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

| In the Matter of the Accusation<br>and Petition to Revoke Probation<br>and First Supplemental Accusation<br>and Petition to Revoke against: | ) ) No. D-4687 |
|---|----------------|
| RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D.   | )              |
| Certificate No. C 28370   | )              |
| Respondent.   | _)             |

#### **DECISION**

The foregoing Stipulation and Order, in case number D-4687, is hereby adopted by the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California as its decision in the above-entitled matter.

| This | Decis  | sion  | shall | become  | effe | ctive | on . | January | 10, | 1993 |  |
|------|--------|-------|-------|---------|------|-------|------|---------|-----|------|--|
| IT I | s so c | ORDER | ED D  | ecember | 10,  | 1992  |      | •       |     |      |  |

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Bv:

THERESA L. CLAASSEN

Secretary

| 1      | DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California SUSAN K. MEADOWS  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
|        | Deputy Attorney General  |  |  |  |  |
| 3<br>4 | 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 6200<br>San Francisco, California 94102-3658<br>Telephone: (415) 703-2509                      |  |  |  |  |
| 5      | Attorneys for Complainant  |  |  |  |  |
| 6      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7      | BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY   |  |  |  |  |
| 8      | MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA STATE OF CALIFORNIA  |  |  |  |  |
| 9      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10     | In the Matter of the Accusation ) No. D-4687 and Petition to Revoke Probation )  |  |  |  |  |
| 11     | and Ferrition to Revoke Probation ) and First Supplemental Accusation ) <u>STIPULATION</u> and Petition to Revoke against: ) |  |  |  |  |
| 12     | j j  |  |  |  |  |
| 13     | RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D. )  2232 Carleton Street )  |  |  |  |  |
| 14     | Berkeley, CA 94704 ) Physician's and Surgeon's ) Certificate No. C28370, )   |  |  |  |  |
| 15     | j j  |  |  |  |  |
| 16     | Respondent. )  |  |  |  |  |
| 17     | )  |  |  |  |  |
| 18     | IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Ronald A.   |  |  |  |  |
| 19     | Bortman, M.D., the respondent in this matter, with the advice of   |  |  |  |  |
| 20     | his attorney, Kenneth Freeman, attorney at law, and Kenneth J.   |  |  |  |  |
| 21     | Wagstaff, as Executive Officer of the Medical Board of   |  |  |  |  |
| 22     | California, Department of Consumer Affairs, by and through his   |  |  |  |  |
| 23     | attorney, Susan K. Meadows, Deputy Attorney General, that the  |  |  |  |  |
| 24     | following matters are true:  |  |  |  |  |
| 25     | 1. Amended Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation   |  |  |  |  |
| 26     | (hereinafter "Amended Accusation" ) No. D-4687 and First   |  |  |  |  |
| 27     | Supplemental Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation   |  |  |  |  |

(hereinafter "First Supplemental Accusation) No. D-4687 are presently pending against Ronald A. Bortman, M.D., (hereinafter referred to as the "respondent"), physician's and surgeon's certificate number C-28370, before the Medical Board of California (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

The second second

- 2. The complainant in said Amended Accusation and First Supplemental Accusation, Kenneth J. Wagstaff, is the Executive Director of the Board and brought said Amended Accusation and First Supplemental Accusation in his official capacity only.
- 3. Respondent has fully discussed with his attorney, Kenneth Freeman, the charges contained in the above-mentioned Amended Accusation and First Supplemental Accusation, and in that regard, respondent has been fully advised regarding his rights in this matter.
- 4. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily waives his right to a hearing on the charges and allegations contained in the above-mentioned Amended Accusation and First Supplemental Accusation in order to enter into this Stipulation and that he further agrees to waive his right to reconsideration, judicial review, and any and all rights which may be accorded him by the Administrative Procedure Act and other laws of the State of California, except his right to petition for termination or modification of probation pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2307.
- 5. All admissions of fact and conclusions of law contained in this Stipulation are made exclusively for this

proceeding and any future proceedings between the Board and the respondent and shall not be deemed to be admissions for any purpose in any other action, forum or proceeding.

- 6. Respondent's license history and status as set forth at paragraph 2 of the Amended Accusation are true and correct and that the respondent's address of record is as set forth in the caption of this Stipulation. (Copies of Amended Accusation Number D-4687 and the First Supplemental Accusation Number D-4687 are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively).
- 7. For purposes of the settlement of the action pending against respondent in case No. D-4687 and to avoid a lengthy administrative hearing, respondent admits that there exist factual and legal bases for the imposition of discipline against his physician's and surgeon's certificate number C28370 pursuant to some of the allegations of the Amended Accusation Number D-4687 and the First Supplemental Accusation Number D-4687.
- 8. With respect to the Amended Accusation, respondent, for the purpose of this stipulation, admits to the following only.
- (a) Concerning the care and treatment provided to patient S.H. identified in the First Cause for Disciplinary Action in the Amended Accusation, No. D-4687, respondent admits that soon after the termination of therapy with S.H., he entered into a social relationship with her, and, subsequently, they dated for nearly two years, fell in love, and married.

Respondent admits that initiating a social relationship with S.H. was an error in judgment, and that it constitutes unprofessional conduct and cause for disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code $\frac{1}{2}$  section 2234(b).

