

**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. Gabriel Fai Pond Chan (CPSO# 63033)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The College received information through a public complaint raising concerns that the Respondent (Geriatrics and Internal Medicine) was soliciting funds from relatives of his patients for a venture to bring food to isolated seniors. In the course of that investigation, the Respondent acknowledged that he had accepted a loan from a couple, one of whom was his patient, for the venture. 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 May 13, 2020. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to maintaining boundaries with patients and relatives of patients, particularly as it relates to financial matters. The Committee also negotiated an undertaking with the Respondent in which the Respondent has agreed to complete professional education in medical ethics.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Respondent acknowledged that there were ethical, boundary and conflict of interest issues with obtaining a loan from a couple, one of whom was his patient, for a business venture in which he was involved, although he did not see these issues at the time. He said he now understands obtaining the loan was inappropriate in this context. The Respondent indicated he was committed to learning from his mistakes and he had completed a course in boundaries.

The Committee regarded the Respondent's actions as highly inappropriate. Even if the Respondent's intent in originally developing the company may have been good, he should have been aware of the implication of accepting money from a patient for the business. Among other things, in a situation such as this, patients or their families may feel as if they must donate and/or participate because their or their loved ones' care may be adversely impacted if they do not do so.

This was a serious boundary violation on the part of the Respondent.

The Committee decided to caution the Respondent and accept an undertaking from him on this issue, as set out above.