

**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. Sharadindu Rai (CPSO# 84749)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant saw the Respondent in a walk-in clinic setting. Her concerns pertain to the Respondent's conduct towards her and a staff member who was present for the assessment.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned that the Respondent conducted himself in an unprofessional manner during a walk-in clinic appointment. Specifically, the Respondent:

- **berated a staff member multiple times, which was particularly upsetting as it occurred during an examination for which the Complainant was undressed from the waist down**
- **was dismissive when the Complainant attempted to provide her history of similar symptomology, stating, "oh you think you're a doctor?", and ended the visit saying, "I hope your...infection never gets better."**

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of July 11, 2019. The Committee required the Respondent to complete a specified continuing education and remediation program (SCERP), which includes completion of a communications course as well clinical supervision of the Respondent's practice. The Committee also required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to his communications and how his communications impacted his staff and his patient.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee was concerned by the Respondent's behaviour towards his staff, and noted that his conduct was inappropriate and unprofessional. It appears that the Respondent became impatient with his receptionist during a clinical encounter and made various comments that the Complainant found unprofessional and which she indicates upset the receptionist. The Committee appreciated that witnessing such a situation could make a patient uncomfortable. The receptionist, who no longer works at the clinic, provided information in support of the Complainant's concerns.

The Committee was also concerned about the nature of the alleged comments the Respondent made to the Complainant and that the Complainant felt he dismissed her concerns. While the

Committee acknowledged that it can be difficult to determine with any certainty the exact nature of an interaction between a doctor and patient, it noted that the receptionist's information seemed to support the Complainant's version of events, and that she indicated that the Respondent had no considerations for staff or patients and that this kind of behaviour was common.

The Committee had concerns regarding the Respondent's communications and professionalism, especially given his significant history of complaints with the College and the fact that he has undertaken remediation to address similar issues in the past.

Given the above, the Committee was of the view that further remediation was necessary, and that a SCERP and a caution in person were warranted, as outlined above.