

**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. Javad Peirovy (CPSO 84832)  
(the Respondent)**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The College received information raising concerns about the Respondent's delegation of controlled acts in the context of cosmetic services. Subsequently, the Committee approved the Registrar's appointment of investigators to conduct a broad review of the Respondent's practice.

## **COMMITTEE'S DECISION**

A General Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of April 22, 2020. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to the improper delegation of controlled acts and failure to comply with College policy, *Delegation of Controlled Acts*, in the context of cosmetic services; and for not complying with terms, conditions and limitations related to disclosing practice locations where he was purporting to delegate. The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent indicating that he would engage in professional education in the appropriate delegation of controlled acts; that he would not delegate any controlled acts, nor permit individuals who are not regulated health professionals to conduct assessments, take histories, or conduct physical examinations of patients, until the completion of the professional education; and that he would undergo a reassessment of his practice following completion of the professional education.

## **COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

As part of this investigation, the Registrar appointed an independent Assessor to review a number of patient charts, interview the Respondent, and submit a written report to the Committee.

The Assessor concluded that the Respondent did not delegate cosmetic injectables to the standard of practice of the profession. The Assessor found that there was a lack of judgment with respect to being the medical director of a clinic without proper supervision and delegation of the acts.

The Respondent confirmed that he did not meet with patients at the cosmetic clinics prior to them receiving treatments, nor at any time, unless they were referred to his own clinic. He acknowledged that the College's understanding of certain elements of the

*Delegation of Controlled Acts* policy differs from his own understanding and that he will adhere to the College's interpretation of all elements of the policy in the future.

The Respondent stated that he was aware of his obligation, under terms, conditions and limitations on his certificate of registration, to report all of his practice locations to the College, and that his failure to advise of his role as delegator and/or medical director at the cosmetic clinics arose due to his honest misunderstanding of what the College considers to be a practice location. The Committee disagreed with the Respondent's interpretation of his notification obligation pursuant to his terms and conditions.

As a result of this investigation, the Committee had concerns about the Respondent's delegating, including his failure to ensure the existence of any doctor-patient relationship for patients on whom delegated acts are performed, and his failure to comply with his terms, conditions and limitations related to disclosing practice locations where he was purporting to delegate. As such, they directed the caution in person set out above.