BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)	
LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D.	Case No. 05-2011-216703
Physician's and Surgeon's	
Certificate No. A 45231	
Respondent)	
)	

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on October 29, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED: September 29, 2015.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Jamie Wright, J.D., Chair

Panel A

1	Kamala D. Harris		
2	Attorney General of California		
3	JUDITH T. ALVARADO Supervising Deputy Attorney General RIGHARD D. MARNO		
4	RICHARD D. MARINO Deputy Attorney General		
	State Bar No. 90471 California Department of Justice		
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013		
6	Telephone: (213) 897-8644 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFOR		
9	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 05-2011-216703	
12	LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. 4731 Conchita Way	OAH No. 2014010827	
13	Tarzana, CA 91356	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 45231	DISCIPLINARY ORDER	
15			
16	Respondent.		
17	In the interest of a prompt and speedy settlement of this matter, consistent with the public		
18	interest and the responsibility of the Medical Board of California of the Department of Consumer		
19	Affairs, the parties hereby agree to the following Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order		
20	which will be submitted to the Board for approval and adoption as the final disposition of the		
21	Accusation.		
22	PAR	<u> FIES</u>	
23	Kimberly Kirchmeyer ("Complainant") is the Executive Director of the Medical		
24	Board of California. She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in		
25	this matter by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Richard D.		
26	Marino, Deputy Attorney General.		
27			
28	//		
	1		

//

- 2. Respondent LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. ("Respondent") is represented in this proceeding by attorney Henry Lewin, Esq., whose address is: 11377 West Olympic Blvd., 5th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90064-1683.
- 3. On or about August 22, 1988, the Medical Board of California issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 45231 to LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 05-2011-216703 and will expire on February 29, 2016, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

- 4. Accusation No. 05-2011-216703 was filed before the Medical Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on October 15, 2013. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.
- 5. A copy of Accusation No. 05-2011-216703 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 6. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 05-2011-216703. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 7. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

8. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

- 9. Respondent admits that, if the matter proceeded to hearing, Complainant would be able to present a *prima facie* case for each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 05-2011-216703.
- 10. Respondent agrees that his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate is subject to discipline and he agrees to be bound by the Board's probationary terms as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

RESERVATION

11. The admissions made by Respondent herein are only for the purposes of this proceeding, or any other proceedings in which the Medical Board of California or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceeding.

CONTINGENCY

- 12. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Medical Board of California. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Medical Board of California may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by Respondent or his counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 13. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, including Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

14. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Disciplinary Order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 45231 issued to Respondent LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. (Respondent) is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and Respondent is placed on probation for five (5) years on the following terms and conditions.

 <u>CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES - TOTAL RESTRICTION</u>. Respondent shall not order, prescribe, dispense, administer, furnish, or possess any controlled substances as defined in the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act.

Respondent shall not issue an oral or written recommendation or approval to a patient or a patient's primary caregiver for the possession or cultivation of marijuana for the personal medical purposes of the patient within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 11362.5.

If Respondent forms the medical opinion, after an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, that a patient's medical condition may benefit from the use of marijuana, Respondent shall so inform the patient and shall refer the patient to another physician who, following an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, may independently issue a medically appropriate recommendation or approval for the possession or cultivation of marijuana for the personal medical purposes of the patient within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 11362.5. In addition, Respondent shall inform the patient or the patient's primary caregiver that Respondent is prohibited from issuing a recommendation or approval for the possession or cultivation of marijuana for the personal medical purposes of the patient and that the patient or the patient's primary caregiver may not rely on Respondent's statements to legally possess or cultivate marijuana for the personal medical purposes of the patient. Respondent shall fully document in the patient's chart that the patient or the patient's primary caregiver was so informed. Nothing in this condition prohibits Respondent from providing the patient or the patient's primary caregiver information about the possible medical benefits resulting from the use

of marijuana.

- 2. <u>CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES SURRENDER OF DEA PERMIT</u>. Respondent is prohibited from practicing medicine until Respondent provides documentary proof to the Board or its designee that Respondent's DEA permit has been surrendered to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation, together with any state prescription forms and all controlled substances order forms. Thereafter, Respondent shall not reapply for a new DEA permit without the prior written consent of the Board or its designee.
- 3. PRESCRIBING PRACTICES COURSE. Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a course in prescribing practices equivalent to the Prescribing Practices Course at the Physician Assessment and Clinical Education Program, University of California, San Diego School of Medicine (Program), approved in advance by the Board or its designee. Respondent shall provide the program with any information and documents that the Program may deem pertinent. Respondent shall participate in and successfully complete the classroom component of the course not later than six (6) months after Respondent's initial enrollment. Respondent shall successfully complete any other component of the course within one (1) year of enrollment. The prescribing practices course shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A prescribing practices course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Board or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Board or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Board or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

4. <u>MEDICAL RECORD KEEPING COURSE</u>. Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a course in medical record keeping equivalent to

the Medical Record Keeping Course offered by the Physician Assessment and Clinical Education Program, University of California, San Diego School of Medicine (Program), approved in advance by the Board or its designee. Respondent shall provide the program with any information and documents that the Program may deem pertinent. Respondent shall participate in and successfully complete the classroom component of the course not later than six (6) months after Respondent's initial enrollment. Respondent shall successfully complete any other component of the course within one (1) year of enrollment. The medical record keeping course shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A medical record keeping course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Board or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Board or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Board or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

5. PROFESSIONALISM PROGRAM (ETHICS COURSE. Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a professionalism program, that meets the requirements of Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1358. Respondent shall participate in and successfully complete that program. Respondent shall provide any information and documents that the program may deem pertinent. Respondent shall successfully complete the classroom component of the program not later than six (6) months after Respondent's initial enrollment, and the longitudinal component of the program not later than the time specified by the program, but no later than one (1) year after attending the classroom component. The professionalism program shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A professionalism program taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the

Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Board or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the program would have been approved by the Board or its designee had the program been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Board or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the program or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

6. <u>SOLO PRACTICE PROHIBITION</u>. Respondent is prohibited from engaging in the solo practice of medicine. Prohibited solo practice includes, but is not limited to, a practice where: 1) Respondent merely shares office space with another physician but is not affiliated for purposes of providing patient care, or 2) Respondent is the sole physician practitioner at that location.

If Respondent fails to establish a practice with another physician or secure employment in an appropriate practice setting within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall receive a notification from the Board or its designee to cease the practice of medicine within three (3) calendar days after being so notified. The Respondent shall not resume practice until an appropriate practice setting is established.

If, during the course of the probation, the Respondent's practice setting changes and the Respondent is no longer practicing in a setting in compliance with this Decision, the Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee within 5 calendar days of the practice setting change. If Respondent fails to establish a practice with another physician or secure employment in an appropriate practice setting within 60 calendar days of the practice setting change, Respondent shall receive a notification from the Board or its designee to cease the practice of medicine within three (3) calendar days after being so notified. The Respondent shall not resume practice until an appropriate practice setting is established.

