
Decision Two

Dr. William Prusin
919 Ellesmere Rd #202
Scarborough, Ontario

ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Contravened the standards of practice, as published by the College, in relation to inducing general anaesthesia or conscious sedation (para. 11).

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF FACTS

- In two instances in respect of two different patients, the member failed to verify and/or adequately record that he verified the patient's NPO (nothing by mouth) status prior to administering IV sedation and/or anaesthesia.
- In three instances in respect of three different patients, the member administered IV sedation and/or anaesthesia to a patient who had something to eat less than six hours before treatment, where the Guidelines prohibit such sedation in patients who have eaten solid food less than six hours prior to the appointment and clear fluids less than three hours prior to the appointment.
- In one instance, he administered IV sedation and/or anaesthesia to a patient and subsequently discharged the patient to a taxi, instead of to the care of a responsible adult.
- In one instance, he administered IV sedation and/or anaesthesia to a patient and subsequently discharged the patient to Wheel-Trans.

- Expert opinion concluded that seven instances set out above were not compliant with the College's Guidelines.
- Sedation Guidelines constitute the minimum standard for practitioners administering general anaesthesia, deep sedation and/or conscious sedation and are incorporated by reference into the College's Regulation.

DECISION

1. Finding

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

2. Penalty

- Reprimand.
- Certificate of Registration suspension for one month (February 1 – February 28, 2009).
- Course in jurisprudence and ethics.
- Practice to be monitored for 24 months following completion of course.

3. Costs/Publication

- Costs to the College in the amount of \$3,500.
- Monitoring costs of \$600 per visit.
- Pursuant to the legislation, publication of this matter includes the member's name and address.

4. Panel's Reasoning

- The penalty reflected a joint submission from both the College and the member reached as a result of a pre-hearing conference.
- Member accepted responsibility for his actions and proactively set his practice right.
- Member took upgrading courses of his own initiative beyond those ordered by the Committee.
- Penalty achieves goal of public interest protection and general and specific deterrence and provides for training and rehabilitation of member.
- Penalty consistent with range of penalties in similar cases.