

DECISION

Dr. Imad Salloum
1200 Prince of Wales Dr #H
Ottawa, Ontario

ALLEGATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

- Signed a certificate, report or similar document that contained a false, misleading or improper statement (para. 28).
- Charged an excessive or unreasonable fee (para. 31).
- Submitted a false or misleading account or charge (para. 33).
- Accepted an amount in full payment of an account that was less than the full amount of the account submitted by the member to a third party payer without making reasonable efforts to collect the balance from the patient or to obtain the written consent of the third party payer (para. 34).
- Engaged in disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical conduct (para. 59).

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF FACTS

- A former employee provided the College with specific information regarding alleged billing irregularities in the member's practice.
 - The College conducted an investigation of the member's practice including a review of clinical, financial and radiographic records of 34 patients, 13 of which were specifically named by the former employee and the rest were randomly chosen.
 - With respect to a number of patients, the member billed for services that were not provided, including surgical curettage, additional units of scaling and/or polishing and surfaces for restoration, complete examinations, among other things.
 - The member billed two patients for surgical extractions which were not justified by the clinical records.
 - For four patients, the member billed for excessive canals, calcified canals and exceptional anatomy, which in fact were not the case.
 - The maximum fee for a specific examination was charged without justification for 20 patients.
- For 21 patients, the member billed for digital radiographic images that should not have been required.
 - For four patients, the member wrote off the co-payment portion of the patient's account and did not make any reasonable attempts to collect that amount.
 - The provision of unnecessary dental services, billing for services not provided and charging of excessive fees would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical.

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 3 months (June 1, 2012 – August 31, 2012)
- Course in ethics
- Course in recordkeeping
- Practice to be monitored for 24 months, at the member's expense, following completion of courses

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

- The penalty was a joint submission formulated with the benefit of a pre-hearing conference.
- Panel felt that the penalty, while on the lenient side, was reached in good faith at a pre-hearing conference in front of an experienced presider and it was within the range of appropriate range of penalty for this type of misconduct such that it would not bring the administration of justice into disrepute.
- The penalty protected the public interest and was necessary to uphold the stature of the profession.
- The panel considered the principles of general and specific deterrence and rehabilitation of the member in reaching its decision on penalty.
- The panel weighed the aggravating and mitigating factors in the case. In the panel's view, aggravating factors included a wide range of egregious misconduct of fraudulent billings and exploitation of patients and their insurance carriers for personal gain. Mitigating factors included the member's co-operation with the College in participating in a pre-hearing conference and his admission of guilt.