7. <u>NOTIFICATION</u>. Within seven (7) days of the effective date of this Decision, the Respondent shall provide a true copy of this Decision and Accusation to the Chief of Staff or the Chief Executive Officer at every hospital where privileges or membership are extended to

Respondent, at any other facility where Respondent engages in the practice of medicine, including all physician and locum tenens registries or other similar agencies, and to the Chief Executive Officer at every insurance carrier which extends malpractice insurance coverage to Respondent. Respondent shall submit proof of compliance to the Board or its designee within 15 calendar days.

This condition shall apply to any change(s) in hospitals, other facilities or insurance carrier.

- 8. <u>SUPERVISION OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS</u>. During probation, Respondent is prohibited from supervising physician assistants.
- 9. <u>OBEY ALL LAWS</u>. Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in California and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments, and other orders.
- 10. QUARTERLY DECLARATIONS. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Board, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations not later than 10 calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

11. GENERAL PROBATION REQUIREMENTS.

Compliance with Probation Unit

Respondent shall comply with the Board's probation unit and all terms and conditions of this Decision.

Address Changes

Respondent shall, at all times, keep the Board informed of Respondent's business and residence addresses, email address (if available), and telephone number. Changes of such addresses shall be immediately communicated in writing to the Board or its designee. Under no circumstances shall a post office box serve as an address of record, except as allowed by Business and Professions Code section 2021(b).

Place of Practice

Respondent shall not engage in the practice of medicine in Respondent's or patient's place

of residence, unless the patient resides in a skilled nursing facility or other similar licensed facility.

License Renewal

Respondent shall maintain a current and renewed California physician's and surgeon's license.

Travel or Residence Outside California

Respondent shall immediately inform the Board or its designee, in writing, of travel to any areas outside the jurisdiction of California which lasts, or is contemplated to last, more than thirty (30) calendar days.

In the event Respondent should leave the State of California to reside or to practice Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing 30 calendar days prior to the dates of departure and return.

- 12. <u>INTERVIEW WITH THE BOARD OR ITS DESIGNEE</u>. Respondent shall be available in person upon request for interviews either at Respondent's place of business or at the probation unit office, with or without prior notice throughout the term of probation.
- 13. NON-PRACTICE WHILE ON PROBATION. Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing within 15 calendar days of any periods of non-practice lasting more than 30 calendar days and within 15 calendar days of Respondent's return to practice. Non-practice is defined as any period of time Respondent is not practicing medicine in California as defined in Business and Professions Code sections 2051 and 2052 for at least 40 hours in a calendar month in direct patient care, clinical activity or teaching, or other activity as approved by the Board. All time spent in an intensive training program which has been approved by the Board or its designee shall not be considered non-practice. Practicing medicine in another state of the United States or Federal jurisdiction while on probation with the medical licensing authority of that state or jurisdiction shall not be considered non-practice. A Board-ordered suspension of practice shall not be considered as a period of non-practice.

In the event Respondent's period of non-practice while on probation exceeds 18 calendar months, Respondent shall successfully complete a clinical training program that meets the criteria

of Condition 18 of the current version of the Board's "Manual of Model Disciplinary Orders and Disciplinary Guidelines" prior to resuming the practice of medicine.

Respondent's period of non-practice while on probation shall not exceed two (2) years. Periods of non-practice will not apply to the reduction of the probationary term.

Periods of non-practice will relieve Respondent of the responsibility to comply with the probationary terms and conditions with the exception of this condition and the following terms and conditions of probation: Obey All Laws; and General Probation Requirements.

- 14. <u>COMPLETION OF PROBATION</u>. Respondent shall comply with all financial obligations (e.g., restitution, probation costs) not later than 120 calendar days prior to the completion of probation. Upon successful completion of probation, Respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.
- 15. <u>VIOLATION OF PROBATION</u>. Failure to fully comply with any term or condition of probation is a violation of probation. If Respondent violates probation in any respect, the Board, after giving Respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an Accusation, or Petition to Revoke Probation, or an Interim Suspension Order is filed against Respondent during probation, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- 16. <u>LICENSE SURRENDER</u>. Following the effective date of this Decision, if
 Respondent ceases practicing due to retirement or health reasons or is otherwise unable to satisfy
 the terms and conditions of probation, Respondent may request to surrender his or her license.
 The Board reserves the right to evaluate Respondent's request and to exercise its discretion in
 determining whether or not to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate
 and reasonable under the circumstances. Upon formal acceptance of the surrender, Respondent
 shall within 15 calendar days deliver Respondent's wallet and wall certificate to the Board or its
 designee and Respondent shall no longer practice medicine. Respondent will no longer be subject
 to the terms and conditions of probation. If Respondent re-applies for a medical license, the
 application shall be treated as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked certificate.

100 miles	17. PROBATION MONITORING COSTS. Respondent shall pay the costs associated	
7	with probation monitoring each and every year of probation, as designated by the Board, which	
3	may be adjusted on an annual basis. Such costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of	
4	California and delivered to the Board or its designee no later than January 31 of each calendar	
5	years.	
6	<u>ACCEPTANCE</u>	
7	Thave carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully	
8	discussed it with my attorney. Henry Lewin, Esq., Lunderstand the stipulation and the effect it	
()	will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. Lenter into this Stipulated Settlement and	
10	Disciplinary Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the	
11	Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.	
12		
13	DATED: 126/15 / 1200 / 2 - 200 / 2 -	
14	LEANDRO GULAPA GATÚS, M.D. Respondent	
15		
16	Thave read and fully discussed with Respondent LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. the	
17	terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and	
18	Disciplinary Order. Lapprove its form and content.	
[9]	DATED: Ougust 28,2015 Here Wern	
20	Attorney for Respondent	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California.

Dated: Olyunt 28, 00/5

Respectfully submitted,

KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California JUDITH T. ALVARADO Supervising Deputy Attorney General

RICHARD D. MARINO Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 05-2011-216703

1	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
2	Attorney General of California E. A. JONES III	FILED	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General RICHARD D. MARINO	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
4	California Department of Justice	DICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA MENTO CHOCK 15, 2012	
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	MICO ANALISI	
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-8644	*/	
7	Facsimile: (213) 897-9395 E-mail: Richard.Marino@doj.ca.gov		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE		
10	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11		se No. 05-2011-216703	
12		C C U S A T I O N	
13	4731 Conchita Way Tarzana, CA 91356	CCUSATION	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A		
15	45231		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	Complein and alleges		
19 20	Complainant alleges: PARTIE	· c	
21			
22	1. Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official		
23	capacity as the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
24	2. On or about August 22, 1988, the Medical Board of California issued Physician's and		
25	Surgeon's Certificate Number A 45231 to LEANDRO GULAPA GATUS, M.D. (Respondent).		
26	The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the		
	II The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full		
27			
27 28	charges brought herein and will expire on February 2		

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Medical Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 2220 of the Code empowers Board with the responsibility of enforcing the provisions of the Medical Practice Act as to holders of physician's and surgeon's certificates.
 - 5. Section 2227 of the Code provides:
 - "(a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:
 - "(1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.
 - "(2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a pursuant not to exceed one year upon order of the board.
 - "(3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.
 - "(4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the board.
 - "(5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem appropriate.
 - "(b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters, medical review or advisory conferences, professional competency examinations, continuing education activities, and cost reimbursement associated therewith that are agreed to with the board and successfully completed by the licensee, or other matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and shall be made available to the public by the board pursuant to Section 803.1."

