

Summary of Discipline Committee Hearing

DR. GERRIT DEUZEMAN

Hearing Date: January 10, 2019



The Discipline Committee met to consider allegations of professional misconduct in the case presented. The member did not attend the hearing but was represented by counsel.

Prior to the onset of the hearing, the member voluntarily relinquished his licence and has no intention of practising at any time in the future. College counsel explained to the Panel that the process for adjournment “sine die” is preferable to outright withdrawal of the matter since the case could be brought forward again if the member applied for a licence to practice in Ontario or any other jurisdiction.

BRIEF SUMMARY

The member attended the client’s home for purposes of humanely euthanizing their dog. The member had never treated the dog previously.

The member instructed the clients to have their children leave the room so that they would not be present for the procedure. He told the clients he would give the dog two needles, one to relax him and one to put him to “sleep.”

The member then instructed the clients to restrain the dog so he could administer acepromazine by needle injection. The dog became agitated and became difficult to restrain.

Despite making several attempts, the member did not properly or adequately sedate or anesthetize the dog. The member then repeatedly attempted to administer Euthansol into the dog’s legs but was unable to do so. Meanwhile, the dog and the clients became further upset.

After trying to administer the Euthansol unsuccessfully for approximately 20 minutes, the member apologized and, without warning, administered Euthansol by way of an intracardiac injection, almost instantly ending the dog’s life.

The member then, without warning and in front of the client, put the dog in a red bag, tied it in a knot, tagged it and carried it out of the house.

ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- made an appointment to perform euthanasia without a veterinarian-client-patient relationship
- failed to make appropriate inquiries to obtain relevant historical information prior to treating the dog
- failed to obtain informed consent with respect to the presence or involvement of family members in the dog’s euthanasia
- failed to adequately examine the dog before treatment
- failed to discuss options for performing the euthanasia
- failed to discuss the euthanasia process either adequately or at all
- failed to discuss options for medication administration and/or restraint techniques either adequately or at all
- failed to obtain informed consent to perform the euthanization
- failed to properly restrain, sedate or anesthetize the dog
- failed to discuss options for sedation, restraint and euthanasia techniques when it became apparent the procedure was not proceeding as planned
- failed to perform the euthanasia in accordance with the standards of practice of the profession;
- failed to properly administer Euthansol
- injected Euthansol by way of intracardiac injection when the dog was neither unconscious nor anesthetized
- failed to obtain informed consent as to how he intended to manage the dog’s remains
- failed to carry out the procedure in a courteous, respectful and an unhurried professional manner
- failed to make or maintain proper records

- failed to maintain the standard of practice of the profession
- treated an animal receiving veterinary services from another member without notifying the other member and obtaining the relevant historical information as soon as practicable
- 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

DECISION

The panel made an order adjourning this matter “sine die”.

PANEL’S REASONING

After listening to the arguments presented by both sides, and after further learning that the complainants had no issue with the proposed disposition, the Panel agreed to the proposed adjournment “sine die”.

While it is generally desirable to have allegations resolved on their merits, that has to be balanced against the public interest in not expending resources on a contested hearing where the circumstances do not warrant it. In this case, public protection is not a concern, because the member is not practising. An adjournment strikes the right balance, because it would permit the allegations to proceed on their merits if the member ever wished to re-enter the profession.