

**INQUIRY COMMITTEE  
RECORD OF DECISION**

**File Reference:** DH15103

---

***ELEMENTS OF COMPLAINT***

On October 16, 2015, the College received a complaint from a client (the “Complainant”) alleging that the Registrant had engaged in sub-standard dental hygiene care as well as concerns regarding alleged lack of professionalism.

The CDHBC Inquiry Committee initiated an investigation under s. 33(1) of the *Health Professions Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 183 (the “Act”) and appointed an inspector to assist with the investigation.

On November 10, 2015, the CDHBC Registrar notified the Registrant of the investigation and requested the Registrant’s response to the investigation, in accordance with s. 33(5) of the Act.

The Registrant provided a written response to the complaint, in which s/he denied the allegations made by the Complainant and stated that the dental hygiene treatment was provided with professionalism, care and full attention to the required standard. The Registrant also stated that s/he had replaced a dental hygienist at the office who did not regularly use the ultrasonic scaler and that some patients were reluctant to its use as they were not familiar with it. The Complainant was provided with a copy of the response for comment.

On March 15, 2016, the College received the inspector’s report, a copy of which was provided to the Complainant and the Registrant for response.

***COMMITTEE DECISION***

---

The Inquiry Committee reviewed the Complainant’s allegations and the Registrant’s response to those allegations. The Inquiry Committee initially determined under s. 33(6)(c) of the Act that this would be an appropriate case to seek a consent agreement under s. 36 of the Act, requiring the Registrant to complete a remedial course. The Registrant declined to sign the formal consent agreement as there was no demonstrated evidence to support the requirement.

Thereafter, in accordance with section 33(6)(a) of the Act, the Inquiry Committee determined that this was an appropriate case to take no further action as there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Registrant departed from standards of practice with respect to his/her dental hygiene skills. The Inquiry Committee continued to be of the view that the Registrant would benefit from completing a course on professional communication and encouraged the Registrant to consider taking such a course. Accordingly, the Inquiry Committee determined that there were no public safety concerns that required additional regulatory action at this time.

***RELEVANT PROVISION OF ACT, REGULATION OR BYLAWS***

Act, section; 33(1); 33(5); 33(6) (a) and (c)

---

**STATUS:** Closed.