6. Section 2234 of the Code provides:

"The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- "(1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- "(2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.
 - "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
 - "(f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate.
- "(g) The practice of medicine from this state into another state or country without meeting the legal requirements of that state or country for the practice of medicine. Section 2314 shall not apply to this subdivision. This subdivision shall become operative upon the implementation of the proposed registration program described in Section 2052.5.
- "(h) The repeated failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview scheduled by the mutual agreement of the certificate holder and the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the

subject of an investigation by the board."

7. Section 2238 of the Code provides:

AA violation of any federal statute or federal regulation or any of the statutes or regulations of this state regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances constitutes unprofessional conduct.@

- 8. Section 2241 of the Code, in pertinent part, provides:
 - "(a) . . .
- "(b) A physician and surgeon may prescribe, dispense, or administer prescription drugs or prescription controlled substances to an addict for purposes of maintenance on, or detoxification from, prescription drugs or controlled substances only as set forth in subdivision (c) or in Sections 11215, 11217, 11217.5, 11218, 11219, and 11220 of the Health and Safety Code. Nothing in this subdivision shall authorize a physician and surgeon to prescribe, dispense, or administer dangerous drugs or controlled substances to a person he or she knows or reasonably believes is using or will use the drugs or substances for a nonmedical purpose.

"(c)..."

- 9. Section 2242 of the Code, in pertinent part, provides:
- "(a) Prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, constitutes unprofessional conduct.

"....

10. Section 2266 of the Code provides:

AThe failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct.@

11. Section 725 of the Code provides:

"Repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering of drugs or treatment, repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic procedures, or repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic or treatment facilities as

determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon, dentist, podiatrist, psychologist, physical therapist, chiropractor, optometrist, speech-language pathologist, or audiologist.

- "(b) Any person who engages in repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs or treatment is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars (\$100) nor more than six hundred dollars (\$600), or by imprisonment for a term of not less than 60 days nor more than 180 days, or by both that fine and imprisonment.
- "(c) A practitioner who has a medical basis for prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering dangerous drugs or prescription controlled substances shall not be subject to disciplinary action or prosecution under this section.
- "(d) No physician and surgeon shall be subject to disciplinary action pursuant to this section for treating intractable pain in compliance with Section 2241.5."
- 12. Health and Safety Code section 11152 provides:

"No person shall write, issue, fill, compound, or dispense a prescription that does not conform to this division."

- 13. Health and Safety Code section 11153, in relevant part, provides:
- "(a) A prescription for a controlled substance shall only be issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner acting in the usual course of his or her professional practice. The responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, but a corresponding responsibility rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription. Except as authorized by this division, the following are not legal prescriptions: (1) an order purporting to be a prescription which is issued not in the usual course of professional treatment or in legitimate and authorized research; or (2) an order for an addict or habitual user of controlled substances, which is issued not in the course of professional treatment or as part of an authorized narcotic treatment program, for the purpose of providing the user with controlled substances, sufficient to keep him or her comfortable by maintaining customary

use.

14. Health and Safety Code section 11155 provides:

"Any physician, who by court order or order of any state or governmental agency, or who voluntarily surrenders his controlled substance privileges, shall not possess, administer, dispense, or prescribe a controlled substance unless and until such privileges have been restored, and he has obtained current registration from the appropriate federal agency as provided by law."

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS

- 15. <u>Norco</u> (Hydrocodone Bitartrate and Acetaminophen): A Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056 and a dangerous drug pursuant Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat and manage pain.
- 16. Xanax (Alprazolam): A Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11057 and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat and manage anxiety.
- 17. Oxycontin (Oxycodone Hydrochloride): A Schedule II controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (b)(1)(M), and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat and manage pain.
- 18. <u>Methadone HCL</u>: A Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056 and a dangerous drug pursuant Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat opiate addiction.
- 19. <u>Suboxone</u>: A Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055 and a dangerous drug pursuant Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat opiate addiction.
- 20. <u>Soma (Carisoprodol)</u>: A Schedule III controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11056 and a dangerous drug pursuant Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat pain and manage pain.
 - 21. Klonopin (Clonazepam): A Schedule IV controlled substance pursuant to Health and

Safety Code section 11057 and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat and manage anxiety.

- 22. <u>Seroquel</u>: A dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat bipolar disorder.
- 23. <u>Celexa (citalopram hydrobromide)</u>: A dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat depression.
- 24. <u>Roxicodone (Oxycodone Hydrochloride)</u>: A Schedule II controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055 and a dangerous drug pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4022 primarily used to treat and manage pain.

PRIOR DISCIPLINARY HISTORY

25. Effective August 11, 2000, *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Leandro Gatus*, *M.D.*, MBC Case No. 05-1997-81247, the Medical Board of California, pursuant to a Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, issued its Decision and Order, a copy of which is hereto attached as Exhibit A, revoking Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A45231. The Board then stayed the revocation and placed Respondent on probation, with terms and conditions, for two years. Respondent successfully completed probation and his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. 05-1997-81247, was fully restored as of August 11, 2002.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Prescribing Without Performing Appropriate Prior Examination)

26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 2242 for prescribing controlled substances and other dangerous drugs without performing a physical examination and/or without medical indication, as follows:

Patient M.Z.

A. On or about July 4, 2011, M.Z., who was 46 years old, died at his home from an overdose of prescription pain medication.

¹ In order to protect the individuals' rights of privacy, all persons referenced in this pleading other than Respondent are identified by initials only. The true names of these individuals are known to Respondent and will be provided to him upon his timely request for discovery.

- B. M.Z. was a known opiate addict and prescription drug abuser. Between 2009 and 2011, M.Z. received prescriptions for treatment of opiate addiction, pain, and anxiety from Respondent and two other California licensed physicians and surgeons, J.W. and W.J.
- C. On June 30, 2011, four days prior to his death, M.Z. received from Respondent the following pain treatment prescription: Soma (carisprodol), 30 tablets, 350 milligrams (mg); and, the following anti-anxiety medication: Klonopin (clonazepam) 90 tablets, 1 mg. Also, on June, 30, 2011, M.Z. received the following anti-anxiety medication from J.W.: Klonopin (clonazepam), 60 tablets, 1 mg. On June 23, 11 days prior to his death, M.Z., received form W.J. the following opiate addiction prescription: Suboxone, 8 tablets, 2 mg.
- D. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, a period of 30 months, M.Z. received 45 prescriptions for clonazepam.
- E. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, a period of 30 months, M.Z. received 30 prescriptions for hydrocoone.
- F. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, a period of 30 months, M.Z. received 24 prescriptions for methadone IICL, a controlled substance used to treat opiate addiction.
- G. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, a period of 30 months, M.Z. received 7 prescriptions for alprazolam, an anti-anxiety medication.
- H. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, a period of 30 months, M.Z. received 20 prescriptions for suboxone, a controlled substance used to treat opiate addition.
- I. On or about and between January 2009 and June 2011, Respondent failed to perform or, in the alternative, failed to document that he performed regular physical examinations prior to prescribing controlled substances and other dangerous drugs, as hereinabove described in paragraph 25, subparagraphs A through H, above. As a consequence, prescriptions written by Respondent for Patient M.Z. between January 2009

27

28

and June 2011 were without substantiated medical indication.

