

**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. Arthur Staroselsky (CPSO #85730)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Patient contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concerns about the Respondent's care and conduct. The Respondent is the medical director of a private clinic where the Patient underwent several cosmetic procedures and received treatments.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of May 28, 2025. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to delegation of controlled acts, the responsibilities of a medical director in a private clinic setting, medical records documentation, and maintaining privacy over personal health information.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee had serious concerns about the Respondent's lack of knowledge and adherence to the College's *Delegation of Controlled Acts* policy at the times relevant to the complaint.

In this case, the Patient underwent procedures and received treatment from individuals to whom the Respondent delegated care. The Respondent did not provide any direct care to the Patient.

In his submissions to the College, the Respondent stated that he was unaware of his obligations under the College's *Delegation of Controlled Acts* policy at the time of the Patient's first visit, including that he was required to have an existing physician-patient relationship prior to delegating any aspect of a patient's care. Since becoming aware of his obligations, he has made changes to his delegation practice.

Even if the Committee were to accept that the Respondent was unaware of his responsibilities under the policy until after the Patient's first visit, the Committee noted that the Patient was treated at the clinic on several occasions after their initial appointment, including in 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. The Respondent acknowledged that at no time did he consult with the Patient or attempt to establish a physician-patient relationship with them.

The Committee found that regardless of when the Respondent became aware of his responsibilities, his lack of familiarity with the College's *Delegation of Controlled Acts* policy was unacceptable, particularly in light of each physician's professional duty to actively participate in the regulatory process, which includes maintaining familiarity with and adhering to the College's policies.

The Committee also had concerns regarding the medical records documentation in the Patient's chart and the handling of photographs taken as part of the Patient's treatment. Specifically, the Committee noted that the documentation was templated in nature and lacked the necessary and expected level of detail regarding a discussion of consent to treatment.

In addition, the Committee had concerns about the Respondent's lack of accountability for and familiarity with the clinic's operations and the fulfillment of his role as medical director of a private clinic (not regulated by the College's Out-of-Hospital Premises Inspection Program), which included concerns about professionalism and the clinic's billing practices.

Accordingly, the Committee required the Respondent to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned, as outlined above.

This is a summary of the Committee's decision as it relates to the caution disposition.