

DR. AIDIN RAHBARI-KHARAZI

Hearing Date: May 26, 2016

ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Did not advise the client that Addison's disease was a potentially life-threatening condition that should be treated immediately
- Did not appropriately offer the client other tests or treatments for Addison's disease either on a timely basis or at all
- Provided inadequate intravenous fluids
- Provided the client with an intravenous catheter and two litres of fluid to administer at home
- Failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession
- Advising a non-member to perform an act which should properly be performed by a member
- An act or omission relevant to the practice of veterinary medicine that, having regard to the circumstances, would be regarded by members as unprofessional

BRIEF SUMMARY

A client brought his dog to the clinic due to vomiting. The member ordered bloodwork.

The member received the results of the bloodwork and suspected the dog may have Addison's disease. Because the ACTH test kit for Addison's disease was on back order, the member advised the client that he could perform the test for one week and suggested the client take the dog to another clinic. The client declined.

There was little the member could do for the dog other than provide intravenous fluids. The member also recommended Florinef therapy, however, the client declined. The member instructed the client to bring the dog to the clinic daily so the fluids could be administered.

The member advised the client the dog's prognosis was poor.

Two days later, the member ordered an abdominal radiograph which did not show any abnormality or obstruction.

The client brought the dog to the clinic daily for intravenous fluid treatments, but the dog's condition continued to deteriorate.

Because the clinic was closing for the holidays, the member advised the client to attend an

emergency clinic or administer the fluids himself. The member provided the client with an intravenous catheter and two litres of fluid to administer at home and showed the client how to administer the intravenous fluids despite the client indicating he had no medical training and was uncomfortable doing so.

The dog's condition improved slightly but then deteriorated to the point where the client took the dog to another clinic a couple of days later. It was confirmed the dog was suffering from Addison's disease and she was successfully treated.

PLEA AND DECISION

The member admitted the allegations as outlined in the Agreed Statement of Facts, including an admission of professional misconduct.

PENALTY

- Reprimand
- Suspension of the member's licence for two months, all of which to be remitted if the member completes the College's records keeping webinar, the Crucial Conversations course through Ontario Medical Association, a half-day mentorship and a paper of at least 1,500 words with a focus on the proper management of Addison's disease in companion animals.
- The member must also provide his medical records for up to 8 patients which will be reviewed by a peer reviewer.
- The member will pay costs to the College of \$3,500.

PANEL'S REASONING

The Panel reviewed the member's medical records, the medical records from two clinics where the patient was subsequently treated, and the report prepared by the College's reviewing expert.

After reviewing the member's medical records, the Panel was satisfied the evidence supported a finding the member did not advise the client that Addison's disease was a potentially life-threatening condition that should be treated immediately.

The College's reviewing expert also concluded there were other choices available for testing for Addison's disease, and the dog should have been treated immediately with dexamethasone.

The Panel agreed with the conclusion and was satisfied the member did not appropriately offer his client other tests or treatments for Addison's disease on a timely basis. The dog recovering fully after being treated at another hospital, helped to confirm this with the Panel.

The Panel was also satisfied that the evidence submitted confirmed that the member provided inadequate intravenous fluids and it was inappropriate to provide the owner of the dog with an IV catheter and two litres of fluids to administer at home.

After considering the member admitted all of the allegations in the Agreed statement of Facts, the Panel was satisfied the member engaged in Professional misconduct.

The Panel accepted the joint submission on penalty and costs. The Panel was mindful that a joint submission should be accepted unless doing so would intervene with public interest and/or bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

In deliberations, the Panel considered three principles for penalty: Public protection; General deterrence; and Specific deterrence of the member with the goal of rehabilitation. The Panel agreed the reprimand provided specific deterrence and rehabilitation. The Panel also found the suspension served all three principles by sending a message to the public, the profession, and specifically to the member. The Panel also judged that the remedial actions imposed on the member served the role of rehabilitation. Lastly, the publication of the proceedings would also serve to send a message to the profession.

In its decision to accept the submission, the Panel considered mitigating factors, including: the member had no prior decisions against him; he cooperated with the College; and the member had already completed several remedial aspects of the joint proposal. The Panel also took note of the fact that the pre-hearing Officer concluded the proposal was reasonable.

The Panel reviewed similar cases and concluded the proposed penalty fell within reasonable parameters and reflected the general trend for increased costs awarded.