

**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. Nigel Phipps (CPSO #55790)  
(the Respondent)**

**INTRODUCTION**

In September 2019, the College's Discipline Committee (now the Ontario Physicians and Surgeons Discipline Tribunal) imposed terms, conditions and limitations on the Respondent's certificate of registration, including that he not engage in any professional encounters unless in the continuous presence and observation of a practice monitor.

In February 2024, the College received information that the Respondent might have breached his Discipline Order by seeing a patient (Patient Y, a close family friend) without his practice monitor being present. The Committee also received information indicating that the Respondent examined the genitalia of a 10-year-old female patient (Patient Z) without wearing gloves. 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 23, 2025. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to breaching his September 2019 Discipline Order.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent that has been posted on the public register.

**COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

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

The Respondent told the College that he spoke to Patient Y as his close associate, not as a physician. He acknowledged that he chose to see Patient Y without the practice monitor being present.

In her report to the College, the Assessor expressed concern about a lack of judgement in the Respondent's decision to treat Patient Y. She stated that the Respondent appeared to lack sufficient insight into the potential impact of his personal relationship with Patient Y, as both his treating physician and a father figure.

In regard to Patient Z, the Assessor expressed the view that the Respondent did not intend to touch Patient Z's labia/genital area without gloves. She considered it to be a lapse in judgement. The Assessor emphasized that the labia majora is part of the external female genitalia, and the College's *Boundary Violations* policy recommends that gloves be worn during this type of sensitive examination.

The Respondent acknowledged that he should have worn gloves on the basis that his examination of Patient Z constituted a pelvic examination

The Committee had concerns about the Respondent's practice regarding maintaining appropriate boundaries and recognizing the inherent risks of providing treatment to those close to him; and exercising good judgment by using gloves when performing pelvic, genital, perineal, perianal or rectal examinations. The Committee decided that a caution was warranted in this matter.

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