Patient J.G.

- J.G., addicted to prescription medications for a number of years, presented to Respondent for the purpose of obtaining prescription pain medication.² On May 13, 2009, she presented with "chronic knee pain/detached quad muscle, chronic back pain." At that time, J.G. was taking roxicodone and oxycodone. Respondent continued the same prescriptions for J.G. but did not contact J.G.'s prior treating physician(s).
- On or about August 25, 2009, Respondent began prescribing Soma to J.G. K. However, Respondent did not advise J.G. of the risks associated with taking Soma or, in the alternative, did not record that he did so in the patient's records.
- In September 2009, Respondent was notified that J.G. was having multiple pain medication prescriptions from Respondent and "at least [two] other physicians . . . in at least [three] different pharmacies in a 3-month period."³
- Respondent next saw J.G. on October 27, 2009, at which time he prescribed roxicodone, 10 mg, 90 tablets, and Soma, 350 mg, 30 tablets. A CURES report showed that J.G. obtained prescription medications, including Roxicodone, from another provider at or about the same time.
- J.G. next saw Respondent on July 8, 15, 20; August 3 and 19; and, N. September 9, 2010. During those visits, Respondent prescribed Roxicodone, 10 mg, 15 tablets; Norco, 350 mg., 30 tablets; Soma, 350 mg, 30 tablets; Roxicodone, 15 mg, 15 tablets; Roxicodone, 30 mg, 60 tablets; Norco, 350 mg, 30 tablets; Xanax, 1 mg, 15 tablets; soma, 325 mg, 30 tablets; Xanax, 1 mg, 15 tablets; Soma, 325 mg, 30 tablets; and, Xanax 2 mg, 30 tablets. Respondent's records for these six (6) office visits did not contain any information with regard, among other things, to the frequency of the prescriptions, the changes in dosage, and whether J.G. was counseled regarding the effects of taking these

terminated if she continued "doctor shopping."

² Respondent first saw J.G, a gymnast, during 2003, when she underwent dual knee surgery.
According to Respondent's medical records, he advised J.G. that she would be

medications in concert.

- O. Respondent next saw J.G. on October 19, 2010, at which time Respondent against wrote prescriptions for Norco, 325 mg, 30 tablets; Xanax, 2 mg, 30 tablets; and, Soma, 325 mg, 30 tablets. Respondent's medical records for this visit did not show that Respondent conducted a physical examination. However, during an interview with representatives from the Medical Board of California, conducted about one year later, Respondent stated that he performed a physical examination on October 19, 2010.
- P. Respondent continued to see J.G. from October 2010 until February 2012 during which time he continued to write prescriptions for Soma, Norco, and Xanax.
- Q. Between October 2011 and February 2012, J.G. continued to obtain pain medication from other medical providers as evidenced by CURES reports for that period of time.
- R. On February 28, 2012, J.G. was found dead from a drug overdose at her apartment. The autopsy report, in part, read:

"Toxicological testing detected a toxic level of hydrocodone, therapeutic levels of alprazolam and acetaminophen, and low to trace levels of doxylamine, carisoprodol, meprobamate . . ., dihydocodeine, and naproxen. . . .[C]ausc of death is mixed medication (hydrocodone, alprazolam, doxylamine, and carisoprodol) intoxication, and the manner of death is accident."

S. On or about and between May 2009 and February 2012, Respondent failed to perform or, in the alternative, failed to document that he performed regular physical examinations prior to prescribing controlled substances and other dangerous drugs, as hereinabove described in paragraph 25, subparagraphs J through R, above. As a consequence, prescriptions written by Respondent for Patient J.G. between May 2009 and February 2012 were without substantiaed medical indication.

Patient J.C.

T. On July 6, 2010, J.C., then 64 years old, presented to Respondent for "pain back hip knee." At the initial visit, J.C. completed an intake questionnaire in which

he wrote that he took Oxycodone, Xanax and Soma.

- U. At the time, J.C. was under the care of a number of physicians and surgeons for a variety of medical issues. According to Respondent's medical records, J.C. had been taking pain medications for 15 years.
- V. During that first visit, Respondent prescribed Oxycontin, 80 mg, 60 tablets; Soma, 350 mg, 60 tablets; and, Xanax, 2 mg, 30 tablets. Respondent did not review J.C.'s medical records from other providers and did not review J.C.'s prescription history prior to writing the Oxycontin, Soma and Xanax prescriptions or, in the alternative, did not record that he had done so in the patient's medical records.
- W. On July 29, 2010, J.C. had a prescription for hydrocodone, 80 mg, 60 tablets, written by a dentist filled.
- X. Respondent next saw J.C. on September 9, 2010, at which time he again prescribed Xanax, 2 mg, 30 tablets and Oxycontin, 80 mg, 60 tablets. Respondent's progress note was brief and did not explain where J.C. obtained prescription medications, if any, during three months since last visiting Respondent.
- Y. Respondent next saw J.C. on October 18, 2010, at which time Respondent prescribed Roxicodone, 30 mg, 90 tablets; Xanax, 2 mg, 30 tablets; and, Soma, 350 mg, 60 tablets. Respondent referred J.C. to an internist based on the patient's elevated vital signs.
- Z. A CURES report showed that J.C. filled prescriptions for Xanax and Hydrocodone, written by another physician and surgeon, two days later.
- AA. Respondent continued to see J.C. on a monthly basis over the next 25 months. On each occasion, Respondent renewed the prescriptions he had been writing for J.C.⁴ Although Respondent conducted a physical examination at J.C.'s initial visit, Respondent did not reexamine or record that he had reexamined the patient during the ensuing two years of treatment.

⁴ At some point, Respondent started prescribing Ambien in lieu of Xanax.

