

# Summary of Discipline Committee Hearing

## DR. KULWINDER GILL

Hearing Date: November 14, 2013



### ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- prescribed and/or administered Convenia in this case
- failed to obtain informed consent to treat the guinea pig with Convenia.
- failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession
- an act or omission relevant to the practice of veterinary medicine that, having regard to the circumstances, would be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional

### BRIEF SUMMARY

The client took a guinea pig to the member's clinic as the client's regular veterinarian's clinic was closed. There had been blood in the guinea pig's urine for three days.

The member examined the guinea pig, took x-rays and diagnosed a bladder infection. The member prescribed Convenia, "off label".

The guinea pig's condition worsened as a result of the administration of Convenia.

The client took the guinea pig to the regular veterinarian who noted, among other things, that the guinea pig was anorexic. A significant amount of frank blood was expressed from the bladder and a repeat x-ray showed a thickening of the bladder wall.

The guinea pig was euthanized the next day.

### DECISION

The member pleaded and was found guilty with respect to the allegations. The College and the member had negotiated an Agreed Statement of Facts, including an admission of professional misconduct.

### PENALTY

- Penalty
- Reprimand
- Suspension of the member's licence to practise veterinary medicine for two months, one month to be remitted if the member completes a mentoring program addressing the findings including consent to treatment and off-label use of medication, and one month to be remitted if the member completes a research paper addressing the learnings from the mentoring
- The member will pay costs to the College of \$2,500.
- Pursuant to legislation, this matter is published including the member's name

### PANEL'S REASONING

The panel, in considering the joint submission as to penalty, accepted that a penalty must be ordered so the member understood that he had fallen below the standard. It was brought to the member's attention that clients must sign their consent, that public protection is required and the member's actions cannot put the profession in disrepute.

The penalty was designed such that the member will be mentored in proper procedures in respect to 'off-label' use of drugs and obtaining informed and signed owner consent.

Penalties for similar cases were reviewed by the panel and it was the decision of the panel that the penalties for the member contained in the joint submission fall within the appropriate range of penalty for this type of professional misconduct.