



## SINGAPORE MEDICAL COUNCIL

16 College Road, #01-01 College of Medicine Building, Singapore 169854

E-mail Address: [moh\\_smc@moh.gov.sg](mailto:moh_smc@moh.gov.sg)

Website: <http://www.smc.gov.sg>

Fax Number: (65) 6258-2134

---

3 November 2010

### PRESS RELEASE

#### DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY FOR DR WONG YOKE MENG

1. The Disciplinary Committee ("DC") of the Singapore Medical Council ("SMC") held a disciplinary inquiry in September 2010 for Dr Wong Yoke Meng ("Dr Wong"), a registered medical practitioner specialising as an Obstetrician and Gynaecologist. At the material time of the complaint, Dr Wong, age 63 years, practised at Clinique Suisse located at 290 Orchard #08-01/02 Paragon Medical Centre, Singapore 238859.
2. Dr Wong faced one charge of professional misconduct for making laudatory and/or misleading statements in an advertisement published in "The Guide to Singapore's Private Medical & Dental Specialist Care" in 2007, in breach of the SMC Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines (ECEG). Dr Wong pleaded guilty to the charge.
3. The DC found the statements made by Dr Wong in the advertisement to be laudatory and/or misleading in that they gave the impression that (a) Dr Wong is one of the pioneers of stem cell treatment; and/or (b) Dr Wong's clinic is part of an internationally established medical group which practises innovative and advanced techniques and treatment, including stem cell treatment; and/or (c) stem cell treatment is a medically accepted and effective therapy both for the treatment and prevention of degenerative diseases of ageing such as "*Arthritis, hypertension, diabetes, Parkinson's degeneration and cancer*". Accordingly, the DC convicted Dr Wong of the charge of professional misconduct.
4. The DC noted that the ECEG embodied the standards of the medical profession in respect of information furnished by medical practitioners to the public and their patients. The DC considered the fact that the statements relate to stem cell treatment which is largely unproven. In that context, where there is potential for harm to patients, a punishment involving a suspension of the medical practitioner may be appropriate. However, as there was no evidence on that aspect in Dr Wong's case, the DC was

mindful not to include that consideration in determining the appropriate sentence. The DC also noted that there was no evidence that any actual harm had resulted to any patient because of the laudatory and/or misleading statements made in the advertisement.

5. The DC noted that Dr Wong, in his mitigation, had stated that he did not contest the charge against him, that he had sincerely apologised for the advertisement containing the laudatory and/or misleading statements and that he had undertaken to remove similar laudatory and/or misleading statements elsewhere, apart from the advertisement.
  
6. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, the DC ordered that Dr Wong be fined \$7,000 and censured. The DC also ordered that Dr Wong give a written undertaking to the SMC that he will abstain from the conduct complained of or any similar conduct and that he will remove similar laudatory and/or misleading statements elsewhere, apart from the advertisement. Dr Wong was ordered to pay the costs and expenses of and incidental to these proceedings, including the costs of the solicitor to the SMC and the Legal Assessor.

- END -