1	SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
2	(Prescribing To Known Addicts)	
3	27. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action Business and Professions Code section	
4	2241, in that Respondent prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to persons	
5	he knew or should have known were drug addicts, as follows:	
6	A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above,	
7	as though fully set forth.	
8	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
9	(Excessive Prescribing)	
10	28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions	
11	Code section 725 for excessively prescribing controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to	
12	patients, as follows:	
13	A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above,	
14	as though fully set forth.	
15	FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
16	(Violation of Drug Laws)	
17	29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions	
18	Code section 2238, in connection with Business and Professions Code sections 725, 2241 and	
19	2242 and Health and Safety Code sections 11152, 11153 and 11155, as follows:	
20	A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above,	
21	as though fully set forth.	
22	FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
23	(Gross Negligence)	
24	30. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action Business and Professions Code section	
25	2234, subdivision (b), in that Respondent was grossly negligent during his care, treatment and	
26	management of patients M.Z., J.G., and J.C., as follows:	
27	A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above,	
28	as though fully set forth.	

- B. The following acts and omissions, considered individually and collectively, constitute extreme departures from the applicable standard of care as to all patients..
 - 1) Respondent did not take a complete medical history of the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
 - 2) Respondent did not perform a complete physical examination on the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs or, in the alternative, continued to prescribed pain medications to patients for years without ever conducting a follow-up physical examination.
 - 3) Respondent did not devise a treatment plan for the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
 - 4) Respondent did not discuss the risks and benefits of controlled substances and other dangerous drugs with patients before prescribing same.
 - 5) Respondent did not review the treatment, if any, rendered by others to the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
 - 6) Respondent did not consider referring patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to specialists in pain management.
 - 7) Respondent failed to keep adequate and accurate medical records in that the records did not contain an adequate history and physical, treatment plan with objectives, progress of treatment, informed consent, appropriate follow-up care and/or referrals to specialists.
 - 8) Respondent prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to individuals he reasonably suspected or should have reasonably suspected were addicts or otherwise dependent on controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
 - 9) Respondent did not utilize CURES reports to determine whether patients were obtaining pain medications from other providers at the same time the

patients were obtaining pain medication prescriptions from Respondent or if the patients were obtaining pain medications prescriptions from other providers when the patients went months without seeing Respondent.

- C. As to Patient M.Z., "[Respondent] did document an adequate history and physical examination of [M.Z.], who had a history of Bipolar Disorder, severe intractable pain and a history of opiate dependence . . . [but his failure to] document an adequate initial psychiatric evaluation, which would include a psychiatric history, history of psychiatric treatment, substance abuse history, psychiatric review of symptoms, social history, and a mental status examination . . . is an extreme departure from [the applicable standard] of care."
- D. As to Patient M.Z., "[t]here were no prior medical records or documented contact with a prior health care provider, establishing the diagnosis of chronic pain condition and prior use of Methadone, before [Respondent] started prescribing Methadone to a patient with a history of chronic pain, Bipolar Disorder, and history of opiate dependence." This and the "multiple instances . . . [of] inadequate monitoring of Methadone . . . [are] . . . extreme departure[s] [from the applicable] standard of care."
- E. As to Patient M.Z., "[Respondent] did not adequately document the progress/treatment response of the symptoms of Bipolar Disorder and anxiety in the treatment of [M.Z.], who ha[d] a history of opiate dependency. There were multiple instances . . . of inadequate monitoring of Klonopin , . . [and] no medical record documentation of informed consent for the psychiatric medications[,]" all of which constitute an extreme departure from the applicable standard of care.
- F. As to Patient J.G., the lack "of medical records or documentation from another health care provider establishing a chronic pain condition and treatment before [Respondent] started prescribing . . . high dose narcotic pain medication . . . is an extreme departure [from the applicable] standard of care."
 - G. As to Patient J.G., '[t]he lack of adequate documentation, for a patient

with a history of chronic pain and history of doctor shopping/overuse of pain medications, of: (1) the progress of treatment of chronic pain and anxiety; (2) lack of documentation of [J.G.]'s overuse of addictive medications as a problem; (3) lack of informed consent for the addictive medications being prescribed; (4) lack of documentation of using CURES to monitor [J.G.]'s prescription of narcotic pain medications and other controlled substances . . . from other health care providers or to contact the pharmacies he was using to inquire whether [J.G.] was receiving similar medications from other doctors; and [,] (5) the lack of documentation of approval of refills . . . is an extreme departure from the [applicable] standard of care,"

H. As to Patient J.C., "[f]or a 64 year old patient with a history of chronic pain and anxiety and [other medical issues] who is being treated with chronic narcotic pain medication and benzodiazepines, (1) the lack of adequate documentation of the progress of treatment of the symptoms of chronic pain and anxiety with narcotic pain medications and benzodiazepines in many of the progress notes; and (2) the lack of documentation of informed consent for the risks and benefits of the addictive medications—narcotic pain medications, *e.g.*, Oxycontin, Roxicodone . . . is an extreme departure from the [applicable] standard of care."

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 31. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2234, subdivision (c), in that Respondent was repeatedly negligent during his care, treatment and management of Patients M.Z., J.G., and J.C., as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above, as though fully set forth.
 - B. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 27, subparagraphs C through H, inclusive, above, as though fully set forth.
 - C. The following acts and omission constitute departures from the applicable standard of care as to all patients.

- 1) Respondent did not take a complete medical history of the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
- 2) Respondent did not perform a complete physical examination on the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
- 3) Respondent did not devise a treatment plan for the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
- 4) Respondent did not discuss the risks and benefits of controlled substances and other dangerous drugs with patients before prescribing same.
- 5) Respondent did not review the treatment, if any, rendered by others to the patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
- 6) Respondent did not consider referring patients for whom he prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to specialists in pain management.
- 7) Respondent failed to keep adequate and accurate medical records in that the records did not contain an adequate history and physical, treatment plan with objectives, progress of treatment, informed consent, appropriate follow-up care and/or referrals to specialists.
- 8) Respondent prescribed controlled substances and other dangerous drugs to individuals he reasonably suspected or should have reasonably suspected were addicts or otherwise dependent on controlled substances and other dangerous drugs.
- 9) Respondent did not utilize CURES reports to determine whether patients were obtaining pain medications from other providers at the same time the patients were obtaining pain medication prescriptions from Respondent or if the patients were obtaining pain medications prescriptions from other providers when the patients went months without seeing Respondent.

- D. As to Patient M.Z., "[t]he lack of documentation to attempt to obtain psychiatric records or to contact the other current treating psychiatrist(s) is a simple departure from the standard of care.
- E. As to Patient J.C., '[t]he lack of documentation . . . of a release of health care information form to obtain treatment records from the patient's current health care providers . . . and the lack of copies of medical records or documented contact by [Respondent] with [J.C.]'s primary care physician and orthopedic surgeon, is a simple departure from the [applicable] standard of care"

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

- 32. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 2234, subdivision (d), in that he was incompetent during his care, treatment and management of patients, as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above, as though fully set forth.
 - B. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 27, subparagraphs C through H, inclusive, above, as though fully set forth.
 - C. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 28, subparagraphs C, D and E, above, as though fully set forth.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dishonest or Corrupt Acts)

- 33. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2234, subdivision (e), in that he committed dishonest or corrupt acts while caring for, treating and managing patients, as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above, as though fully set forth.

