

# Decisions by Hospital Committees Can Be Reviewed by the Courts

April 28, 2016

The Divisional Court has held that decisions of hospital committees can be subject to judicial review by the courts. If committee decisions are not reasonable, or if the process they follow is not procedurally fair, the courts can intervene.

**The applicants in *Asa et al. v. University Health Network*<sup>1</sup> were researchers and authors** in the field of endocrine oncology. They had been engaged in clinical practice and medical research at the respondent hospital (the "Hospital") for many years. Their research was widely-published. The Hospital had a research policy which defined "research misconduct" as including falsification, fabrication and material non-compliance with accepted standards and regulations. The policy also set out a 2-step process for addressing allegations of research misconduct: 1) an inquiry is launched to determine if there are "reasonable grounds to proceed to an investigation"; and 2) if there are sufficient grounds to proceed, a formal investigation committee is formed. According to the policy, decisions of the investigation committee could be appealed to the CEO of the hospital.

The Hospital received a complaint involving certain papers written by the applicants. The Hospital determined that the allegations had enough merit to launch a formal investigation. The Hospital informed the applicant researchers that an investigation committee of three scientists would be investigating the allegations of research misconduct. In the course of the investigation, the applicants had an opportunity to make oral and written submissions, and to respond to the committee's draft report. Although there was no formal oral hearing, the applicants were represented by a lawyer throughout the investigation.

After a 22-month investigation, the committee released a final report. It found, among other things, that the applicants had committed research misconduct. They found that the applicants had falsified data, fabricated data, and had not complied with accepted standards. The committee decided that in light of the extent and duration of the policy violations, the applicants' research activities would be suspended.

The applicants appealed to the hospital's CEO. The CEO upheld the committee's decision.

The applicants went to court. They filed an application for judicial review.

One of the threshold issues was whether or not the decision was even subject to review by the courts. The Hospital argued that the courts had no oversight over this type of decision. The court disagreed. It held that the decision was of a sufficient public character to be reviewable by the courts. The standard the court would apply in reviewing the decision was whether the decision was reasonable. In other words, although the court would afford some deference and discretion to the hospital, it has the power to intervene if the decision was not reasonable. In addition, the court held that the process followed by the court must be procedurally fair and that the court can intervene if the process is not fair.

In the result, the court found that part of the decision was reasonable, but other parts were not. Although it was reasonable to find that there had been material non-**compliance with certain research standards, it was unreasonable to find that there had** been falsification and fabrication. The evidence before the committee did not support that conclusion. The court quashed that part of the decision, and sent the matter back to the Hospital committee to reconsider what sanction would be appropriate in light of the more limited findings.

With respect to the issue of procedural fairness, the court found that the applicants were awarded the procedural fairness to which they were entitled. A formal hearing was not required as the applicants were given appropriate opportunities to respond.

This case is important for hospitals. It cautions that internal committee decisions of hospitals can be reviewed by the courts. It is critical to ensure that when committees are making decisions, their processes are procedurally fair, and their decisions are reasonable.

1 Asa et al. v. University Health Network, 2016 ONSC 439

By:

[Kirsten Crain](#)

Services:

[Health Care, Health Care & Life Sciences](#)

---

## BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

[blg.com](http://blg.com)

### BLG Offices

#### Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower  
520 3rd Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, AB, Canada  
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500  
F 403.266.1395

#### Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street  
Ottawa, ON, Canada  
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160  
F 613.230.8842

#### Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre  
200 Burrard Street  
Vancouver, BC, Canada  
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744  
F 604.687.1415

#### Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West  
Suite 900  
Montréal, QC, Canada  
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555  
F 514.879.9015

#### Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON, Canada  
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000  
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing [unsubscribe@blg.com](mailto:unsubscribe@blg.com) or manage your subscription preferences at [blg.com/MyPreferences](http://blg.com/MyPreferences). If you feel you have received this message in error please contact [communications@blg.com](mailto:communications@blg.com). BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at [blg.com/en/privacy](http://blg.com/en/privacy).

© 2022 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.