

## DECISION 4

---

Dr. Jordan Lottman  
23 O'Brien St  
Orillia, Ontario

### ALLEGATION OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Contravened a standard of practice or failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession (para. 1).
- Failed to keep records as required by the regulations (para. 25).
- Engaged in disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical conduct (para. 59).

### BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF FACTS

- Matter arose as a result of a patient complaint and all facts are in respect of this patient.
- Member provided inadequate, unnecessary and/or iatrogenic treatment which resulted in the need for additional treatment and the potential loss of a tooth.
- Specifically, the member iatrogenically caused a pin-point exposure of the pulp of tooth 24 which resulted in the need for endodontic treatment.
- Performed endodontic treatment on this tooth without taking a pre-treatment radiograph.
- While performing this treatment, aggressively removed tooth structure and perforated the tooth.

- Member did not acknowledge to the patient that the perforation occurred. It is not accepted that the member was unaware of the perforation during the procedure. It was deceptive not to disclose the information to the patient at the time and to cause the patient to receive this information from a subsequent treating practitioner.
- Recordkeeping was incomplete and inadequate as there was a lack of an updated odontogram, intra-oral and extra-oral findings, periodontal charting, diagnosis, treatment planning, documented consent and treatment provided.

### DECISION

#### 1. Finding

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

#### 2. Penalty

- Reprimand
- Member shall not perform any endodontic treatment until successful completion of a competency assessment in endodontics
- Practice to be monitored for 24 months following completion of assessment, at member's expense

#### 3. Costs/Publication

- Costs awarded to the College in the amount of \$1,500.
- Member to pay monitoring costs.
- Pursuant to the legislation, publication of this matter includes the member's name and address.

#### 4. Panel's Reasoning

- Penalty was a joint submission reached as a result of a pre-hearing conference.
- Penalty within the acceptable range for professional misconduct of this nature and appeared to be tailored to suit the circumstances of this case.
- The principles of deterrence to the member, deterrence to the general membership, rehabilitation of the member and protection of the public were adhered to in the panel's acceptance of the joint submission.