.

In the Committee’s opinion, the Respondent failed to adequately manage and de-escalate the interaction, and in fact, exacerbated matters in her approach towards/reaction to the Complainant. The Committee believed that the Respondent would benefit from a careful review of the College’s policy, *Physician Behaviour in the Professional Environment*, and some reflection on the professional de-escalation of challenging professional encounters

While the Complainant stated that the Respondent advised the police that she could not attend the clinic but that her boyfriend could go whenever he wanted, which made her feel isolated, the Respondent denied making this statement, and the Committee was not in a position to reconcile the competing accounts.

The Committee expressed concern that the Respondent did not seem to recognize that her actions were unacceptable or to demonstrate appropriate remorse for how these events unfolded, and that she continued to assert that it was illegal for the Complainant to record her as she did, even after the police informed her that the Complainant had the right to record the interaction. Overall, the Committee was left with significant concerns about the Respondent’s judgment and conduct in this case, and felt a caution, as set out above, was warranted.