In mitigation of the above, at the time that he entered into a social relationship with S.H., respondent was under great personal stress and was vulnerable, which affected his judgment at that time. Respondent did not enter into that relationship to exploit S.H., believing that he loved her and marrying her because of those feelings.

(b) With respect to the allegations contained in the Second Cause of Action of the Amended Accusation, respondent admits that after he terminated therapy with S.H. and after she injured her back, he provided her with samples of Xanax; and after they were married, and after she had injured her back, with prescriptions for Tylenol/Codeine #3 written in the name of her father, mother, and sister; and admits that he failed to maintain records as required by sections 4051 and 4232. Respondent admits that this conduct constitutes a violation of statutes or regulations regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances, in violation of section 2238, and therefore, constitutes unprofessional conduct and cause for disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234; and cause for discipline under section 2234(b).

In mitigation of the above, the drugs respondent prescribed/supplied to S.H. were provided after she had injured

<sup>1.</sup> All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise specified.

her back, and were provided to S.H. only for severe back pain caused by the injury she had suffered. This condition was being treated by another physician, but S.H. told respondent that she was not being given medication as part of that treatment, and respondent was responding to what in good faith he believed were the needs of his wife.

(c) With respect to the allegations contained in the Third Cause of Action of the Amended Accusation, respondent admits that neither M.H., H.H., nor L.G. were his patients when he wrote the Tylenol/Codeine #3 prescriptions in their names and admits that he did not keep any medical charts or other records for these individuals.

Respondent admits that this conduct constitutes a violation of statutes or regulations regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances, in violation of section 2238, and therefore constitutes unprofessional conduct and cause for disciplinary action pursuant to sections 2234 and 2234(e).

- (d) Respondent further admits that as a result of the above admissions, his conduct constitutes a violation of condition 3 of his probation in Case No. D-3219.
- 9. With respect to the First Supplemental Accusation filed against respondent, respondent, for the purpose of this stipulation admits to the following only.
- (a) Concerning the allegations contained in the First Supplemental Accusation, respondent admits that on or about June 24, 1989 he discharged patient C.H. from Herrick Hospital and at the time of discharge prescribed one hundred fifteen 50 mg.

tablets of Norpramine (desipramine hydrochloride), which she ingested to commit suicide. At the time of discharge it was respondent's opinion that C.H. was not a suicide risk.

Respondent admits that he should not have prescribed that much medication to C.H., and he admits that this conduct constitutes unprofessional conduct under section 2234(b) and section 725. Respondent admits that this conduct constitutes a violation of condition 3 of his probation in case no. D-3219.

10. BASED UPON THE FOREGOING RECITALS, IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that the Medical Board of California, upon its adoption of the Stipulation herein set forth, may, without further notice, prepare a decision and enter the following order:

Physician and Surgeon Certificate No. C-28370, heretofore issued to RONALD A. BORTMAN, respondent,

by the Medical Board of California, is hereby revoked;

PROVIDED HOWEVER, that execution of this order of revocation
is stayed, and respondent is placed on probation for a

period of ten (10) years, upon the following terms and
conditions:

#### (A) ACTUAL SUSPENSION

As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for a period of one year beginning on the effective date of this decision.

#### (B) PSYCHIATRIC EVALUATION

Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the Division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric

evaluation (and psychological testing, if deemed necessary), by a Division-appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the Division or its designee, with a copy to respondent.

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if respondent is mentally fit to practice safely, and to determine if respondent is in need of psychiatric treatment.

If, after the psychiatric evaluation, respondent is required by the Division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within 30 days of the requirement notice submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the Division. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the Division. With the exception of the psychiatric evaluation, the cost of any treatment or therapy shall be paid by respondent.

Respondent shall not engage in the practice of medicine until notified by the Division of the determination that respondent is mentally fit to practice safely, based on the evaluation required by this condition.

#### (C) ORAL CLINICAL EXAMINATION

Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall take and pass an oral clinical exam in the field of psychiatry, including those areas of psychiatry that pertain to the prescribing of psychopharmacological drugs and general

medicine relating to the practice of psychiatry. If respondent fails this examination, respondent must take and pass a reexamination consisting of a written as well as an oral examination. The waiting period between repeat examinations shall be at three month intervals until success is achieved. The Division shall pay the cost of the first examination and respondent shall pay the cost of any subsequent re-examinations.

Respondent shall not practice medicine until respondent has passed the required examination and has been so notified by the Division in writing. Failure to pass the required examination no later than 100 days prior to the termination date of probation shall constitute a violation of probation.

#### (D) EDUCATION COURSES

Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an education program or a course in psychopharmacology and an education program or a course in the area of the treatment of drug and alcohol addictions. Respondent shall take and successfully complete the above courses within one year from the effective date of this decision.

In addition to the above education requirements, within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an educational program(s) or course(s) which shall not be less than 20 hours per year, for each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the

completion of each course, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 45 hours of continuing medical education of which 20 hours were in satisfaction of this condition and were approved in advance by the Division.

#### (E) ETHICS

Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a course in Ethics which respondent shall successfully complete during the first year of probation.

#### (F) DRUGS AND ABSTAIN FROM USE

Respondent shall abstain completely from the personal use or possession of controlled substances as defined in the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act, and dangerous drugs as defined by section 4211 of the Business and Professions Code, or any drugs requiring a prescription.

