

Pam Elliott

From: Heather Predham
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2006 1:00 PM
To: Robert Williams(HCCSJ); Patricia Pilgrim(HCCSJ); Pam Elliott
Cc: Nancy Parsons; Debbie Parsons; Dianne Smith(HCCSJ)
Subject: ER/PR communication

*discuss in HRP
 re: Elliott*

Hi everyone,

You are all aware of the incident last week in which a lady was admitted to the HSC with metastases. It was discovered that this lady had converted and had been paneled in October but there was that there was no evidence of any action in response to a letter sent from the panel last October. Joy McCarthy had signed the letter which was sent to Dr. Laing.

Yesterday, Dr. Ganguly's secretary called Debbie and requested a copy of a letter on [redacted] This letter was written on February 20, 2006. Dr. Ganguly's secretary said that he was seeing her today and wanted a copy of the letter as it wasn't on her chart. She did say that he had seen it previously. Debbie faxed it over to her and let myself and Nancy know about the call. We hoped that he was only looking for a copy for the file and not that this was when he was going to inform her.

Today, Nancy received a call from [redacted] She identified herself and told Nancy that she had come from her regularly scheduled annual check up with Dr. Ganguly. She was aware of the ER/PR review as we had contacted her about the review. She called us on the 27th of October inquiring about her results and of course they weren't available then. She called again the 29th of March, Nancy returned her call and left a message but never spoke to her, she didn't call back.

Today, she said no one had contacted her about her ER/PR retesting results and she was assuming that no news was good news. Dr. Ganguly told her today that "he had not heard from anybody but he could see by looking up her results that the retesting had been done and the new results were different from the original". [redacted] told Nancy that she was negative originally and said "I can only assume that this means I am now positive". Nancy asked if there were any implications for treatment and the patient answered that Dr. Ganguly told her "he had to consult with his colleagues as to whether or not she had to take Tamoxifen".

[redacted] was incredulous that this could happen, that she had to find out at an annual check up that she only attended as a matter of habit and wondered what would have happened if she had never attended. She went on to inquire about the class action lawsuit and what lawyer was heading that up. Nancy told her she couldn't advise her on that matter.

The process of double checking with the physicians has been slowly addressed and this has not been a priority with the physicians at the Cancer Clinic. This will be a priority over the next week.

I can't begin to express my frustration at these circumstances. This just happened and I have not told anyone other than who's copied on this e-mail. After all the work, time and effort that has gone into this, I hate to see us undermined by ourselves.

....please let me know what follow-up should be done.....

Heather

ps: Dianne can you forward this on to Pat for me?Thanks

Heather Predham
Assistant Director, Quality and Risk Management
Southcott Hall, Room 1206

*Spec [unclear] Pat
 Kara [unclear]
 [unclear]*