**Case of Medical Negligence and Malpractice**

The medical issue facing the hospital is that of medical malpractice, specifically negligence. Apparently, Yolanda Pinellas has suffered loss and function of her third, fourth, and fifth fingers, as well as damage to her thigh tissue in the hands of medical personnel at the hospital. The parties liable for this unfortunate medical incident include: Mary Jones, RN, who first inserted the IV infusion machine on Yolanda’s hand; and Jeffery Chambers, RN, who was responsible for Yolanda and set up the IV; and Dr. William Brady, who administered the wrong drug when grafting Yolanda’s skin, thereby causing uneven harvesting of tissue that further scarred Yolanda’s thigh. While the above parties were directly responsible for wrong doing, others, including Patricia Peters, Pharm D, who brought the chemotherapy drug late, and Carol Price, LPN, and Diana Smith, both of whom deliberately ignored the beeping of the IV infusion machine, were also party to the case.

In their defence, however, the parties, particularly Carol, Diana, Jeffrey, and Mary, are likely to argue that they were working under strained circumstances seeing that the hospital was short-staffed.

Luckily for Yolanda, documentation from the hospital records indicate that the IV infusion machine had been infiltrated; this strengthens her suit against the hospital and the liable parties.

Indeed, Yolanda can prove that the standards of care at the hospital were poor and the evidence of infiltration would serves as proof of her claim before the court.

Luckily for the hospital and Dr. William, their malpractice insurance covers protect them against any financial loss as their insurer would compensate Yolanda for her loss, which is she can no longer study to be a music conductor.

The hospital, prior and even after the Yolanda incident, has serious issues relating to risk management. Before Yolanda’s incident, Michel Parks, RN, who is the clinical nurse had discussed with Susan Post, JD, the risk manager, and Amy Green, the quality assurance manager, about the shortage of manpower at the hospital. After the Yolanda incident, the hospital noticed the weaknesses of the SAF-INFUSE IV infusion machine that the hospital was testing.

According to the doctrine of respondeat superior, an employer is held liable for the wrong-doing of their employee/s even if the employer is not directly responsible (Burns, 2011). In the case involving Yolanda, this doctrine applies in that the hospital as the employer of the parties mentioned as having been negligent in handling Yolanda would compensate the victim (Fenn, 2002; Studdert et al., 2006).
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