



Three Discipline Hearings Conducted

Value V of the Code of Ethics states that “A pharmacist protects the patient’s right of confidentiality.” Bylaws 40(4)* and 40(14)* describe the only purposes for which a pharmacist may use PharmaNet patient record information: dispensing a prescription, counselling a patient with regard to the patient’s drug therapy, drug usage evaluation, or claims adjudication and payment by any insurer providing drug coverage.

Recent discipline hearings have inquired into the practice of three pharmacists as a result of allegations that they inappropriately accessed patient information in the PharmaNet database.



Sandford Leung (Diploma #7596)

At a Discipline Hearing held 16 December 1999, Sandford Leung pled guilty to professional misconduct related to a number of inappropriate accesses made to PharmaNet patient records.

The College received a complaint that Sandford Leung had accessed a PharmaNet patient record for reasons unrelated to health care. In investigating this complaint, it was determined that between September 1996 and December 1998, Mr. Leung made a number of PharmaNet accesses while working at two community pharmacies.

Mr. Leung acknowledged that many of those accesses were not related to the provision of health care. Although the accesses demonstrated a pattern rather than an isolated incident he could not provide an explanation for the accesses.

Mr. Leung expressed remorse over his actions. The Discipline Panel, nonetheless, considered his actions to be a most serious offence. His actions violated the Code of Ethics of the College of Pharmacists of British Columbia and compromised the position of trust held by the profession.

Mr. Leung’s actions were in contravention of Bylaw 40 and Value V of the Code of Ethics. He was assessed a fine and required to pay the costs of the hearing and the investigation. The penalty assessment totalled approximately \$6,500.

Stephen Mar (Diploma #7490)

At a Discipline Hearing held 6 January 2000, Stephen Mar pled guilty to professional misconduct related to a number of inappropriate accesses made to PharmaNet patient records.

The College received a complaint that Stephen Mar had accessed a PharmaNet patient record for reasons unrelated to health care. In investigating this complaint, it was determined that between September 1995 and December 1998, Mr. Mar made a number of PharmaNet accesses while working at three community pharmacies.

Mr. Mar acknowledged that many of those accesses were not related to the provision of health care. Although the accesses demonstrated a pattern rather than an isolated incident he could not provide an explanation for the accesses.

Danielle Chong (Diploma #7510)

At a Discipline Hearing held 14 December 1999, Danielle Chong pled guilty to professional misconduct related to a number of inappropriate accesses made to PharmaNet patient records.

The College received a complaint that Danielle Chong had accessed a PharmaNet patient record for reasons unrelated to health care. In investigating this complaint, it was determined that between July 1996 and December 1998, Ms. Chong made a number of PharmaNet accesses while working at one community pharmacy.

Ms. Chong acknowledged that many of those accesses were not related to the provision of health care. The accesses demonstrated a pattern rather than an isolated incident. Ms. Chong could not provide an explanation for the accesses.

Although there was a PharmaNet access log kept in the pharmacy, Ms. Chong stated that she was not aware of the existence of this log. The Panel indicated it was Ms. Chong’s responsibility to be aware of and to follow procedures within the pharmacy for recording PharmaNet patient profile accesses when a prescription is not dispensed.

Ms. Chong’s actions were in contravention of Bylaw 40 and Value V of the Code of Ethics. She was assessed a fine and required to pay the costs of the hearing and the investigation. The penalty assessment totalled approximately \$6,500.

(Continued on page 5)