

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee
(the Committee)**

Information about the complaints process and the Committee is available at:
<https://www.cpso.on.ca/Public/Services/Complaints>

**Dr. Waqar Mustafa Cheema (CPSO #82070)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's conduct. In particular, the Complainant, who states that she saw the Respondent once in what she understood to be a social encounter, was concerned that the Respondent diagnosed her with anxiety and provided a letter to her husband (a friend of the Respondent) to this effect without her knowledge or consent.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned about the professionalism and conduct of the Respondent during 2015 to 2016. Specifically, the Complainant is concerned that the Respondent prepared and executed a medical note at the request of her husband, without having assessed or provided medical treatment to her.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A General Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of December 12, 2018. The Committee required the Respondent to attend at the College to be cautioned in person with respect to adding information to the medical record after the fact (shortly after being notified of a College complaint), failing to make a contemporaneous chart entry, and failing to date a late chart entry.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

After initially contacting the College, the Complainant subsequently declined to participate in the College's process.

The Committee noted the serious nature of the Complainant's allegations. Lacking the Complainant's participation, however, the Committee determined that referral to the College's Discipline Committee was not indicated.

The Committee had significant concerns about the Respondent's medical record-keeping given that his note of the encounter with the Complainant as documented in the electronic medical record (EMR) was not contemporaneous and was made after the fact (after the Respondent was notified of the complaint to the College). The Respondent also did not properly indicate

that the entry was a late entry by dating and signing it as such. The information the Respondent provided the College with respect to his actions in accessing the Complainant's EMR was inconsistent with the information before the Committee from the EMR audit trail. The Respondent did not comply with his obligations as identified in legislation and the College's policy on medical records.