
IT'S NICE TO BE NICE, BUT...

Psychiatrists can unexpectedly find themselves in situations where agreeing to help someone, such as a colleague or a patient, results in an increase in their own professional liability risk. The various examples set forth below, while certainly not an exhaustive list, illustrate the importance of evaluating your own risk exposure when agreeing to the seemingly reasonable requests of others.

Be careful when “helping” a patient

Bartering with a patient: Patients who are unable to pay their bill may ask psychiatrists to agree to a barter arrangement, such as exchanging professional services for a tangible item or for personal services. For example, a psychiatrist may be asked to agree to allow a patient who is having financial difficulties to work for him/her. But how will the barter arrangement be structured? Are there tax implications? Is one hour of therapy equivalent to one hour of work? What if the work is not acceptable? What if the patient becomes too ill to work?

While the psychiatrist may have the best of intentions, if something goes wrong in the relationship, allegations that the doctor had non-therapeutic motivations in taking on the dual role may follow. When presented with such a request, it is advised that psychiatrists instead consider working out a monthly payment plan to help the patient meet his/her financial obligation. If this is unacceptable, the psychiatrist may need to consider termination of the treatment relationship and referral to community mental health services or other services which can meet the patient's clinical needs.

Prescribing extended amounts of medication: Patients may ask psychiatrists to prescribe large amounts of medication, often for the purpose of receiving better prescription drug plan benefits. Such requests must be evaluated as to the clinical appropriateness, including the patient's risk of overdose, even if it may cost the patient more money.

Prescribing after termination of the psychiatrist – patient relationship: Psychiatrists need to understand that if they prescribe after the termination date, they are still treating the patient with whom they purportedly terminated care. Sometimes former patients request a medication refill after a termination date. There may be a valid basis for the patient's request, such as a delay in being seen by the new psychiatrist. Certainly psychiatrists who weigh the risk and benefits of prescribing versus not prescribing may decide to prescribe. If this is done, the prescriber should understand his/her responsibility for meeting the patient's clinical needs, as always, and prescribe only the minimum amount necessary. Also, it should be clarified with the patient that the termination date is being extended this one time and that there is a new termination date, after which medications will no longer be prescribed.

Treating patients at a distance: Numerous calls to the Risk Management Consultation Service (RMCS) have illustrated the problems associated with agreeing to treat a patient at a distance. Usually these calls for risk management consultation involve some type of crisis that the psychiatrist cannot manage appropriately due to the distance. The bottom line is that the treating psychiatrist is responsible for delivering treatment that meets the standard of care and the standard of care may require in-person evaluation. Even the most stable patients can end up in crisis. During patient emergencies, a remote psychiatrist will be of limited assistance at the time the psychiatrist's services are needed the most. Also, if the psychiatrist is not licensed in the state where the patient is located, the medical board in the patient's state could find the psychiatrist violated the state's Medical Practice Act and/or other statutes and regulations. Such violations could include practicing without a license, which could lead to professional discipline as well as possible insurance coverage issues.

Treating patients via e-mail: E-mail has become an important part of our day to day lives and may be appropriate in psychiatric practice for administrative issues, such as confirming appointments. Given the ease and convenience of e-mail, patients may want to use e-mail to communicate with their physicians for all treatment issues, not just administrative issues. Psychiatrists should proceed with caution when actually treating patients via e-mail and realize that e-mail is not appropriate for every treatment situation or every patient. It is easy to become complacent with technology and let it dictate one's actions to some extent. As always, the responsibility for patient care remains the same, regardless of the treatment modality employed. Sometimes problems develop when the psychiatrist agrees to treat via e-mail under specific conditions (such as periodic office visits), the patient initially agrees to these conditions but then refuses to comply because he/she finds it easier and more convenient to be treated via e-mail than to be seen in person.

Failing to terminate the treatment relationship for continuing non-adherence: Patients, by their own non-adherence, may limit the psychiatrist's ability to effectively treat them. For example, a patient who is prescribed lithium may refuse to obtain the ordered blood work. If, after reasonable efforts have been made to work with the patient, the patient is still not complying with the treatment plan, the psychiatrist needs to understand the risk associated with staying in a treatment relationship with a patient who is not allowing the him/her to provide treatment within the standard of care. Once it is clear that there is no agreement on a treatment plan, including actions (such as testing) required of the patient, the psychiatrist needs to consider terminating the treatment relationship. Often psychiatrists in these situations believe that sub-standard care is better than no care, as would be the case if the treatment relationship was terminated. However, from the risk management perspective, substandard care is just that – care that does not meet the standard of care. Psychiatrists must not allow patients to convince them to be negligent.

