

**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. David Anthes (CPSO #69091)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The College received information raising concerns about the Respondent's role as a panel physician performing immigration medical examinations (IMEs) on behalf of the federal government. 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 March 26, 2025. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to:

- Meeting service delivery expectations in the best interest of patient care, including timely completion and delivery of third-party reports
- Following up and communicating test results in a timely manner
- Ensuring appropriate coverage related to patient care during periods of absence
- Providing appropriate oversight of administrative staff to meet the expectations of their job descriptions.

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 Assessor indicated that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada requires panel physicians to complete and submit files back to the IRCC within 10 days. Of the eight immigration files the Assessor reviewed, only one met the 10-day submission requirement of the IRCC.

The Respondent's explanations to the IRCC about delays in submitting IME reports focused largely on problems with the system and administrative staff and very little on his own shortcomings. He maintained that it was his responsibility to complete the medical examination, and the remainder of the work was the responsibility of the administrative staff.

The Respondent accepted an important role, but he failed to carry it out appropriately. He had an obligation to meet IRCC performance service standards for the complete IME process, not only in regard to the medical examination. It was troubling to the Committee that the Respondent did not demonstrate insight into the very difficult situation he placed vulnerable patients in and did not appear to take accountability for his deficiencies in fulfilling the role of panel physician. 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.