#### (G) DRUGS-EXCEPTION FOR PERSONAL ILLNESS

Paragraph 10 (F) above, forbidding respondent from personal use or possession controlled substances or dangerous drugs, does not apply to medications lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.

#### (H) BIOLOGICAL FLUID TESTING

Respondent shall immediately, and upon any future request, submit to biological fluid testing, at respondent's cost, upon the request of the Division or its designee. If,

after a biological fluid test, it is determined that respondent is using the drugs identified in paragraph 10 (F) above and that paragraph 10 (G) is inapplicable, respondent will be deemed to be in violation of his probation.

#### (I) LIMITATION ON PRACTICE

Respondent's practice shall be restricted to the practice of psychiatry. However, should respondent decide to pursue another field of practice in medicine and take and complete an approved residency or training program in that field, respondent shall be required to take and pass an oral clinical examination in that field, to be administered by the Division or its designee. Respondent shall not practice in any other field of medicine except psychiatry until respondent has passed an oral clinical examination in any such other field and has been so notified by the Division in writing.

#### (J) Monitoring

Prior to resuming practice under this probation, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a plan of practice in which respondent's practice shall be monitored by another physician in respondent's field of practice, who shall provide quarterly reports to the Division.

The monitor must meet, in person, with respondent and review his practice a minimum of twice per month and the monitor must be made specifically aware of the allegations contained in Case No. D-4687 and also the terms and conditions of this Stipulation.

If the monitor resigns or is no longer available,

respondent shall, within 15 days, move to have a new monitor appointed, through nomination by respondent and approval by the Division.

The monitor and all costs associated with the monitor's duties, functions and responsibilities shall be paid by respondent. Respondent is specifically prohibited from entering into any bartering arrangement with the monitor, (i.e., using the referral of patients to the monitor to offset the expenses incurred in satisfying this term of probation, etc.) which would or could compromise the integrity of the monitor to render fair and unbiased reports to the Division.

#### (K) CONTROLLED DRUGS--PARTIAL RESTRICTION

Respondent shall not prescribe administer, dispense, order, or possess any controlled substances as defined by the California Uniform controlled Substances Act, except for those drugs listed in Schedules IV and V of the Act. Respondent shall immediately surrender respondent's current DEA permit to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation and reapply for a new DEA permit limited to those Schedules authorized by this order. Respondent shall not order, maintain or keep an office supply of any controlled substance. Respondent's ability to prescribe any Schedule IV or V drug is subject to paragraph 10 (L) below.

### (L) SCHEDULE IV OR SCHEDULE V CONTROLLED DRUGS-MAINTAIN A RECORD

Respondent shall maintain a record of all Schedule IV and Schedule V controlled substances prescribed by respondent during probation, showing all the following: 1) the name and

address of the patient, 2) the date, 3) the character and quantity of controlled substances involved, and 4) the indications and diagnosis for which the controlled substance was furnished.

Respondent shall keep these records in a separate file or ledger, in chronological order, and shall make them available for inspection and copying by the Division or its designee, upon request.

#### GENERAL TERMS OF PROBATION

#### (M) OBEY ALL LAWS

2.2

Respondent shall obey all laws of the United States, State of California, and its political subdivisions, and all rules and regulations and laws pertaining to the practice of medicine.

#### (N) QUARTERLY REPORTS

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.

#### (O) SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM

Respondent shall comply with the Board's probation surveillance program.

#### (P) INTERVIEW WITH MEDICAL CONSULTANT

Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Board or its designee upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

(Q) TOLLING FOR OUT-OF-STATE PRACTICE OR RESIDENCE
In the event respondent should leave California to

reside or to practice outside the State, respondent must notify the Board in writing of the dates of departure and return.

Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

#### (R) COMPLETION OF PROBATION

Upon full compliance with all the terms and conditions hereof, and the expiration of ten (10) years from the effective date of this decision, this stay shall become permanent, and respondent's physician's and surgeon's license shall be fully restored.

#### (S) VIOLATION OF PROBATION

If respondent violates 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.

11. IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that the terms set forth herein shall be null and void, and in no way binding

23 | //

24 | //

25 1//

26 | //

27 | //

| 1      | upon the parties hereto, unless and until accepted by the Medical   |
|--------|---|
| 2      | Board of California of the State of California.   |
| 3      |   |
| 4<br>5 | DATED: OCOURT 13,1992  DANIEL E. LUNGREN Attorney General of the State of California  |
|        | State of California   |
| 6      | Su mot Meadows  |
| 7      | SUSAN K. MEADOWS  |
| 8      | Deputy Attorney General   |
| 9      | Attorneys for Complainant   |
| 10     |   |
| 11     | DATED: October 9,1992   |
| 12     | KÉNNETH L. FREEMAN, Esq.<br>Attorney for Respondent   |
| 13     |   |
| 14     |   |
| 15     |   |
| 16     | I hereby certify that I have read this Stipulation in   |
| 17     | its entirety, that I discussed the same with my attorney of   |
| 18     | record, that I fully understand all of same, and in witness   |
| 19     | thereof, I affix my signature this day of <u>October</u> ,  |
| 20     | 1992 at San Huncary, California.  |
| 21     | March |
| 22     | RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D.   |
| 23     | Respondent  |
| 24     |   |
| 25     |   |
|        | 03573160  |
| 26     | SF91AD1397<br>10/1/92   |
| 27     |   |

