

College of Paramedics of Nova Scotia

Consent Reprimand

GRADY, Mark

Upper Sackville, NS

CPNS Registration Number: 32843

On November 20, 2023, the Investigation Committee of the College of Paramedics of Nova Scotia (CPNS) ordered, pursuant to section 67(6)(a)(i) of the *Paramedics Regulations*, and with the consent of Mr. Grady, that he receive a reprimand for: failing to provide appropriate assessment, intervention, and/or treatment, and failing to adequately document.

Mr. Grady and his partner attended a call for what they believed to be a cardiac arrest. Upon arrival, Mr. Grady (the primary crew member) noted that the patient was not breathing and had no carotid pulse. Based on this and the patient's appearance, he concluded that the patient was deceased. Approximately 12 minutes had elapsed between the request for service and their arrival at the patient, and there was no known intervention prior to their arrival. Accordingly, Mr. Grady determined that viability of life was no longer present, and no resuscitation was attempted. The Committee noted that the cardiac monitor was not used; therefore, the paramedics did not know what rhythm the patient was in, as required by the relevant clinical practice guideline. The assessment was incomplete in other respects, and the documentation did not adequately capture the patient's medical history or the paramedics' rationale. Ultimately, the Committee concluded that it was not reasonable to assume that the patient was not viable under the circumstances.

Based on the available information, the Committee was satisfied that Mr. Grady breached the *Code of Ethics* and the *Standards of Practice* related to, *inter alia*, advocating in the best interests of the patient, assessing the medical needs of the patient, being accountable for patient care, practising in accordance with practice setting policy and procedures, and maintaining complete documentation.

The Committee determined that under these circumstances, Mr. Grady's breach of the *Code of Ethics* and *Standards of Practice* was unprofessional, and that pursuant to s. 67(4)(g) of the *Regulations*, there is sufficient evidence that, if proven, would constitute professional misconduct. The Committee therefore determined that a reprimand was the appropriate outcome in this situation.

On March 11, 2024, Mr. Grady consented to the reprimand.