//

NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Medical Records)

- 34. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2266 in that he failed to maintain adequate and accurate records pertaining to the provision of medical services to Patients M.Z., J.G., and J.C., as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 25, above, as though fully set forth.

TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

- 35. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2234, generally, in that he was grossly negligent during his care, treatment and management of Patients M.Z. J.G., and J.C., as follows:
 - A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference incorporates paragraph 31, above, as though fully set forth.

//

EXHIBIT A

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)
LEANDRO GATUS, M.D	File No: 05-1997-81247
Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate #A-45231))))
Respondent.))

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on August 11, 2000.

IT IS SO ORDERED July 12, 2000

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Ira Lubell, M.D. Chair, Panel A

Division of Medical Quality

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General 1 of the State of California RICHARD D. MARINO (State Bar No. 90471) 2 Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 3 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013=1233 4 Telephone: (213) 897-8644 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 7 BEFORE THE . 8 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 In the Matter of the Accusation) Case No. 05-1997-81247 OAH No. L-2000010507 Against: 12 STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND LEANDRO G. GATUS, M.D. **DISCIPLINARY ORDER** 13 4731 Conchita Way Tarzana, Ca. 91356 14 Physician and Surgeon's Certificate 15 No. A 45231, 16 Respondent. 17 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the 18 parties to the above-entitled proceedings that the following 19 matters are true: 20 An Accusation in case number 05-1997-81247 was filed 21 with the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, 22 23 Department of Consumer Affairs (hereinafter the "Division") on December 1, 1999, and is currently pending against LEANDRO G. 24 GATUS, M.D. ("respondent"). 25 The Accusation, together with all statutorily 2. 26

required documents, was duly served on the respondent on or about

December 1, 1999, and respondent filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation on or about December 8, 1999. A copy of Accusation No. 05-1997-81247 is attached as Exhibit "1" and hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.

б

- 3. Complainant, Ron Joseph, is the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California ("Complainant") and brought this action solely in his official capacity. The Complainant is represented by the Attorney General of California, Bill Lockyer, by and through Deputy Attorney General Richard D. Marino.
- 4. At all times relevant herein, respondent has been licensed by the Medical Board of California under Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 45231.
- 5. Respondent is representing himself in this matter in propria persona.
- 6. Respondent has fully read the charges contained in Accusation No. 05-94-40204. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights and the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 7. Respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in the Accusation and that, if proven at hearing, the charges and allegations would constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate. Respondent is fully aware of his right to a hearing on the charges contained in the Accusation, his right to confront and crossexamine witnesses against him, his right to the use of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents in both defense and mitigation of the charges, his right to

reconsideration, court review and any and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

- 8. Respondent knowingly, intelligently, voluntarily and irrevocably waives and gives up each of these rights.
- 9. Respondent admits the truth of paragraphs 1 through 5, inclusive, of Accusation No. 05-1997-81247, and agrees that he has thereby subjected his Physician and Surgeon's Certificate to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 2236 for having a sustained a criminal conviction for an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a physician and surgeon--namely, driving with a blood alcohol level greater than .08 percent, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (B). Respondent agrees to be bound by the Division's Disciplinary Order as set forth below.
- 10. The admissions made by respondent herein are for the purpose of this proceeding and any other proceedings in which the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceedings.
- 11. Based on the foregoing admissions and stipulated matters, the parties agree that the Division shall, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

Certificate No. A 45231 issued to LEANDRO G. GATUS, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for two (2) years on the following terms and conditions. Within 15 days after the effective date of this decision the respondent shall provide the Division, or its designee, proof of service that respondent has served a true copy of this decision on the Chief of Staff or the Chief Executive Officer at every hospital where privileges or membership are extended to respondent or where respondent is employed to practice medicine and on the Chief Executive Officer at every insurance carrier where malpractice insurance coverage is extended to respondent.

- 1. <u>ALCOHOL ABSTAIN FROM USE</u> Respondent shall abstain completely from the use of alcoholic beverages.
- 2. <u>BIOLOGICAL FLUID TESTING</u> Respondent shall immediately submit to biological fluid testing, at respondent's cost, upon the request of the Division or its designee.
- a. TWELVE STEP PROGRAM Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this decision, respondent shall enroll and participate in an Alcoholics Anonymous or similar 12-Step recovery program until the Division or its designee determines that the respondent's participation in such a program is no longer necessary or until the termination of probation whichever occurs first. Quitting the program without permission or failing to attend the program on a regular basis shall constitute a violation of

probation by respondent.

- 4. ETHICS COURSE Within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall enroll in a course in Ethics approved in advance by the Division or its designee, and shall successfully complete the course during the first year of probation.
- 5. OBEY ALL LAWS Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in California, and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments and other orders.
- 6. QUARTERLY REPORTS Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.
- shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program. Respondent shall, at all times, keep the Division informed of his business and residence addresses which shall both serve as addresses of record. Changes of such addresses shall be immediately communicated in writing to the Division. Under no circumstances shall a post office box serve as an address of record.

Respondent shall also immediately inform the Division, in writing, of any travel to any areas outside the jurisdiction of California which lasts, or is contemplated to last, more than thirty (30) days.

8. <u>INTERVIEW WITH THE DIVISION, ITS DESIGNEE OR ITS DESIGNATED</u>

PHYSICIAN(S) Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division, its designee or its designated physician(s) upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- TOLLING FOR OUT-OF-STATE PRACTICE, RESIDENCE OR IN-STATE NON-PRACTICE In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the State or for any reason should respondent stop practicing medicine in California, respondent shall notify the Division or its designee in writing within ten (10) days of the dates of departure and return or the dates of non-practice within California. Non-practice is defined as any period of time exceeding thirty (30) days in which respondent is not engaging in any activities defined in Sections 2051 and 2052 of the Business and Professions Code. All time spent in an intensive training program approved by the Division or its designee shall be considered as time spent in the practice of medicine. Periods of temporary or permanent residence or practice outside California or of non-practice within California, as defined in this condition, will not apply to the reduction of the probationary period.
- 10. <u>COMPLETION OF PROBATION</u> Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.
- probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended

until the matter is final.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 12. COST RECOVERY The respondent is hereby ordered to reimburse the Division the amount of \$4,000, in 12 installments during the first year of probation, investigative and prosecution costs. The first installment is due within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision and each subsequent installment every thirty (30) days thereafter. Failure to reimburse the Division's cost of investigation and prosecution shall constitute a violation of the probation order, unless the Division agrees in writing to payment by an alternate installment plan because of financial hardship. The filing of bankruptcy by the respondent shall not relieve the respondent of his responsibility to reimburse the Division for its investigative and prosecution costs.
- associated with probation monitoring each and every year of probation, which are currently set at \$2,304, but may be adjusted on an annual basis. Such costs shall be payable to the Division of Medical Quality and delivered to the designated probation surveillance monitor at the beginning of each calendar year. Failure to pay costs within 30 days of the due date shall constitute a violation of probation.
- 14. <u>LICENSE SURRENDER</u> Following the effective date of this decision, if respondent ceases practicing due to retirement, health reasons or is otherwise unable to satisfy the terms and conditions of probation, respondent may voluntarily tender his certificate to the Board. The Division reserves the right to

evaluate the respondent's request and to exercise its discretion whether to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate and reasonable under the circumstances. Upon formal acceptance of the tendered license, respondent will not longer be subject to the terms and conditions of probation.