| 1  | DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General                               |                                  |  |  |
|----|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2  | of the State of California SUSAN K. MEADOWS                       |                                  |  |  |
| 3  | Deputy Attorney General<br>455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 6200     |                                  |  |  |
| 4  | San Francisco, California 94102-3658<br>Telephone: (415) 703-2509 |                                  |  |  |
| 5  | Attorneys for Complainant   |                                  |  |  |
| 6  |   |                                  |  |  |
| 7  | BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL BOARD OF C.                        |                                  |  |  |
| 8  | STATE OF CALIF  |                                  |  |  |
| 9  |   |                                  |  |  |
| 10 | In the Matter of the Accusation )                                 | No.: D-4687                      |  |  |
| 11 | and Petition to Revoke Probation ) Against:                       |                                  |  |  |
| 12 | RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D.   | AMENDED ACCUSATION               |  |  |
| 13 | Berkeley, CA 94704  | AND PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION |  |  |
| 14 | Physician's and Surgeon's ) Certificate No. C28370, )             |                                  |  |  |
| 15 | Respondent. )   |                                  |  |  |
| 16 | )   |                                  |  |  |
| 17 | Complainant Kenneth J. Wags                                       | taff, as causes for              |  |  |
| 18 | disciplinary action and revocation of probation against the above |                                  |  |  |
| 19 | named respondent, Ronald A. Bortman, M.D., (hereinafter referred  |                                  |  |  |
| 20 | to as "respondent") charges and allege                            | es as follows:                   |  |  |
| 21 | 1. He is the Executive Dire                                       | ector of the Medical Board       |  |  |
| 22 | of California (hereinafter the "Board                             | ") and makes and files these     |  |  |
| 23 | charges and allegations solely in his official capacity and not   |                                  |  |  |
| 24 |   |                                  |  |  |
| 25 | 2. On or about August 17,   | 1966, the board issued to        |  |  |
| 26 | respondent physician's and surgeon's certificate number C-28370.  |                                  |  |  |
| 27 | Said certificate has been previously disciplined and respondent   |                                  |  |  |

is currently on probation to the Board as is more clearly set forth hereinafter.

before the Board, by way of adopted stipulated decision, respondent's certificate was revoked with revocation stayed and respondent was placed on probation, under various terms and conditions, including obeying all laws and filing timely quarterly reports, for a period of seven (7) years. Attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length is a true and correct copy of the board's decision in said case number D-3219.

#### **STATUTES**

- 4. Section 2018 of the Business and Professions Code delauthorizes the Division of Medical Quality to adopt regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry into effect the provisions of law relating to the practice of medicine.
- 5. Section 2220 provides that the Division of Medical Quality of the Board may take action against all persons guilty of violating the provisions of the Medical Practice Act (sections 2000 et seq.)
- 6. Section 2234 provides, in pertinent part, that the Division of Medical Quality 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: ...

<sup>1.</sup> All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

- 1 (a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or
  2 indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation
  3 of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this
  4 chapter.
  - (b) Gross negligence.
  - (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.
- 7. Section 725 provides, in pertinent part, that repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs or treatment as determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon.
- 8. Section 2238 provides that a 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.
- 9. Section 2242 (a) provides that prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing of dangerous drugs as defined in section 4211 without a good faith prior examination and medical indication therefor, constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- 10. Section 4051 provides, in pertinent part, that a prescriber may furnish a limited quantity of drug samples to the patient in the package provided by the manufacturer, if no charge is made to the patient therefor, and an appropriate record is

entered in the patient's chart.

- 11. Section 4232 provides that any physician who fails, neglects, or refuses to maintain records of the disposition of dangerous drugs when called upon by an authorized officer of the board, and who fails to produce those records within a reasonable amount of time, is guilty of a misdemeanor.
- 12. Section 11157 of the Health and Safety Code provides that no person shall issue a prescription that is false or fictitious in any respect.
- 13. Section 11154 of the Health and Safety Code provides in relevant part that except in the practice of his or her profession, no person shall knowingly prescribe, administer, dispense, or furnish a controlled substance to or for any person which is not under his or her treatment for a pathology or condition other than addiction to a controlled substance, except as provided in this division.
- 14. Section 11174 of the Health and Safety Code provides that no person shall in connection with the prescribing, furnishing, administering, or dispensing of a controlled substance, give a false name or false address.
- 15. Section 11153 of the Health and Safety Code provides that 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 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 methadone maintenance program for the purpose of providing the user with controlled substances, sufficient to keep him or her comfortable by maintaining customary use.

#### DRUGS

- 16. The following controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs are involved in this proceeding.
- A. Tylenol with Codeine, a trade name for a combination of acetaminophen and codeine, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 and a schedule III controlled substance and narcotic as defined by section 11056, subdivision (e) (2), of the Health and Safety Code and a Schedule III controlled substance as defined by section 1308.13 (e) (2) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- B. Xanax, a trade name for alprazolam, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 and a schedule IV controlled substance as defined by section 1308.14 (c) (1) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- C. Halcion, a trade name for triazolam, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 of the code and a schedule IV controlled substance as defined by section 1308.14 (c) (1) of

Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

- D. Trazadone, a trade name for desyrel, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211.
- E. Vicodin, a trade name for 5 mg hydrocodone bitartrate and 500 mg acetaminophen, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 and a schedule III controlled substance as defined in section 11056 (e) (4) of the Health and Safety Code.
- F. Hycodan, a trade name for hydrocodone bitartrate and homatropine methylbromide, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 and a schedule III controlled substance as defined in section 11056 (e) (4) of the Health and Safety Code.
- G. Naldecon is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 of the Code.
- H. Phenegran Expectorant with Codeine, also known as promethazine hydrochloride and codeine phosphate syrup, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 and a schedule V controlled substance as defined in section 11056 (e) (4) of the Health and Safety Code.
- I. Promethazine with codeine is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211 of the Code and a schedule V controlled substance as defined in section 11056 (e) (4) of the Health and Safety Code.
- J. Paraflex, a trade name for chlorzoxazone tablets, is a dangerous drug as defined by section 4211.
- K. Prednisone is a dangerous drug as defined by section 4211.

Section 726 of the code provides, in pertinent, 1 part, that the commission of any act of sexual abuse, misconduct, or relations with a patient which is substantially related to the 3 qualifications, functions or duties of the occupation for which a 4 license was issued constitutes unprofessional conduct and grounds 5 for disciplinary action. 6 7 CODE OF ETHICS 8 The Principles of Medical Ethics With Annotations 9 Especially Applicable To Psychiatry, published by the American 10 Psychiatric Association, state as follows: 11 "While psychiatrists have the same goals as all physicians, there are special ethical problems in 12 psychiatric practice that differ in color and degree from ethical problems in other branches in medical 13 practice, even though the basic principles are the same." (FOREWORD, Paragraph 2). 14 15 Section 1, paragraph 1, states as follows: "SECTION 1 16 17 "A physician shall be dedicated to providing competent medical service with compassion and 18 respect for human dignity. 19 The patient may place his/her trust in his/her psychiatrist knowing that the psychiatrist's 20 ethics and professional responsibilities preclude him/her gratifying his/her own needs by exploiting the 21 This becomes particularly important because of the essentially private, highly personal, and 22 sometimes intensely emotional nature of the relationship established with the psychiatrist." 23 24 Section 2, paragraphs 1 and 2, state, in pertinent 25 part, as follows: 26 "SECTION 2

"A physician shall deal honestly with patients and colleagues, and strive to expose those

physicians deficient in character or competence, or who engage in fraud or deception.

- "1. The requirement that the physician conduct himself with propriety in his/her profession and in all the actions of his/her life is especially important in the case of the psychiatrist because the patient tends to model his/her behavior after that of his/her therapist by identification. Further, the necessary intensity of the therapeutic relationship may tend to activate sexual and other needs and fantasies on the part of both patient and therapist, while weakening the objectivity necessary for control. Sexual activity with a patient is unethical.
- "2. The psychiatrist should diligently guard against exploiting information furnished by the patient and should not use the unique position of power afforded him/her by the psychotherapeutic situation to influence the patient in any way not directly relevant to the treatment goals."

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 19. In or about April of 1983 S.H.<sup>2</sup>/ was referred to respondent by her family practitioner for insomnia and depression following the break-up of her marriage approximately two months earlier. S.H. saw respondent approximately four months (from April of 1983 through the end of August of 1983). Her visits consisted of at least twice weekly one hour psychiatric sessions.
- 20. While treating S.H., respondent prescribed Trazadone, an anti-depressant, at a dosage of 200 mg daily for relief of S.H.'s "vegetative depressive symptoms."
- 21. On or about August 31, 1983, respondent advised S.H. that she no longer needed therapy and announced that he could no longer be her therapist because he was falling in love with her. During that same session, respondent encouraged a

<sup>2.</sup> Initials are used to describe patients in this pleading. Full names will be disclosed pursuant to a request for discovery.

social relationship with S.H. and asked if they could meet. That same evening, respondent and S.H. met at a McDonald's restaurant in Berkeley, California. Respondent drove S.H. to his apartment that evening and attempted to have sexual intercourse with S.H.; however, she protested and he eventually drove her home.

- 22. After that evening of August 31, 1983, respondent sent S.H. flowers and a personal card. Two or three weeks after her last session, respondent and S.H. became sexually intimate. It was at this time that respondent began providing S.H. with samples of Xanax. The first time that respondent gave Xanax to S.H. was immediately prior to sexual intercourse; respondent advised S.H. that Xanax would help her to relax. In June of 1985, respondent and S.H. were married.
- 23. During the course of their relationship before marriage, and during the marriage, respondent provided S.H. with multiple prescriptions for Tylenol/Codeine #3 using the names of her parents and her sister in order to obtain this drug for S.H. Respondent also supplied S.H. with multiple drug samples of Xanax, and Halcion.
- 24. In March of 1985, S.H. injured her back. Although S.H. was already under the treatment of another physician, respondent increased the Xanax prescriptions for her and also gave her Vicodin and Tylenol/Codeine #3 to help ease her pain.
- 25. From August of 1983 through November of 1987, S.H. became physically and psychologically addicted to Xanax, Tylenol/Codeine #3 and various other drugs that were supplied to her by respondent.

26. On or about October of 1987, respondent left S.H. after impregnating another woman. S.H. and respondent were divorced in 1988.

27. At the end of 1987, S.H. was hospitalized for depression and suicidal ideation. S.H. was and continues to be emotionally and psychologically traumatized by respondent's conduct towards her.

#### FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

- 28. The allegations of paragraphs 19 through 27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 29. Although respondent advised S.H. that she no longer needed treatment, he continued to prescribe and/or supply her with Xanax, Tylenol with Codeine and other dangerous drugs and controlled substances after August of 1983, thereby continuing the patient/physician relationship with S.H.
- 30. Respondent's conduct, as set forth above constitutes unprofessional conduct under the Principles of Medical Ethics with Annotations Especially applicable to Psychiatry, section 1, paragraph 1 and section 2, paragraphs 1 and 2 and pursuant to sections 726 (sexual misconduct), 2234(b) (gross negligence), and/or (d) (incompetence) by reason of the following acts or omissions:
- A. Respondent failed to recognize his own wishes for personal involvement with S.H. as potentially endangering the patient's welfare and he allowed his own feelings to influence or interfere with the treatment of S.H.
  - B. Respondent failed to seek professional consultation

- C. Respondent failed to clearly and ethically terminate the physician-patient relationship and to refer S.H. to the care of another physician in a way that did not compromise the S.H.'s already fragile condition. Respondent, ostensibly, terminated therapy with S.H. and immediately began to pursue a social and sexual relationship with her.
- D. Respondent failed to allow any time to pass after he allegedly terminated treatment with S.H. before commencing a social and sexual relationship with S.H.
- 31. Therefore, cause exists for disciplinary action pursuant to sections 726 and 2234.

#### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

- 32. The allegations of paragraphs 19 through 27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 33. The following indicates the prescriptions that respondent wrote for S.H. after allegedly terminating therapy on or about August 31, 1983:

| 20 | DATE     | DRUG            | AMOUNT | STRENGTH |
|----|----------|-----------------|--------|----------|
| 21 | 6/1/83   | Trazadone       | 60     | 50       |
| 22 | 8/9/83   | Trazadone       | 50     | 100      |
| 23 | 5/17/84  | Naldecon        | 50     |          |
| 24 | 7/13/84  | Prednisone      | 30     | 5 mg     |
| 25 | 11/27/84 | Hycodan         | 6 oz   |          |
| 26 | 12/10/84 | Hycodan         | 6 oz   |          |
| 27 | 10/25/83 | Tuberculin Test | n/a    | n/a      |

| 1  | 8/23/85 | Xanax (1 refill)         | 50   | 1 mg   |
|----|---------|--------------------------|------|--------|
| 2  | 2/25/86 | Naprosyn (3 refills)     | 50   | 250 mg |
| 3  | 4/20/86 | Naprosyn                 | 50   | 250 mg |
| 4  | 5/29/86 | Naprosyn (11 refills)    | 100  | 500 mg |
| 5  | 6/13/86 | Naprosyn (1 refill)      | 60   | 500 mg |
| 6  | 6/24/86 | Cortisporin Otic Susp.   | -    |        |
| 7  | 7/21/86 | Naprosyn                 | 50   | 250 mg |
| 8  | 8/20/86 | Paraflex                 | 100  | 250 mg |
| 9  | 9/29/86 | Promethazine w/codeine   | 8 oz |        |
| 10 | 2/19/87 | Lomotil                  | 24   |        |
| 11 | 2/19/87 | Tigan Suppositories      | 6    |        |
| 12 | 2/19/87 | same as above            | 5    |        |
| 13 | 6/29/87 | Hycodan                  | 8 oz |        |
| 14 | 9/29/87 | Phenegran Exp. w/codeine | 6 oz |        |

- 34. Respondent also, on numerous occasions after
  August 31, 1983 provided S.H. with physician's samples of Xanax
  as well as Halcion. He also provided S.H. with Tylenol/Codeine
  #3 obtained through false prescriptions to S.H.'s parents and
  sister. As a result, S.H. became drug dependent.
- 35. Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 2242(a) (prescribing without a good faith prior examination and medical indication), section 4232 (failure to maintain records of the disposition of dangerous drugs), section 4051 (failure to maintain record of drug samples given to patient), 725 (clearly excessive administration of drugs or treatment), and 2238 (violation of statutes or regulations regulating dangerous drugs

- A. Respondent failed to prepare and maintain adequate medical/treatment records on S.H. relating to the drugs that he supplied and or prescribed for her.
- B. Respondent prescribed and/or supplied Xanax and Tylenol with Codeine and other dangerous drugs and/or controlled substances to S.H. in excessive amounts far beyond the period of time said drug(s) should have been administered, if at all.
- C. Respondent prescribed and/or supplied S.H. with Xanax, Tylenol with Codeine and other dangerous drugs and/or controlled substances over an inordinate amount of time without a legitimately recognized medical indication and/or medical purpose.
- D. Respondent failed to recognize and/or to act appropriately upon the adverse reactions suffered by S.H. due to said drugs that respondent supplied and/or prescribed in that respondent continued to supply these drugs to S.H. after S.H. became physically and psychologically addicted to said drugs.
- E. Respondent prescribed and/or furnished drugs and treatment to a member of his family on a long term basis without consultation or other objective assessment, including medical records. In fact, respondent knew that such treatment constituted unprofessional conduct in that he obtained controlled substances for his patient/fiancee/wife through subterfuge, especially after the marriage.

36. Therefore, cause exists for disciplinary action pursuant to sections 2234, 2234(b) and/or (d), 2234 through section 2238, sections 4051 and 4232 through sections 2234 and 2238 and section 2234 through section 2242(a).

