

**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 Taliano (CPSO #63148)  
(the Respondent)**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Complainant saw the Respondent in June 2018 to request testing; specifically, ultrasound investigations of the pelvis and abdomen. The Respondent refused to order the investigations and subsequently terminated care to the Complainant.

The Complainant contacted the College to express concern about the Respondent's care and communications. The Committee investigated and considered the complaint in April 2019 and issued the Respondent advice regarding communications. The Committee also suggested that the Respondent consider taking a course in communications.

The Complainant requested a review of the Committee's decision by the Health Professions Appeal and Review Board (HPARB or the Board). In its May 2020 decision, HPARB required the Committee to conduct further investigation and then reconsider its decision.

## **COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS**

**The Complainant is concerned that the Respondent behaved in an unprofessional manner towards her in that, for example, he was dismissive, rude, and failed to order necessary diagnostic tests.**

## **COMMITTEE'S DECISION**

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of December 10, 2020. The Committee required the Respondent to complete a specified continuing remediation and education program (SCERP) consisting of a course in communications acceptable to the College.

## **COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

The Committee noted that although the Respondent provided information about courses in communication he had previously completed, these courses were not general courses for physicians in need of improvement in communication. The Committee also noted the Respondent's significant history with the College, including a history of complaints involving communications issues. These aspects of the matter,

combined with the Respondent's previous refusal to enter into an undertaking to complete a communications course, influenced the Committee's decision to require that the Respondent complete a SCERP.

Regarding the Respondent's refusal to order tests, the Committee noted that in one instance the decision not to order testing for resolving, benign-appearing cysts was not below the standard of care, and that in the other instance the Respondent was following current guidelines and recommendations with respect to testing for abdominal aortic aneurysm.

The Committee also noted that the Respondent's letter to the Complainant ending the physician-patient relationship was consistent with the College's policy in this regard.

Given its concern about the Respondent's communication issues, the Committee required that he complete a SCERP.