CONTINGENCY

This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order shall be subject to the approval of the Division of Medical Quality. Respondent understands and agrees that Board staff and counsel for complainant may communicate directly with the Division regarding this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, without notice to or participation by respondent or his counsel. If the Division fails to adopt this stipulation as its Order, the stipulation shall be of no force or effect, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Division shall not be disqualified from further action in this matter by virtue of its consideration of this stipulation.

ACCEPTANCE

I have read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I understand the effect this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order will have on my Physician and Surgeon's Certificate, and agree to be bound thereby. I enter this stipulation freely, knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily.

DATED: 2-17-2000

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for the consideration of the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs.

DATED: March 14, 2000.

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of California

RICHARD D. MARINO Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

Exhibit: Accusation shell.stp [1197 rev]

EXHIBIT 1 Accusation No. 05-1997-81247

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

SAGRAMENTO L. 1999

BY WELL TAMERAL ASSOCIATION

Case No. 05-1997-81247

ACCUSATION

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General of the State of California RICHARD D. MARINO (State Bar No. 90471)
Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013=1233 Telephone: (213) 897-8644

Attorneys for Complainant

Matter

LEANDRO G. GATUS, M.D.

4731 Conchita Way Tarzana, Ca. 91356

οf

Physician and Surgeon's Certificate

О

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

the

No. A 45231,

Against:

12

13 14

15

ТЭ

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

Respondent.

BEFORE THE

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

the Accusation)

- 1. Complainant, Ron Joseph, is the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California (hereinafter "Board") and brings this accusation solely in his official capacity.
- 2. On or about August 22, 1988, Physician and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 45231 was issued by the Board to LEANDRO G. GATUS, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent"), and at all times relevant to the charges brought herein, this license has been in full force

and effect. Unless renewed, it will expire on February 28, 2000.

JURISDICTION

3. This accusation is brought before the Board's

- Division of Medical Quality (hereinafter "Division"), under the authority of the following sections of the California Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "Code"):
 - A. Section 2227 provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline the Division deems proper.
 - B. Section 2234 provides that unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this chapter.
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
 - "(c) Repeated negligent acts.
 - "(d) Incompetence.
 - "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
 - "(f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate.

C. Section 2236 of the Code provides:

1.1.

- "(a) The conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.
- "(b) The district attorney, city attorney, or other prosecuting agency shall notify the Division of Medical Quality of the pendency of an action against a licensee charging a felony or misdemeanor immediately upon obtaining information that the defendant is a licensee. The notice shall identify the licensee and described the crimes charged and the facts alleged. The prosecuting agency shall also notify the clerk of the court in which the action is pending that the defendant is a licensee, and the clerk shall record prominently in the file that the defendant holds a license as a physician and surgeon.
- "(c) The clerk of the court in which a licensee is convicted of a crime shall, within 48 hours after the conviction, transmit a certified copy of the record of conviction to the board. The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions,

or duties of a physician and surgeon.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- "(d) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction after a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section and Section 2236.1. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred.
 - D. Section 2239 of the Code provides:
- "(a) The use or prescribing administering to himself or herself, of any controlled substance; or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section 4211, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the licensee, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice medicine safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the. substances referred to in this section, or combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such unprofessional conduct.
- "(b) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section. The Division of Medical Quality may order discipline of the licensee in accordance with Section 2227 or the

Division of Licensing may order the denial of the license when the time for appeal has elapsed or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint, information, or indictment."

1

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

E. Section 490 of the Code provides:

"A board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, is substantially crime related qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action which a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code."

F. Section 820 of the Code provides:

"Whenever it appears that any person holding a license, certificate or permit under this division or under any initiative act referred to in this division may be unable to practice his or her profession safely because the licentiate's ability to practice is impaired due to mental illness, or physical illness affecting competency, the licensing agency may order the licentiate to be examined by one or more physicians and surgeons or psychologists designated by the agency. The report of the examiners shall be made available to the licentiate and may be received as direct evidence in proceedings conducted pursuant to Section 822.

G. Section 821 of the Code provides:

"The licentiate's failure to comply with an order issued under Section 820 shall constitute grounds for the suspension or revocation of the licentiate's certificate or license."

H. Section 822 of the Code provides:

"If a licensing agency determines that its licentiate's ability to practice his or her profession safely is impaired because the licentiate is mentally ill, or physically ill affecting competency, the licensing agency may take action by any one of the following methods:

- "(a) Revoking the licentiate's certificate or license.
 - "(b) Suspending the licentiate's right to

practice.

1.1

"(c) Placing the licentiate on probation.

"(d) Taking such other action in relation to the licentiate as the licensing agency in its discretion deems proper.

"The licensing agency shall not reinstate a revoked or suspended certificate or license until it has received competent evidence of the absence or control of the condition which caused its action and until it is satisfied that with due regard for the public health and safety the person's right to practice his or her profession may be safely reinstated."

I. Section 826 of the Code provides:

"The proceedings under Sections 821 and 822 shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code [Administrative Procedure Act], and the licensing agency and the licentiate shall have all the rights and powers granted therein."

J. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in relevant part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct any licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act, to pay the Board a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR MEDI-CAL CLAIMS

4. Section 14124.12 of the Welfare and Institutions Code provides:

"(a) Upon receipt of written notice from the Medical Board of California, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, or the Board of Dental Examiners of California, that a licensee's license has been placed on probation as a result of a disciplinary action, the department may not reimburse any Medi-Cal claim for the type of surgical service or invasive procedure that gave rise to the probation, including any dental surgery or invasive procedure, that was performed by the licensee on or after the effective date of probation and until the termination of all probationary terms and conditions or until the probationary period has ended, whichever occurs This section shall apply except in any case in which the relevant licensing board determines that compelling circumstances warrant the continued reimbursement during the probationary period of any Medi-Cal claim, including any claim for dental services, as so described. In such a case, the department shall continue to reimburse the licensee for all procedures, except for those invasive or surgical procedures for which the licensee was placed on probation.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

27

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Criminal Conviction --

Driving With Greater Than .08 Percent Blood Alcohol Level)

