

# Summary of Discipline Committee Hearing



## DR. JAMES HOLMES

Hearing Date: March 22, 2021

### BRIEF SUMMARY

Case 1: On December 3, 2014, the Discipline Committee imposed a condition and limitation on the member's licence requiring completion of two random medical record reviews by a peer. Both reviews indicated the member failed to maintain proper records and these failures were likely to negatively affect patient care.

Case 2: On January 16, 2020, the Discipline Committee suspended the member's licence for two months and the member's clinic was not accredited during the suspension. However, the member practised veterinary medicine while his licence was suspended. Further, the member permitted staff to dispense prescription drugs and controlled drugs to clients. As well, the member retained a locum to operate the clinic, despite the clinic not being accredited.

### ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- failed to maintain the standards of the profession
- failed to make or retain the records required by the regulation

- an act or omission relevant to the practice of veterinary medicine that would be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable or unprofessional
- an act or omission inconsistent with the Act or the Regulation, in particular, section 15 of the Act and sections 10 and 12 of the regulation
- permitting, counselling or assisting any person, other than a veterinarian, to practise, or to attempt to practise, veterinary medicine
- conduct unbecoming a veterinarian

### DECISION

The panel made an order adjourning this matter "sine die".

### THE MOTION

The College, with the consent of the member, asked that the cases be adjourned "sine die", in other words indefinitely.

The College submitted that it was not in the public interest to proceed with the allegations of professional misconduct as the member had irrevocably resigned his licence as of March 2, 2021.

### PANEL'S REASONING

The panel agreed that adjourning the matter indefinitely is in the public interest. Because the member has resigned his licence there is no longer a risk to the public. Due to the resignation, there is no need for a hearing to determine the merit of the allegations of professional misconduct and assign penalties.