

DECISION #4

Dr. David Styles
161 Main Street West
Shelburne, Ontario

ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Recommended and/or provided unnecessary dental services (para. 6).
- Charged fees that were excessive or unreasonable (para. 31).
- Contravened a standard of practice or failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession (para. 1).

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE FACTS

- For 14 patients who received endodontic therapy, member also performed and charged for incision, drainage, and trephination, which was unnecessary and thus the fees charged were excessive.
- For 10 patients, member fabricated upper and lower bruxism appliances which is not the standard of practice as one appliance is all that is required. Accordingly, the one of the two appliances was unnecessary and the fees charged for it were excessive.
- For seven patients, fees charged for gingivectomy/gingivoplasty in conjunction with fillings and/or endodontic treatment were excessive in that services rendered were little more than gingival trimming to facilitate a restorative procedure.
- No rubber dam was used for six patients during endodontic procedures which is contrary to the standard of practice.
- For same six patients, canals were negotiated close to the root apex [as per existing radiographs] yet the obturation was under-extended in some cases.

DECISION

1. Finding

The member pleaded guilty and was found guilty of professional misconduct with respect to the above allegations.

2. Penalty

- Reprimand.
- Certificate of registration suspended for six consecutive months [dates of suspension not known at time of publication].
- Practice monitoring for 24 months.

3. Costs/Publication

- Monitoring costs of \$600 per visit to a maximum of \$2,400.
- Pursuant to the legislation, publication of this matter includes the member's name and address.

4. Panel's Reasoning

- Penalty reached as a result of a joint submission following a pre-hearing conference.
- Member had previously appeared before the Discipline Committee and had been suspended for six months for that case.
- Penalty encouraged rehabilitation and sufficient to deter this member and others from engaging in this type of misconduct.
- Member was co-operative.