



Dr. Anjena GANDHAM

Charges

Date Charge(s) Laid:	June 16, 2018
Hearing:	September 14, 2018
Charge(s):	Unprofessional Conduct
Outcome Date:	September 14, 2018

The Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons directs that, pursuant to section 47.5 of **The Medical Profession Act, 1981**, the Discipline Committee hear the following charges against Dr. Anjena Gandham, namely:

1. You, Dr. Anjena Gandham, are guilty of unbecoming, improper, unprofessional, or discreditable conduct contrary to the provisions of Section 46(o) of **The Medical Profession Act, 1981** s.s. 1980-81 c. M-10.1.

The evidence that will be lead in support of this charge will include some or all of the following:

- a. On or about 27 day of June, 2017 you spoke to Ms. Bareham, Manager, of the Prescription Review Program of the College ["PRP"].
- b. During the conversation with Ms. Bareham you confirmed that [REDACTED] as a patient and that you wrote her a prescription for [REDACTED].
- c. After you were advised by Ms. Bareham that resident physicians are not permitted to write PRP medications you then stated that you did not write the impugned prescription.
- d. On or about the 21 day of July 2017, you sent an email message to the College in which you stated:
"To Whom It May Concern, I was not involved with the prescription in question. Further, I have never been involved with writing any prescriptions for [REDACTED]"
- e. That statement was false or misleading.
- f. On or about the 25 day of September 2017 you sent an undated letter to the College in which you stated:
"To be absolutely clear, I have not written prescriptions for [REDACTED] in the past and I did not write the prescription dated June 18, 2017 that was included in your letter. None of the writing on that prescription is mine and the signature is not mine."

- g. That response was false or misleading.
2. You, Dr. Anjena Gandham, are guilty of unbecoming, improper, unprofessional, or discreditable conduct for knowingly giving false information to a preliminary inquiry committee contrary to the provisions of Section 46(o) and/or section 55.2 of **The Medical Profession Act, 1981** s.s. 1980-81 c. M-10.1.

The evidence that will be lead in support of this charge will include some or all of the following:

- a. You were interviewed by a preliminary inquiry committee on or about 19 day of March, 2018.
- b. During that interview you advised the preliminary inquiry committee that you attended a Shoppers Drug Mart pharmacy on or about the 27 day of June, 2017 and examined the prescription in the name of [REDACTED].
- c. During that interview you advised the preliminary inquiry committee that you did not sign the prescription.
- d. During that interview you advised the preliminary inquiry committee that you did not write anything on the prescription.
- e. During that interview you advised the preliminary inquiry committee that while the signature on the prescription looked like your signature, you could not provide an explanation why what appeared to be your signature appeared on the prescription.
- f. During that interview you advised the preliminary inquiry committee that you denied all involvement in issuing the impugned prescription that was the subject of the preliminary inquiry committee.
- g. You knowingly gave false information to the preliminary inquiry committee in connection with one or more statements in this charge.