SUMMARY

Dr. Sukhjeet Kaur Dhillon (CPSO# 99050)

1. Disposition

On January 18, 2018, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (the Committee) required family medicine specialist Dr. Dhillon to appear before a panel of the Committee to be cautioned with respect to her failure to follow through with her commitment to both the College and an IMG (international medical graduate) for whom she was acting as a back-up supervisor. Upon further consideration, following an application for judicial review, the Committee confirmed this aspect of its decision on January 10, 2019.

2. Introduction

The College received a public complaint expressing concern about the closure of Dr. Dhillon's practice. Subsequently, the Committee approved the Registrar's appointment of investigators to conduct a review of Dr. Dhillon's practice and her approach to supervising an IMG.

Dr. Dhillon provided a detailed response to the College's investigation. She explained that she was not the owner of the clinic, but she acted as lead physician at the clinic where both she and the IMG practiced until she went on maternity leave in December 2014. She decided not to return after her leave was over. Dr. Dhillon indicated that her role as a back-up supervisor was limited to assisting the IMG in the event his primary supervisor was unavailable.

3. Committee Process

A Panel of the Committee, consisting of public and physician members, met to review the relevant records and documents related to the complaint. The Committee always has before it applicable legislation and regulations, along with policies that the College has developed, which

reflect the College's professional expectations for physicians practising in Ontario. Current versions of these documents are available on the College's website at www.cpso.on.ca, under the heading "Policies & Publications."

4. Committee's Analysis

In the Committee's view, Dr. Dhillon failed the IMG under her supervision in two important ways. First, she agreed to be available as a secondary supervisor yet left on leave less than one month after the IMG started at the clinic, and never returned. Dr. Dhillon should not have taken on the role of secondary supervisor when she was unable to fulfill her duties. In addition, when Dr. Dhillon decided not to return to the clinic in 2016, she should have informed both the IMG and the College in writing of her decision, with appropriate notification time, allowing the IMG the opportunity to make timely arrangements to be supervised elsewhere. Dr. Dhillon appeared to view the presence of the IMG as a way to ensure coverage of her practice while on leave, and she does not seem to have considered the effect her decision not to return would have on the ability of the IMG to continue to practise.

For the above reasons, the Committee decided to caution Dr. Dhillon.