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

- 37. The allegations of paragraphs 19 through 27 and paragraph 34 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 38. Between 1983 and 1987, S.H.'s parents, H.H. and M.H. received prescription medication from respondent on two occasions. On or about 1987 respondent's mother, H.H., had a back spasm. Respondent brought H.H. some Tylenol with Codeine to relieve her pain. After taking one or two of the pills, H.H. became extremely nauseated and because of that negative reaction, did not take any more of the Tylenol with Codeine pills.
- 39. The second and last occasion that H.H. and M.H. received medication from respondent occurred when S.H.'s father, M.H., was having difficulty sleeping because he was undergoing chemotherapy. Without requesting that respondent do so, respondent provided M.H. with a sample packet of Xanax for M.H. Other than the incidents cited above, neither H.H. nor M.H. received or took any prescription medication where the prescription was written by respondent.
- 40. M.H. and H.H. were never patients of respondent and respondent never took a medical history from M.H. or H.H., never medically examined M.H. or H.H. and did not keep any medical records for M.H. and H.H.
  - 41. S.H.'s sister, L.G. was never a patient of

respondent, and respondent never took medical history from her or medically examined her, and he did not keep any medical records for L.G. Respondent never directly provided L.G. with any medications or directly prescribed any medication for L.G. pursuant to any medical complaint or otherwise.

3

4

6

8

42. Respondent prescribed the following dangerous drugs and/or controlled substances for S.H. using the names of her parents, H.H. and M.H., and that of her sister, L.G., in order to supply S.H. with said drugs as follows:

| <u>DATE</u> | <u>DRUG</u>   | AMOUNT   | STRENGTH  |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| For H.H     |   |  |   |
| 12/24/84    | Hycodan   | 6 oz   |   |
| 9/23/85     | Tylenol/Codeine #3  | 60   |   |
| 11/15/85    | Hycodan   | 6 oz   |   |
| 11/15/85    | Erythromycin  | 30   | 250 mg  |
| 11/20/85    | Hycodan   | 6 oz   |   |
| 11/20/85    | Erythromycin  | 40   | 250 mg  |
| 11/24/85    | Hydrocodone Syrup   |  |   |
| 11/29/85    | Tylenol/Codeine #3  | 30   |   |
| 2/12/86     | Same as above   | 30   |   |
| 12/31/86    | Same as above   | 36   |   |
| 4/18/86     | Same as above   | 20   |   |
| 8/28/87     | Same as above   | 50   |   |
| 10/4/87     | Same as above   | 50   | 30 mg   |
| For M.H.    |   |  |   |
| 2/28/87     | Tylenol/Codeine #3  | 50   |   |
| 3/15/87     | Same as above   | 50   |   |
|             | For H.H  12/24/84  9/23/85  11/15/85  11/15/85  11/20/85  11/20/85  11/24/85  11/24/85  2/12/86  12/31/86  4/18/86  8/28/87  10/4/87  For M.H.  2/28/87 | For H.H  12/24/84 Hycodan  9/23/85 Tylenol/Codeine #3  11/15/85 Hycodan  11/15/85 Erythromycin  11/20/85 Hycodan  11/20/85 Erythromycin  11/24/85 Hydrocodone Syrup  11/29/85 Tylenol/Codeine #3  2/12/86 Same as above  12/31/86 Same as above  4/18/86 Same as above  8/28/87 Same as above  10/4/87 Same as above  For M.H.  2/28/87 Tylenol/Codeine #3 | For H.H  12/24/84 Hycodan 6 oz  9/23/85 Tylenol/Codeine #3 60  11/15/85 Hycodan 6 oz  11/15/85 Erythromycin 30  11/20/85 Hycodan 6 oz  11/20/85 Erythromycin 40  11/24/85 Hydrocodone Syrup  11/29/85 Tylenol/Codeine #3 30  2/12/86 Same as above 30  12/31/86 Same as above 36  4/18/86 Same as above 50  8/28/87 Same as above 50  For M.H.  2/28/87 Tylenol/Codeine #3 50 |

| 1 | 3/31/87         | Same as above      | 50 |  |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----|--|
| 2 | 4/7/87          | Same as above      | 50 |  |
| 3 | 4/22/87         | Same as above      | 50 |  |
| 4 | 5/12/87         | Same as above      | 50 |  |
| 5 | 5/23//87        | Same as above      | 50 |  |
| 6 | 7/7/87 For L.G. | Xanax              | 30 |  |
| 7 | For L.G.        |                    |    |  |
| 8 | 2/20/87         | Tylenol/Codeine #3 | 50 |  |

#### 43. Conduct with Respect to H.H., M.H. and L.G.

Based on the allegations of paragraphs 37 through 42 above, respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to sections 2242(a) (prescribing drugs without a good faith prior examination and medical indication), and 2234 through sections 2238 and 4232 (failure to maintain records of prescriptions in patient chart).

#### 44. False Prescriptions.

Based upon the allegations of paragraphs 37 through 42, above, respondent is subject to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct pursuant to sections 2234(e) (act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a physician and surgeon) and section 2234 in conjunction with section 2238 (violation of drug laws) and Health and Safety Code sections 11157 (issuing a false prescription), 11154 (knowingly issuing a prescription for a person not under his treatment for a pathology or condition), 11174 (giving a false name or address on a

prescription) and 11153 (issuing prescriptions for controlled substances without legitimate medical purpose).

