

Tribunal reprimands practitioner over unsatisfactory professional conduct

22 July 2015

The Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal found Ms Devorah Lindberg acted in a way that constituted unsatisfactory professional conduct, by omitting information about her work history when applying for registration as a medical radiation practitioner.

In January 2012, Ms Lindberg applied for general registration with the former Medical Radiation Technologists Board of Queensland, which regulated medical radiation practitioners before the Medical Radiation Board of Australia was established on 1 July 2012.

Ms Lindberg stated in her application that between 2006 and 2010 she had been employed by the Dubai Hospital in Zabeel, Dubai UAE, describing the facility as a government hospital.

Shortly afterwards, a member of the former board discovered that the hospital Ms Lindberg had been employed at was the Dubai Equine Hospital, where she had worked as a radiographer, providing MRIs to animals, in particular horses, as well as individuals with horse-inflicted injuries

At the time, the former Board's recency of practice policy required general registration applicants to demonstrate at least one year full-time experience in clinical practice (on humans) in the last five years. Ms Lindberg didn't meet this requirement as her experience had primarily been with horses, and the former board granted general registration with conditions requiring supervision.

The Medical Radiation Board of Australia referred the matter to the tribunal in October 2014, alleging that Ms Lindberg had engaged in unsatisfactory professional conduct under the former *Disciplinary Proceedings Act 1999* (Qld). The Board alleged that Ms Lindberg had omitted all references to equine treatment in her application for registration with the Board and that this was false, misleading and incorrect.

Ms Lindberg disputed the allegation, stating it wasn't her intention to mislead the Board and that during her time at the hospital, she had used the MRI equipment to x-ray veterinarians, trainers and other staff. Ms Lindberg said she had omitted references to equine treatment as it was not relevant to her application.

The tribunal found that while it may not have been Ms Lindberg's intention to deliberately mislead the Board, omitting information about her equine experience meant that she had not provided full and complete disclosure of her work history.

The tribunal found Ms Lindberg had acted in a way that constituted unsatisfactory professional conduct, reprimanding her and ordering her to pay the Board's costs.

[Reasons for the tribunal's decision](#) are on AustLII.