

DECISION 5

Dr. Ronald Nazon
297 Augusta Ave
Toronto, Ontario

ALLEGATION OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Engaged in the practice of dentistry where he has a conflict of interest (para. 38).
- Failed to keep records as required by the regulations (para. 25).
- Signed a certificate, report or similar document that contained a false, misleading or improper statement (para. 28).
- Submitted a false, misleading account or charge (para. 33).

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF FACTS

- Member billed for services that were not provided.
- Member failed to keep records as required and specifically: failed to fully document the details of a complete examination for two patients; failed to fully document the details of a bridge preparation and payment information for one patient; and failed to document the financial details of crown and bridge work for eight patients.
- College investigator had difficulty obtaining printouts of computerized patient records and the information was inadequate or inaccurate. Additionally, the office failed to retain copies of insurance claims and/or explanation of benefits as part of patient records for the time period required.
- Member supplied movie tickets to two patients in return for referral of patients to his practice, which is a conflict of interest and contrary to the regulations.

DECISION

1. Finding

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

2. Penalty

- Reprimand
- Suspension of certificate of registration for two months (January 16, 2012 – March 15, 2012)
- Course in ethics
- Course in recordkeeping
- Mentoring program in electronic recordkeeping
- Practice to be monitored for 24 months following completion of courses and mentoring program, at member's expense

3. Costs/Publication

- Costs awarded to the College in the amount of \$5,000.
- 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 was within the acceptable range of penalty for professional misconduct of this nature.
- Penalty satisfied the rationales of protection of the public, general and specific deterrence and rehabilitation.
- Panel considered both aggravating and mitigating factors of the case.
- For aggravating factors, of particular significance were the facts that the misconduct spanned a period of six years and the member's lack of knowledge about the professional obligation to maintain accepted administrative procedures for staff to follow in his office.
- For mitigating factors, among other things, the panel recognized that the member appeared to have no complicity in the staff's fraudulent use of insurance codes and apparent failure to collect co-payment from the patients in question. Moreover, there was no evidence of personal benefit to him and he dismissed the staff when the facts became clear.