

VETERINARY SURGEONS REGISTRATION ORDINANCE (Chapter 529)

ORDER MADE BY AN INQUIRY COMMITTEE OF THE VETERINARY  
SURGEONS BOARD OF HONG KONG

It is hereby notified that on 6 July 2016 an inquiry committee of the Veterinary Surgeons Board of Hong Kong (the 'Board'), after due inquiry in accordance with section 18 of the Veterinary Surgeons Registration Ordinance, Chapter 529 of the Laws of Hong Kong (the 'Ordinance'), found Dr WEST Adam Michael ('Dr WEST') (Registration No.: R000260) guilty of misconduct or neglect in a professional respect in that Dr WEST failed to compile a proper or adequate medical record pertaining to the consultation, treatment, and care that he provided to the complainant's cat on 19 and 20 November 2012.

Pursuant to section 19 of the Ordinance, the inquiry committee ordered on 6 July 2016 that: (1) Dr WEST be reprimanded in writing with the reprimand not to be recorded on the register; (2) Dr WEST be required to conduct one open seminar for veterinary surgeons in Hong Kong of no less than two hours in length on the subject of professional standards in the keeping of veterinary medical records by reference to a paper prepared by him following appropriate research with the arrangements for, and scope of, the seminar approved by the Board in advance, such seminar to be held within 12 months from the date thereof; and (3) in the event that Dr WEST fails to conduct the aforementioned seminar within the said period, the Secretary shall remove his name from the register and no application for restoration of his name to the register pursuant to section 21(3) of the Ordinance shall be approved unless and until he has conducted the seminar ordered therein.

Particulars of the Matter to Which the Order Relates

The inquiry committee noted that in the medical record for 19 November 2012, which was the day of the operation, Dr WEST did not record any of the cat's vital signs or even use the shorthand abbreviation NAD, standing for no abnormalities detected. There was a record of CRT in the anaesthesia record for the operation, but this was not transferred to the medical record and was insufficient in any case in the inquiry committee's view as a record of vital signs. As for the medical record for 20 November 2012, this related to a post-operative check at the owners' request. This was not a routine consultation. The inquiry committee agreed with the expert witness that details such as heart rate, respiration rate and effort, pulse quality, hydration and lung sounds should have been recorded by Dr WEST in the circumstances of this particular consultation.

The omissions from the medical records the inquiry committee has identified were a falling short of the standard expected of veterinary surgeons at the time in the inquiry committee's view.

*CHING Pak-chung* *Chairman, the Veterinary Surgeons Board of Hong Kong*