

**DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE
COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRISTS OF ONTARIO**

B E T W E E N:

THE COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRISTS OF ONTARIO

-AND-

DR. AMPREET SINGH

NOTICE OF HEARING

THE INQUIRIES, COMPLAINTS, AND REPORTS COMMITTEE OF THE COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRISTS OF ONTARIO has referred the following allegations about you to the Discipline Committee:

1. You have committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by subsection 51(1)(c) of the *Health Professions Procedural Code* (the “Code”) being Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, S.O. 1991 C.18*, and defined in the following paragraphs:
 - a. paragraph 1.12 of Ontario Regulation 119/94 in that you failed, without reasonable cause, to provide 9 patients who needed a prescription for vision correction with a written, signed and dated prescription for subnormal vision devices, contact lenses or eye glasses after you had assessed their eyes;
 - b. paragraph 1.14 of Ontario Regulation 119/94 in that you have failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession in respect of the oculo-visual assessments you conducted on 28 patients and for failing to provide at least 10 patients with your contact information; and
 - c. paragraph 1.24 in that you failed to make and maintain records in accordance with Part IV of Ontario Regulation 119/94

Particulars of the allegations are set out at Appendix “A” to the Notice of Hearing.

TAKE NOTICE THAT THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE WILL HOLD A HEARING pursuant to the provisions of the *Health Professions Procedural Code* (the “Code”) which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, R.S.O. 1991 cs. 18* and the Discipline Committee’s Rules of Procedure (a copy of which is available to you upon request) for the purpose of deciding whether you are guilty of professional misconduct.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT a hearing will be held before a panel of the Discipline Committee of the College of Optometrists of Ontario on a date to be set at the Pre-

Hearing Conference on the date to be determined at 65 St. Clair Avenue East, Suite 900, Toronto Ontario.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT at the hearing a panel of the Discipline Committee will do the following:

1. Consider the allegations of professional misconduct;
2. Make its findings based exclusively on evidence admitted before it; and
3. Determine whether in respect of the allegations you have committed an act or acts of professional misconduct.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to subsections 51(2) of the Code, if the Panel finds you guilty of professional misconduct, it may make an order doing one or more of the following:

1. Directing the Registrar to revoke your certificate of registration.
2. Directing the Registrar to suspend your certificate of registration for a specified period of time.
3. Directing the Registrar to impose specified terms, conditions and limitations on your certificate of registration for a specified or indefinite period of time.
4. Requiring you to appear before the panel to be reprimanded.
5. Requiring you to pay a fine of not more than \$35,000 to the Minister of Finance.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT pursuant to section 53.1 of the Code if the Panel finds you guilty of professional misconduct the Panel may make an Order requiring you to pay all or part of the College's legal costs and costs and expenses incurred in investigating this matter and conducting the hearing.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT you are entitled to be represented by counsel at the said Hearing and to call witnesses and to adduce evidence in answer to the allegations set out in this Notice of Hearing.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT a member whose conduct is being investigated in proceedings before the Discipline Committee is entitled to certain disclosure of evidence pursuant to section 42 of the Code. To facilitate that process, you or your lawyer may contact directly the lawyer for the College of Optometrists of Ontario. The College's lawyer in this matter is:

Julia J. Martin
Barrister and Solicitor
440 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 200
Ottawa ON
K1R 7X6

Tel: (613)513-6735

Email: julia@juliamartinlaw.com

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE THAT if you do not attend at the Pre-Hearing Conference on the date above, or on any subsequent date fixed by the Discipline Committee, the panel of the Discipline Committee may proceed in your absence and you will not be entitled to any further notice.

DATED at Toronto, Ontario this 25th day of June, 2018.

**COLLEGE OF OPTOMETRISTS
OF ONTARIO**

65 St. Clair Avenue East
Suite 900
Toronto, ON M4T 2Y3



**Paula L. Garshowitz, O.D.
Registrar**

TO: Dr. Ampreet Singh
c/o Counsel to Dr. Singh
Simmons Da Silva
Suite 200, 201 County Court Blvd.
Brampton ON
L6W 4L2

Attention: Amrita Mann

Appendix “A”

1. Dr. Singh is an optometrist who has practised in Ontario since in or about July 14, 2014.
2. In or about October and November 2016, Dr. Singh attended at the University of Ottawa, in Ottawa and the [REDACTED] Nursing Home in [REDACTED], to conduct eye clinics for the students and residents respectively.

Failure to release prescriptions

3. Dr. Singh conducted examinations of the patients listed at Appendix “B” to the Notice of Hearing at the University of Ottawa.
4. Dr. Singh determined that each of the patients listed at Appendix “B” required prescription eyewear.
5. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Dr. Singh failed to provide a prescription for eyeglasses to the patients listed at Appendix “B”.

