

---

# Discipline Summary

Dr. Jashandeep Kaur  
8975 Chinguacousy Rd #5  
Brampton, Ontario

Hearing Date: June 20, 2019

---

## Allegations of professional misconduct

- Failed to comply with an order of the Discipline Committee
- Disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical conduct

## Synopsis

- As a result of a previous matter before the Discipline Committee, among other things, the dentist was ordered to obtain an unconditional pass in the ProBE program for Professional/Problem-Based ethics within six months of the finalized order.
- Dr. Kaur failed her first attempt at the course, and did not register for the next sessions of the course, despite receiving an extension of the deadline and reminders from College staff.
- Dr. Kaur eventually attempted the course again and received a conditional pass, which did not meet the requirement set out in the order of the Discipline Committee.

## Decision

### 1. Finding

The College sought to withdraw the allegation related to disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical conduct as it was satisfied that the dentist is governable. The panel agreed to the withdrawal.

The dentist pleaded guilty and was found guilty with respect to the remaining allegation of professional misconduct.

### 2. Penalty

- Reprimand
- One-on-one mentoring program in ethics, including reporting by the mentor to the College, and a requirement that the dentist cooperate with the mentor, implement and maintain the mentor's suggestions.

### 3. Costs

- Dentist to pay costs to the College in the amount of \$2,500

## Panel's reasoning

- The dentist pled guilty to the allegation that she failed to comply with an order of the Discipline Committee.
- The penalty was a joint submission reached as a result of a pre-hearing conference.
- Joint submissions should be respected unless they fall so far outside the range of an appropriate sanction that they would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or are contrary to the public interest. The panel felt that the joint submission was appropriate in all circumstances of this case.
- The mentoring requirement will protect the public and rehabilitate the dentist, since it will help her to understand and address these issues to avoid similar misconduct in the future.
- There were mitigating factors:
  - the nature of the (original) misconduct was not very serious; the dentist cooperated with the College;
  - the dentist attempted the course twice, but was unsuccessful, demonstrating her good faith;
  - English is her second language and her inability to pass the course may have been due to language barriers, as she explained;
  - the dentist is a single mother and has limited financial resources.
- The aggravating factors included the dentist's breach of the order and her irregular communication with the College.
- Mentoring with a bioethicist of a similar cultural background would be more beneficial to remediating the dentist than continuing to repeat the ProBE course.
- The costs order was made due to the dentist's demonstrated financial constraints.