

**INQUIRIES HELD BY MALAYSIAN MEDICAL COUNCIL WHERE THE PRACTITIONER WAS FOUND GUILTY FROM JULY - DECEMBER 2006.**

**COMPILED BY: DR. KAREN SHARMINI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, Malaysian Medical Council.**

DATE	OFFENCE	VERDICT
11/7/2006	<p>BOTH PRACTITIONERS HAD FAILED TO PROVIDE A GOOD STANDARD OF MEDICAL CARE BY FAILING TO GIVE SUFFICIENT ATTENTION TO THE HISTORY, SYMPTOMS AND SIGN'S OF THE PATIENT'S CONDITION DURING THE COURSE OF THE PATIENT'S ANTENATAL VISITS WHEREBY THE PATIENT WAS HYPERTENSIVE AND FOUND TO HAVE A SMALL BABY, CONSEQUENTLY CAUSING THE PAITENT TO LOSE HER BABY AT 32 WEEKS INTO HER PREGNANCY.</p> <p>In doing so the practitioners were found to have contravened; Section 1.1 of the Code of Professional Conduct 1987, inter-alia, as follows: The public is entitled to expect that a registered medical practitioner will provide and maintain a good standard of medical care. This includes:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. conscientious assessment of the history, symptoms and signs of a patient's condition;</li> <li>b. sufficiently thorough professional attention, examination and where necessary, diagnostic investigation;</li> <li>c. competent and considerate professional management;</li> <li>d. appropriate and prompt action upon evidence suggesting the existence of condition requiring urgent medical intervention;</li> </ul>	BOTH PRACTITIONERS WERE REPRIMANDED
11/9/2006	<p>PRACTITIONER WAS FOUND TO HAVE CONDUCTED HIS MEDICAL PRACTICE IN ASSOCIATION WITH THAT OF A PHARMACY.</p> <p>In doing so the practitioners were found to have contravened Section 3.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct which states; “that a practitioner should not associate himself with commerce in such a way as to let it influence, his attitude towards the treatment of his patients”.</p>	THE PRACTITONER WAS REPRIMANDED

12/9/2006	<p>PRACTITIONER FOUND TO HAVE ABUSED HIS PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE AND ACTED IN A MANNER DEROGATORY TO THE MEDICAL PROFESSION IN HAVING A SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PAITENT'S DAUGHTER IN LAW WHO FREQUENTLY ACOMPANIED THE PATIENT ON MOST OF THE VISITS TO THE PRACTITIONER'S CLINIC.</p> <p>In doing so the practitioner was found to have contravened; Section 2.2.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct 1987, inter-alia, 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>	THE PRACTITIONER WAS SUSPENDED FOR 6 MONTHS
10/10/2006	<p>THIS PERSON HAD MISREPRESENTED THE REGISTRAR OF THE MALAYSIAN MEDICAL COUNCILIN ITEM 6 OF FORM 4 OF THE SCHEDULE TO THE MEDICAL ACT 1971 THAT SHE HAD PASSED THE NECESSARY EXAMINATION AND WAS IN POSSESSION OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE AS SPECIFIED IN THE THIRD COLUMN OF THE SECOND SCHEDULE OF THE MEDICAL ACT 1971 WHEREAS SHE WAS ONLY IN POSESSION OF THE DEGREE OF 'SARJANA KEDOKTERAN' ISSUED BY THAT UNIVERSITY WHICH DOESN'T ENTITLE HER TO BE REGISTERED UNDER SECTION 12 OF THE MEDICAL ACT 1971.</p>	THIS PERSON WAS DEREGISTERED
10/10/2006	<p>PRACTITIONER HAD CERTIFIED AND SIGNED IN HIS CAPACITY AS A REGISTERED MEDICAL PRACTITIONER 4 REPORTS TO THE REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS STATING THAT 4 INFANTS WERE BORN TO THOSE PARTICULAR PARENTS WHEN THERE WERE NO SUCH BIRTHS RECORDED IN THE DELIVERY BOOK OF HIS CLINIC THEREBY CAUSING UNTRUE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO THE REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS.</p> <p>In doing so the practitioner was found to have contravened; Section 2.1.4 of the Code of Professional Conduct 1987, which states:</p>	THIS PRACTITIONER WAS DEREGISTERED

	<p>“that any registered practitioner who shall be proved to satisfaction of Council to have signed or given under his name and authority any such certificate, notification, report or document of kindred character, which is untrue, misleading or improper, will be liable to disciplinary punishment”</p>	
--	---	--