

**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. Sammy Vaidyanathan (CPSO # 94400)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Patient contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concerns about the Respondent's care.

The Respondent serves as the medical director of a clinic where the Patient received injections for acne treatment. The Patient's appointment and procedure were conducted by an international medical graduate, not licensed with the College, who was acting under the Respondent's delegation.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of January 19, 2026. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to providing ethical and professional care and following the College policy, *Delegation of Controlled Acts*, including ensuring that delegation is in the best interest of the patient, establishing a physician-patient relationship, providing an appropriate level of supervision and support to delegates, and maintaining appropriate documentation.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee identified significant concerns with the Respondent's delegation practices and noted multiple areas in which the Respondent did not adhere to the College's policy, *Delegation of Controlled Acts* (as it was at the time).

The Committee identified concerns including delegation occurring outside the context of an existing physician-patient relationship, an insufficiently detailed medical directive, documentation that was not reviewed in a timely manner, and inadequate supervision of the delegate.

The Committee was also not satisfied that the delegation occurred in the Patient's best interest. The procedure was elective and privately funded. In these circumstances, the Committee was concerned that the delegation may have been motivated by physician convenience or financial considerations, which would be contrary to College policy.

The Committee's concerns were heightened by the Respondent's prior history with the College, which included issues related to professionalism, record-keeping, and adherence to College policy. While the Respondent acknowledged some deficiencies, the Committee was concerned that he did not demonstrate adequate insight into the extent of the shortcomings identified.

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