

MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE (Chapter 161)

ORDER MADE BY THE INQUIRY PANEL OF  
THE MEDICAL COUNCIL OF HONG KONG

DR WONG CHIT SUN (REGISTRATION NO.: M07217)

It is hereby notified that after due inquiry held on 31 May 2022 in accordance with section 21 of the Medical Registration Ordinance, Chapter 161 of the Laws of Hong Kong, the Inquiry Panel of the Medical Council of Hong Kong found Dr WONG Chit Sun (Registration No.: M07217) guilty of the following charge:—

*'That in or about 2016, he, being a registered medical practitioner, sanctioned, acquiesced in or failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of his name, title, interview records/statements on the Article '全醫生主理！DONNABEL 水光嫩膚療程' on the webpage of (<https://www.style-tips.com/blog/post/3769>) which promoted or endorsed the treatment(s) provided by 'Donnabel'.*

*In relation to the facts alleged, he has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.'*

Briefly stated, the Medical Council ('the Council') received an email on 27 April 2018 complaining Dr WONG of practice promotion. Attached to the email were relevant extracts downloaded from the webpages of (<http://www.style-tips.com/blog/post/3769>) ('the Webpages'), which discussed about the treatments provided by an organization of the name 'Donnabel'.

The Secretariat to the Council had on 19 November 2019 downloaded from the Webpages an article entitled '全醫生主理！DONNABEL 水光嫩膚療程' ('the Article').

At the beginning of the inquiry, Dr WONG admitted that he failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of his name, title, interview records/statements on the Article on the webpage of (<https://www.style-tips.com/blog/post/3769>) which promoted or endorsed the treatment(s) provided by 'Donnabel'.

The Secretary's case was also that Dr WONG sanctioned and/or acquiesced in the publication of the offending promotional materials. There was however nothing in the evidence adduced by the Secretary to show that Dr WONG had actually sanctioned the publication of the offending promotional materials. The inquiry panel also did not agree that it was open for them to infer from the fact that the offending promotional materials were published so that Dr WONG must have acquiesced in the publication.

There was no dispute that at all material times, Dr WONG worked part time at Donnabel and received a monthly salary.

The Article was written by a blogger of name 'Popcorn 55'. There was a time stamp on the Article, which read '3 years ago'. There was no dispute that the Article was first posted in or about 2016.

It was clear that the Article gave a detailed account from the first-person perspective of Vital Injector treatment ('Treatment') which the blogger received at Donnabel 醫學美容中心. It made reference to the name and title of Dr WONG, who was the only doctor referred to throughout, and certain interview records/statements made by him. The Article mentioned the following: (i) that Dr WONG attended to details when explaining about the Treatment during enquiry stage; (ii) how the blogger was at ease as Dr WONG did not exert any pressure on her; (iii) that Donnabel had a professional medical team of which Dr WONG was very experienced such that safety was implied not to be a problem; and (iv) that there was little pain from the Treatment and the effect of the Treatment was implied to be better than those offered at other places. The Article also contained a number of photographs which appeared to be showing the interior of the clinic of Donnabel, consultation done with the blogger by Dr WONG, some machines, and the faces of a female patient undergoing treatment. The Article ended with contact details of Donnabel provided. The Article when viewed as a whole was laudatory, unduly persuasive and promotional. There was no doubt that the publication of the Article aimed at soliciting and/or canvassing for patients for Donnabel with which Dr WONG had a professional relationship.

In his first submission to the Preliminary Investigation Committee ('PIC'), Dr WONG admitted that Donnabel had posted in its website a link to the said blog. Dr WONG also admitted at the inquiry that he should have done better to not allow the interview by the blogger to continue. In any event, Dr WONG admitted that he had failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the Article.

For these reasons, by failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of his name, title and interview records/statements on the Article which promoted or endorsed the Treatment, Dr WONG had in the view of the Inquiry Panel fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, Dr WONG was found guilty of misconduct in a professional respect as per the charge.

The Inquiry Panel was told in mitigation that Dr WONG had tendered his resignation and left Donnabel in December 2018. Further, Donnabel had closed its business in August 2019. Since leaving Donnabel, Dr WONG said in his second PIC submission that he had set up his own clinic and had kept advertisement to the straight and narrow within the Code. The Inquiry Panel accepted that the chance of re-offending was low.

Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the disciplinary charge for which Dr WONG was convicted and what the Inquiry Panel had heard and read in mitigation, the Inquiry Panel ordered that Dr WONG's name be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month and further ordered that the operation of the removal order be suspended for a period of 6 months.

The orders are published in the *Gazette* in accordance with section 21(5) of the Medical Registration Ordinance. Full decision of the Inquiry Panel of the Medical Council is published in the official website of the Medical Council of Hong Kong (<http://www.mchk.org.hk>).

LAU Wan-yee, Joseph *Chairman, The Medical Council of Hong Kong*