

INQUIRIES HELD BY MALAYSIAN MEDICAL COUNCIL WHERE THE PRACTITIONER WAS FOUND GUILTY FROM JANUARY - JUN 2007.

COMPILED BY DR. KAREN SHARMINI-ASSISTANT SECRETARY MMC

DATE	OFFENCE	VERDICT
8/1/2007	<p>THE PRACTITONER BEING A FAMILY DOCTOR HAD ENTERED INTO AN EMOTIONAL AND/OR SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMPLAINANT’S WIFE.</p> <p>The Council found the charge proven based on Section 2.2.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct 1987, which inter-alia states as follows;</p> <p>A practitioner may not enter into an emotional or sexual relationship with a patient (or with a member of a patient’s family), which disrupts that patient’s family life or otherwise damages, or causes distress to, the patient or his or her family.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITIONER WAS SUSPENDED FOR 6 MONTHS</p>
8/1/2007	<p>THE PRACTITONER HAD CONDUCTED HIMSELF IN A MANNER DEROGATORY TO THE REPUTATION OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION IN THAT HE HAD, BY HIS OWN ADMISSION, COMMITTED AN OFFENCE UNDER SECTION 36(B) OF THE BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT 1957 WHERE HE WAS FOUND GUILTY IN COURTS FOR FALSIFYING A BIRTH CERTIFICATE</p> <p>By the same admission, he has also contravened Section 2.1.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct of the Malaysian Medical Council which states;</p> <p>“Any registered practitioner who shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Council to have signed or given under his name and authority any such certificate, notification, report or document of a kindred character, which is untrue, misleading or improper, will be liable to disciplinary punishment”.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED</p>

<p>9/1/2007</p>	<p>THE PRACTITIONER HAD GIVEN A REPORT TO THE REFERRING SPECIALIST STATING THAT AMPICILLIN WAS GIVEN TO THE PATIENT WHICH HAD CAUSED THE ALLERGIC REACTION, UPON VERIFICATION BY THE TREATING SPECIALIST IT WAS FOUND THAT THE PRACTITIONER HAS PRESCRIBED CHLORAMPHENICOL INSTEAD OF AMPICILLIN</p> <p>He was found to have violated Section 2.1.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct of the Malaysian Medical Council which states;</p> <p>“Any registered practitioner who shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Council to have signed or given under his name and authority any such certificate, notification, report or document of a kindred character, which is untrue, misleading or improper, will be liable to disciplinary punishment”.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED</p>
<p>13/3/2007</p>	<p>THIS PRACTITONER HAD NEGLECTED AND DISREGARDED HER PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THAT SHE HAD FAILED TO PROVIDE COMPETENT AND CONSIDERATE PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT TO HER PATIENT WHEN HE ATTENDED AT HER PLACE OF MEDICAL PRACTICE FOR A MEDICAL CHECKUP, WHEREBY SHE WRONGLY CERTIFIED HIM AS A DIABETIC IN A REPORT WHEN HIS BLOOD GLUCOSE LEVEL WAS WITHIN NORMAL LIMITS.</p> <p>She has thus contravened Section 2.1.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct of the Malaysian Medical Council which states</p> <p>“Any registered practitioner who shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Council to have signed or given under his name and authority any such certificate, notification, report or document of a kindred character, which is untrue, misleading or improper, will be liable to disciplinary punishment”.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED</p>

<p>10/4/2007</p>	<p>THE PRACTITIONER HAD FAILED TO REMOVE THE RENAL CALCULI IN THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHT KIDNEY AS CLAIMED WHEN THE OPERATION WAS CARRIED OUT. SUBSEQUENT TO THE OPERATION THE PATIENT WAS DIAGNOSED AS STILL HAVING THE RENAL CALCULI BY ANOTHER HOSPITAL</p> <p>The practitioner was found to have breached section 1.2.1 of the Code of Professional Conduct where the practitioner had failed to consult or otherwise seek the assistance and/or opinion of other appropriate professional colleagues in respect of the appropriate treatment for the patient's condition.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED</p>
<p>12/6/2007</p>	<p>THIS PRACTITIONER HAD NEGLECTED AND DISREGARDED HIS PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THAT HE HAD FAILED TO CONDUCT A SUFFICIENTLY THOROUGH PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION AND CARYY OUT APPROPRIATE DIAGNOSTIC INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THE PATIENT WAS PRESENTED IN WHAT APPEARED TO BE AN UNCONSCIOUS STATE</p> <p>THE PRACTITONER WAS ALSO FOUND TO HAVE FAILED TO TAKE ANY STEPS TO RESUSCITATE THE PATIENT OR OTHERWISE PROVIDE APPROPRIATE AND PROMPT ACTION WHEN THE PATIENT WAS PRESENTED TO APPEAR TO BE IN AN UNCONSCIOUS STATE.</p> <p>The practitioner was found to have breached section 1.1(b)&(d) of the Code of Professional Conduct which states;</p> <p>The public is entitled to expect that a registered medical practitioner will provide and maintain a good standard of medical care. This includes (b) sufficiently thorough professional attention, examination and where necessary, diagnostic investigation and (d) appropriate and prompt action upon evidence suggesting the existence of condition requiring urgent medical intervention.</p>	<p>THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED</p>