Not asking for proof of substitute decision-maker's authority: Whenever the patient is incompetent to make treatment decisions (particularly minors with divorced parents or adults who have had guardians appointed), the treating psychiatrist should obtain proof of the substitute decision-maker's authority. Such authority could include court documentation of appointment of the guardian for an incompetent adult or a copy of the custody order for minor children of divorced parents. Problems have occurred when proof was not obtained and the psychiatrist treated the patient based upon the representations of the party bringing the patient to the appointment (who in fact had no authority to consent to treatment) resulting in the psychiatrist being accused of treating without consent.

Taking on dual role of expert witness, in addition to treating psychiatrist: Psychiatrists are often asked by patients who are involved in litigation (where the treating psychiatrist is not a party to the litigation) to provide expert witness testimony. However, taking on the dual roles of treater and expert witness (or performing an evaluation for legal purposes) could adversely affect the therapeutic relationship and objectivity as an expert. For child and adolescent psychiatrists, this situation can often arise in the context of a parent requesting testimony in a custody dispute. While it may be appropriate for the psychiatrist as the treater to provide factual information, multiple roles bring with them the very real possibility - even the inevitability - of conflicting obligations (i.e., the patient's clinical needs versus the parents' legal needs). Conflicting obligations increase the risk of clinical, ethical, and even legal problems. If possible, psychiatrists should avoid assuming multiple roles. The safest response is for the doctor to explain the limits of his/her role as a treating psychiatrist, outlining the potential conflicts, and reiterating that the patient's treatment is the primary concern. If an expert opinion is needed, it should be obtained from an independent expert.

When a patient's attorney wants to speak to a psychiatrist about a patient's care, the psychiatrist should recognize that he/she does not have to agree to speak informally (versus formally in a deposition) with the patient's attorney, even if the patient authorized such discussions. The attorney should be advised that with proper authorization, the psychiatrist can release the patient's record but that the psychiatrist has nothing further to add. In other words, the record should be allowed to speak for itself. Psychiatrists who agree to speak to a patient's attorney about their treatment may later find themselves in a difficult situation when they learn (often very close to the trial date) that patient and the patient's attorney are expecting them to act as an expert witness at trial.

Giving a deposition without notifying his/her malpractice insurance carrier: The patient's attorney may want to depose the psychiatrist regarding treatment issues. Participants in the Psychiatrists' Program are encouraged to contact us regarding all subpoenas for deposition. In addition to confidentiality issues, there could be issues related to the psychiatrist's own liability. There have been cases where the psychiatrist (who was not originally a defendant in the patient's medical malpractice case against another healthcare professional) agreed to give a deposition, and did not notify his/her malpractice insurance carrier beforehand. As a result of the deposition testimony, which was given without legal counsel representing the psychiatrist's interests, the psychiatrist was later added as a defendant in the underlying medical malpractice case.

Be careful when "helping" a colleague

Prescribing for a colleague: Psychiatrists should understand that prescribing is generally equated with treating. Accordingly, if prescribing for a colleague (or other non-patient, such as a family member), it is likely that the state medical licensing board will attach the same expectations as with a formal patient such as examination before prescribing and documentation of the evaluation and treatment.

Agreeing to not keep records: While the urge to accommodate a colleague may be very strong, psychiatrists need to keep in mind that the standard of care must always be met, and that documenting the care provided is part of the standard of care. Consider the case where a physician sought treatment from a psychiatrist and asked the psychiatrist not to keep any records.

The psychiatrist - as a courtesy to her colleague - agreed, but regretted this decision later when the patient (physician) sued the psychiatrist and filed a board complaint. Because there were no records, the psychiatrist's defense of her care in the lawsuit was compromised and she was disciplined by the board.

Renting office space for a percentage of fees collected: Psychiatrists may be approached by colleagues who practice independently and want to rent office space. Often the renting providers want to pay a percentage of fees collected for rent and administrative support. While such business arrangements are very common, there are ethical and legal issues that must be considered. Legal counsel for clarification of these issues may need to be sought. The preferred arrangement would be to negotiate a mutually agreed upon fair market value fee for the use of space and, if applicable, administrative support.

Compliments of:



Call (800) 245-3333
Email TheProgram@prms.com
Visit us PRMS.com
Twitter @PRMS

Professional Risk Management Services ("PRMS") provides the information contained in this article for general use and information. Information provided is intended to improve clarity on issues regarding psychiatry services and insurance coverage, and related issues regarding those services. This information is intended, but not promised or guaranteed, to be current, complete, or up-to-date. PRMS is neither a law firm nor a provider of professional medical services, and the materials in this article do not constitute legal, medical, or regulatory advice. You should not act or rely on any legal or medical information in this article without first seeking the advice of an attorney, physician, or other appropriate professional. PRMS, The Psychiatrists' Program and the PRMS Owl are registered Trademarks of Transatlantic Holdings, Inc., a parent company of Fair American Insurance and Reinsurance Company (FAIRCO).

©2014 Professional Risk Management Services[®] (PRMS[®]). All rights reserved.
M_0189 (Revised 04/2014)