- 5. Respondent Leandro G. Gatus, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under sections 490, generally, and 2236, specifically, of the Business and Professions Code in that respondent has sustained a conviction for driving a motor vehicle while having blood alcohol content of .08 percent or greater, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (B), a misdemeanor and a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a respondent's licensure. The facts and circumstances underlying respondent's conviction are as follows:
 - A. On or about January 3, 1994, in the matter entitled The People of the State of California v. Leandro Gulapa Gatus, Misdemeanor Complaint No. 93D05510, Los Angeles County Municipal Court, Van Nuys Judicial District, respondent was charged, in Count 1, with driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, a misdemeanor and violation of Vehicle Code section 22152, subdivision (a), and in Count 2, with driving with greater than .08 percent blood alcohol. Respondent had been stopped for suspicion of drunk driving on December 10, 1993, and arrested for each of the charged offenses when he thereafter failed to pass the field sobriety test or was found to have a blood alcohol level greater than .08 percent. Respondent entered not guilty pleas to both charges.
 - B. On or about February 10, 1994, pursuant to a

1.3

negotiated plea agreement, respondent changed his previously entered not guilty plea to the charge set forth in Count 2 of the complaint--namely, driving with a blood alcohol level greater than .08 percent--to nolo contendere. Proceedings were suspended. Respondent was placed on summary probation for 36 months with certain terms and conditions including, among others, that respondent complete an alcohol and drug education program and pay a \$390 fine. Thereafter, the driving under the influence charge in Count 1 was dismissed in the furtherance of justice.

- C. On or about April 11, 1994, respondent failed to appear before the court or, in the alternative, to file with the court proof of having completed the alcohol and drug education program. A bench warrant for respondent in the amount of \$15,000 was issued by the Court.
- D. On or about May 17, 1994, respondent appeared with proof of having completed the alcohol and drug education program. Proceedings were terminated and the bench warrant was recalled.
- E. Respondent's December 1993 arrest was not his first.
 - (1) On or about November 4, 1987, respondent was found to be in possession of a stolen .357 Magnum revolver during a police investigation of his wife's report of domestic violence.
 - (2) On that date, respondent and his

14 15

12

13

16 17

18 19

20

21

23

24

25 26

27

wife engaged in a heated dispute that escalated into a physical altercation when respondent struck his wife across her right cheek.

- (3) The police were called. Upon their arrival, they observed that respondent's wife right cheek reddened and swollen.
- (4) Upon asking respondent's wife whether respondent had any weapons the residence, respondent's wife stated that respondent kept a .357 revolver in a kitchen drawer and a .22 caliber rifle in the master bedroom. The police retrieved the .357 revolver from the kitchen and proceeded upstairs where they found respondent in the master bedroom.
- (5) Respondent was arrested for inflicting corporal injury on a spouse, a violation of Penal Code section 273.5. The police seized the .22 caliber rifle which was located in the bedroom as indicated by respondent's wife.
- (6) The police checked the serial number on the .357 Magnum revolver and found that it was stolen. Before learning the handgun was stolen, the police were told by respondent that he had purchased the handgun six months earlier. Respondent, however, refused to divulge the identity of the seller.
 - (7) The police booked respondent for

receiving stolen property, a violation of Penal.

Code section 496.1.

- (8) On or about November 11, 1987, in the matter entitled The People of the State of California v. Leandro Gulapa Gatus, Misdemeanor Complaint No. 87F10705, Los Angeles County Municipal Court, San Fernando Judicial District, respondent was charged with inflicting corporal injury on a spouse, in violation of Penal Code section 273.5, subdivision (a), and battery, in violation of Penal Code section 242.
- (9) On or about August 29, 1988, the case was dismissed, respondent having successfully completed a diversion program to which he was admitted on or about February 29, 1988, upon his motion.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Criminal Conviction -- Possession of Dangerous Weapon)

6. Respondent Leandro G. Gatus, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under sections 490, generally, and 2236, specifically, of the Business and Professions Code in that respondent has sustained a conviction for possession of a dangerous weapon, in violation of Penal Code section 12020, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor and a crime which, under the facts and circumstances of its commission, is substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of respondent's licensure. The facts and circumstances underlying respondent's conviction are as follows:

- A. On or about September 22, 1996, at approximately, 2:45 a.m., respondent was stopped for suspected drunk driving. Prior to being stopped, respondent was observed straddling the traffic lane dividing lines and driving 55 miles per hour in a 35 miles per hour speed zone.
- B. After detecting the strong odor of alcohol on respondent and administering the standard field sobriety test which respondent failed, the police placed respondent under arrest for driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, a violation of Vehicle Code section 22152. subdivision (a), and transported him to the police station. During booking, the police found a knife in respondent's front pants pocket. Respondent was charged with possession of a dangerous weapon, a violation of Penal Code section 12020, subdivision (a).
- C. On or about September 30, 1996, in the matter entitled The People of the State of California v. Leandro G. Gatus, Misdemeanor Complaint No. 6PN06997, Los Angeles County Municipal Court, Van Nuys Judicial District, respondent was charged, in Count 1, with possession of a dangerous weapon, a violation of Penal Code section 12020, subdivision (a).
- D. At his arraignment on October 17, 1996, respondent entered a not guilty plea.
- E. On or about November 20, 1996, pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement, respondent changed his previously entered not guilty plea to the charge to nolo contendere. Proceedings were suspended. Respondent was placed on summary probation for 12 months on the term and condition, among

others, that he pay a fine in the amount of \$300.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Use of Alcoholic Beverages)

7. Respondent Leandro G. Gatus, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under section 2239 of the Business and Professions Code in that respondent has used alcoholic beverages or any of the dangerous drugs specified in section 4211 of the Business and Professions Code to the extent or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to himself or to the public; and, that respondent has sustained more than one misdemeanor conviction involving the use or consumption of alcoholic beverages or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in section 2239, as follows:

A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein paragraphs 5, subparagraphs A through E, inclusive, and 6, subparagraphs A through E, inclusive, above as though fully set forth.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

8. Respondent Leandro G. Gatus, M.D., is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, generally, of the Business and Professions Code in that respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct by reason of his 1994 and 1996 criminal convictions for offenses which under the facts and circumstances of their commission are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a physician and surgeon; by using alcoholic beverages or any of the dangerous drugs specified in

section 4211 of the Business and Professions Code to the extent or in such a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to himself or to the public; or, by sustaining more than one misdemeanor conviction involving the use or consumption of alcoholic beverages or any of the dangerous drugs specified in section 4211 of the Business and Professions Code, as follows:

A. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein paragraphs 5, subparagraphs A through E, inclusive, and 6, subparagraphs A through E, inclusive, above as though fully set forth.

1//

12 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13 | ///

14 | ///

15 | ///

16 ///

17 | ///

- | ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

. 1

23 ///

24 ///

25 | ///

26 ///

27 | ///

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Division issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending Physician and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 45231, heretofore issued to respondent LEANDRO G. GATUS, M.D.;
- Revoking, suspending or denying approval of the 2. respondent's authority to supervise physician's assistants, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 3527;
- Ordering respondent to pay the Division the actual and reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case as well as the costs of probation monitoring, if applicable; and,
- Taking such other and further action as the Division deems necessary and proper.

Executive Director

State of California

Medical Board of California

Department of Consumer Affairs

DATED: December 1, 1999

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

03573160-LA99AD0000

Complainant