Failure to maintain standards of practice

i. Ocular-visual assessments

6. Dr. Singh conducted oculo-visual assessments of the patients listed at Appendix “C” to the Notice of Hearing.
7. It is alleged that Dr. Singh’s assessments of these patients failed to maintain the standards of practice of the profession and did not meet the following requirements established in sections 4.1, 6.1 and 6.2 of the Optometric Practice Reference as follows:
 - a. For all the patients at Appendix “C” he recorded “no concern” for “the chief concern” on their patient record;
 - b. He failed to provide any details of “a review of ocular or visual symptoms or experiences” on the patient records for patients 2, 3 and 11;
 - c. For “a general health history, with emphasis on eyes and vision, including medications used and applicable family history” on the patient record he did not include any information on the patient record for patients 1-7, 9-15, 17-23, 25, 27, 28. And for patients 8, 16 and 24 he did not indicate whether the patients were taking medication or had a family history;

- d. For “the occupational and avocational visual environment and demands” Dr. Singh recorded patients 1-25 as being in grade 1. For patients 26-28 there was no recorded information;
- e. For “the measurement and description of their ophthalmic appliances including purpose and effectiveness” although Dr. Singh noted that patients 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 27, had prescription eyewear, he failed to indicate what the purpose was. And, for patient 28 he indicated that he had no current (or presenting) prescription eyewear, yet he recorded aided acuities for the patient;
- f. For “apparent and relevant physical, emotional and mental status” Dr. Singh failed to record anything for the patients 1-27;
- g. For assessment of “the external eye and adnexa”, Dr. Singh failed to record anything on all the patients’ records;
- h. For assessment of “pupillary function” patients 26 and 28 had “no APD” (afferent pupillary defect) but no other pupillary findings;
- i. For assessment of “the anterior segment (OPR 6.1) and, when indicated, corneal thickness” there were no concerns listed for any of the patients;
- j. For assessment of “ocular media” there were no concerns recorded for any of the patients;
- k. For “the posterior segment (OPR 6.2)” including pharmacologic dilation as indicated, Dr. Singh failed to perform a dilated fundus examination of any patient;
- l. Dr. Singh failed to perform a dilated fundus examination of patients 8 and 16 despite reduced vision and a diagnosis of amblyopia;
- m. Despite a chief complaint of headaches, Dr. Singh failed to perform a dilated fundus examination or perform a cycloplegic evaluation of patient 24;
- n. Patient 26 had reduced vision and glaucoma, yet Dr. Singh failed to perform a dilated fundus examination for the patient;
- o. For assessment of “intraocular pressure in adults and, when indicated, in children”, only 16 of the patients 1-25, had intraocular pressure recorded. And, for patient 26 Dr. Singh failed to record the time the test was conducted;
- p. For assessment of “presenting monocular visual acuities at distance and near” patients 20, 26-28 had only distance visual acuities recorded;
- q. For assessment of “refractive status and best-corrected monocular visual acuities” Dr. Singh did not record any subjective refractive findings but determined a final prescription for vision correction without recording acuities for patients 2, 3, 11, 13 (OS only), 19, 20 and 23. And the final prescription for vision correction for patients 5, 10, 14, 22 and 26-28 contains prescription for presbyopia (reading addition) but no visual acuities recorded at near;
- r. For assessment of “accommodative function”, accommodative function was not measured or recorded with acuities and amplitude for any of the patients;
- s. For assessment of “oculomotor status and, when indicated, fusional reserves” patients 1-25 had no measurement of binocular function performed or recorded. Patients 25-28 were only administered a cover test which was recorded as ortho (or zero);
- t. For assessment of “other sensory functions, when indicated, such as visual fields, colour vision, stereoacuity, sensory fusion and contrast sensitivity” Dr. Singh

conducted Confrontation Fields on 5 patients, Confrontation Fields and Colour Vision were recorded on 20 patients. 3 patients had no other sensory functions measured or recorded. Recording was via a single checkbox “FFC OD + OS” and “Colour vision () normal” No other options were available; and

- u. For “in situations where it is not possible to obtain specific required information, justification must be documented” there were no concerns listed.

ii. No contact information

- 8. Dr. Singh did not provide the patients listed at Appendix “D” with his contact information so that they could contact him in the event that they had problems with their vision or eye glasses.
- 9. It is alleged that the conduct in paragraph 8 constitutes a failure to maintain the standards of practice of the profession.

Failure to maintain records

- 10. Dr. Singh failed to record the information required by subsection 10(2) of Ontario Regulation 119/94 as set out in paragraph 7, above.
- 11. In addition, Dr. Singh’s patient records for patients 1-25 at Appendix “C” failed to comply with subsection 10(2) of Ontario Regulation 119/94 as follows:
 - a. they contained no patient addresses; and
 - b. all the dates of birth were listed as “01/01/2001” which would have meant they were all 15 years of age at the time of the examination; and
 - c. many of the boxes on the patient record were left blank relating to the chief complaint, family history, presenting prescription, NPC, colour vision, dilation, diagnosis, ocular health, BV/OH, pupils, eye health, follow-up and recall.
- 12. Dr. Singh did not have any financial records for each of the patients listed at Appendix “C” as required by section 9 of Ontario Regulation 119/94.
- 13. Dr. Singh did not have an appointment book as required by section 8 of Ontario Regulation 119/94.