

**ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS**

**V**

**MR REZA D'EHGHANI MRCVS**

**FINDINGS**

Mr Reza D'Ehghani appeared before the Disciplinary Committee to face the charge that:-

**That being registered in the Register of Veterinary Surgeons and whilst in practice at North London Veterinary Clinic, 1041 Finchley Road, London:**

**1. On 22 February 2006, you failed to ensure that Stewart Bradley was in a position to give you informed consent in relation to treatment of his mongrel bitch, Affra, more particularly in that you:**

- (i) failed to discuss with Mr Bradley a range of reasonable treatment options and prognoses; and/or**
- (ii) failed to discuss likely fees and total cost of the various procedures with Mr Bradley;**

**initially or after the procedures / treatment had been started.**

**and that in relation to the facts alleged, you have been guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.**

The background to this case is that a mongrel bitch, 'Affra' owned by Mr Stewart Bradley was taken ill during the late afternoon on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2006, showing acute swelling of the abdomen and obvious pain. Mr Bradley telephoned his local veterinary clinic, Biovet, and was connected to an answer machine, which gave him a contact number for the North London Veterinary Clinic, Golders Green. Mr Bradley spoke to Mr D'Ehghani, the owner of this practice, who explained that he was providing out of hours cover for the Biovet Clinic. After a short conversation, it was agreed that Affra should be brought to the Golders Green surgery for treatment.

The College's case is that at about 8.30pm Mr Bradley arrived outside the clinic, and was followed shortly afterwards by Mr D'Ehghani, who arrived on his own and opened up the surgery. He says that Mr D'Ehghani gave Affra a cursory examination in the consulting room. A provisional diagnosis of gastric dilation was made and Mr Bradley was told that the condition was serious and that Affra would need to be admitted for treatment, also that surgery might be necessary if other non-invasive procedures were not successful.

Mr Bradley's evidence was that after a short consultation he signed a blank consent form. Mr Bradley left Affra in the surgery where she underwent a successful operation to remove

undigested dental chews, dog food and foreign objects (bits of plastic bag) from her stomach. Mr Bradley says that he was not at anytime advised as to the range of treatments available or the likely cost of treatment or surgery should it become necessary to operate. He says that he telephoned at about 11pm and was told that Affra was fine and could be collected the following day.

Problems began to arise the following afternoon when Mr Bradley was asked to pay £1,000 before his dog was discharged from the surgery. The situation escalated when a bill for £4,667 was sent to his insurance company for payment. Mr Bradley, having made enquiries of several veterinary surgeons, friends and the insurance company, felt this amount to be quite unreasonable and although he was insured for £3,000 he advised his insurers not to pay the bill. The insurance company subsequently complained to the RCVS about the excessive amount of the claim.

Mr Bradley is adamant that Mr D'Ehghani was the only veterinary surgeon in attendance when the initial consultation took place.

Mr D'Ehghani's version of events could not be more different. He told the Committee that when he received Mr Bradley's first telephone call in a restaurant he established that Affra needed to be seen as an emergency and told him the cost of the consultation. He says that he was accompanied to the clinic by his assistant Mr Azimi who carried out the actual consultation and the subsequent surgery. On Mr Bradley's arrival, the registration form was completed. Mr D'Ehghani said that it was Mr Azimi who explained to Mr Bradley the options for treatment and cost, twice offering to give Mr Bradley a printed estimate. Mr Bradley then signed a consent form which said that the cost would be approximately £1,500 and surgery if needed.

Mr Azimi fully supported the evidence given by Mr D'Ehghani that he was the veterinary surgeon who saw Mr Bradley and Affra in consultation and carried out the subsequent surgery. Copies of detailed handwritten clinical records that had been scanned into the practice computer were produced, in the handwriting of both Mr Azimi and Mr D'Ehghani. They recorded in detail the course of treatment following the arrival of Mr Bradley and Affra at the clinic.

The Committee has considered carefully the evidence that has been adduced both by the College and on behalf of Mr D'Ehghani and is not satisfied that the College has proved to the requisite standard that Mr D'Ehghani was the sole treating veterinary surgeon on the night in question. Whilst Mr Bradley was adamant that Mr D'Ehghani was on his own throughout the consultation, he was clearly under considerable stress at the time as a result of his dog being seriously unwell. The Committee has concluded that he was not being untruthful in his evidence but that he may have been mistaken in his recollection of events.

During the course of this case issues were raised which related to the receipt and response to correspondence from the College to veterinary surgeons. The Committee wishes to take this opportunity to emphasise the importance of responding promptly, fully and courteously to correspondence with the College.

The charge is dismissed

**DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**  
**5 SEPTEMBER 2007**