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. John Peter Chong (CPSO# 31249)
(the Respondent)

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant attended the Respondent from June 1998 until December 2007. The Complainant had severe, worsening pain in her right forearm. The Respondent did not order MRI imaging of the Complainant's forearm until 2007. This led to a diagnosis of a synovial sarcoma which was surgically removed from the Complainant's forearm in 2008. The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concerns about the Respondent's care and conduct.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant raised concerns about the Respondent's charting and documentation, his assessment and diagnosis of her arm condition, his prescribing and treatment, his prolonged failure to order an MRI and his slow follow-up on MRI results when he finally ordered one, his providing her psychotherapy over a prolonged period, his inaccurately representing his credentials, and his breaching confidentiality of other patients.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of April 2, 2019. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person about his poor care in this case, including his documentation, diagnosis, assessment, prescribing, his undertaking psychotherapy, his failure to make timely referrals to specialists or for imaging, and accuracy in how he describes his credentials.

The Committee also accepted an undertaking from the Respondent.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

The Committee found that the Complainant's concerns about the Respondent's charting and documentation, assessment and diagnosis of her arm, prescribing and treatment, prolonged failure to order an MRI and slow follow-up on MRI results when he finally ordered one, providing her psychotherapy over a prolonged period, and inaccurately representing his credentials were substantiated.

The Committee determined that its concerns about the Respondent's care and conduct would be satisfied if an undertaking could be obtained from the Respondent to address the issues arising in this case and in a concurrent investigation, coupled with a caution in person.

The undertaking provides, among other things, that the Respondent will restrict his psychotherapy practice; practise under the guidance of a Clinical Supervisor acceptable to the College for twelve months; engage in professional education in psychotherapy, prescribing and recordkeeping; and submit to a reassessment approximately six months after the end of the period of Clinical Supervision.

The Committee took no further action on the concern respecting the Respondent's breaching the confidentiality of other patients, as it could not determine from the record whether the conversations that the Complainant recalled had occurred as she described, and the Respondent denied them.