#### CAUSES FOR REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- Respondent's probationary terms, which were effective March 8, 1985, as set forth in Exhibit A, includes the following term:
  - Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California."
- 46. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation for violating condition "3" of his terms of probation for all violations occurring after March 8, 1985 as set forth herein above in the first, second and third causes for disciplinary action.

WHEREFORE, complainant requests that the Board hold a hearing on the matters hereinabove alleged and after that hearing issue an order suspending or revoking physician's and surgeon's certificate No. C-28370, heretofore issued to respondent Ronald A. Bortman and taking such other and further action as is deemed just and proper.

**DATED:** June 2, 1992

25

26

27

State of California Complainant

Executive Director

Medical Board of California

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

| In the Matter of the Accusation Against:        | )            |
|---|--------------|
| RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D. Certificate No. C-28370 | No. D-3219   |
| Respondent.                                     | )<br>}<br>_) |

#### DECISION

The attached Stipulation is hereby adopted by the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on March 8, 1985.

IT IS SO ORDERED February 6, 1985.

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

MILLER MEDEARIS Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General 1 of the State of California 2 FRANK H. PACOE Deputy Attorney General 3 6000 State Building San Francisco, California 94102 4 Telephone: (415) 557-2546 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE 8 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 In the Matter of the Accusation NO. D-3219 Against: 11 RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D. STIPULATION 12 2232 Carleton Street Berkeley, California 94704 13 Respondent. 14 15 16 17 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN Ronald A. Bortman, M.D., (hereinafter "respondent") with the advice and 18 consent of his attorney, Kenneth L. Freeman, Esq., and the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance 21 (hereinafter "Division") by and through its attorney Frank H. 22 Pacoe, Deputy Attorney General, as follows: 23 1. Accusation No. D+3219 is presently pending before 24 the Division. 25 Respondent is represented by Kenneth L. Freeman, Esq., in this matter.

//

- 3. Respondent and his attorney have fully discussed the charges and allegations in Accusation No. D-3219 and respondent has been fully advised by his attorney of his rights concerning this Accusation.
- 4. Respondent is fully aware of and understands his right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in Accusation No. D-3219; his right to reconsideration, to appeal, and any and all other rights which may be afforded him under the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California as they relate to Accusation No. D-3219.
- 5. Respondent hereby fully and voluntarily waives his right to a hearing, to reconsideration, to appeal, and any and all other rights afforded him under the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California as they relate to Accusation No. D-3219, except for those statutory rights pertaining to modification or termination of probation.
- 6. Respondent admits the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. D-3219, and admits that grounds for discipline are stated under Business and Professions Code section 2236 in conjunction with sections 2227 and 2234.
- 7. Based on the foregoing admissions, it is further stipulated and agreed by the parties hereto that the Division may issue the following decision:

Certificate No. C-28370 issued to the respondent

Ronald A. Bortman is revoked. However, revocation is stayed and
respondent is placed on probation for seven years upon the followin
terms and conditions:

decision and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval educational programs or courses related to psychiatry or an area of general medicine related to the general practice of psychiatry which shall not be less than 25 hours per year, for each year of probation. These programs shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each of the courses, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the courses.

Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for continuing medical education of which 25 hours were in satisfaction of this condition and were approved in advance by the Division.

(2) Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a community service program in which respondent shall provide free medical services on a regular basis to a community or charitable facility or agency for at least 384 hours during the first 48 months of probation.

Respondent is currently providing community services as ordered by the Municipal Court for the County of Alameda (Berkeley-Albany Judicial District) in case number 93938. No community service hours performed under that court order shall be included in the 384 hour community service obligation provided for herein.

(3) Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

URT PAPER

- (5) Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.
- (6) Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.
- (7) In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the State, respondent must notify the Division in writing of the dates of departure and return.

  Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.
- (8) Upon successful completion of probation, respondent certificate will be fully restored.
- (9) If respondent violates 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.

25 //

of probation.

26 //

27 //

| 1            | S. The parties hereto agree that the terms and                     |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| 2            | conditions set forth herein shall be null and void and not binding |  |  |
| 3            | upon them unless approved and adopted by the Division.             |  |  |
| <b>4</b> 5 6 | DATED: NonALD A. BORTMAN, M.D. Respondent                          |  |  |
| 7            | Respondent   |  |  |
| 8            | DATED: 12 4 84 KENNETH L. FREEMAN, ESQ.                            |  |  |
| 9            | Attorney for Respondent  |  |  |
| 10           | DATED: 12/6/84 Maul Allace   |  |  |
| 12           | FRANK H. PACOE Deputy Attorney General                             |  |  |
| 13           | Attorney for Complainant   |  |  |
| 14           |  |  |  |
| 15           |  |  |  |
| 16           |  |  |  |
| 17           |  |  |  |
| 18           |  |  |  |
| 19           |  |  |  |
| 20           |  |  |  |
| 21           |  |  |  |
| 22           |  |  |  |
| 23<br>24     | •  |  |  |
| 24<br>25     |  |  |  |
| ں ت          | Ų.   |  |  |

26

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California FRANK H. PACOE Deputy Attorney General 6000 State Building San Francisco, CA 94102 Telephone: (415) 557-2546

Attorneys for Complainant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

**2**5

26

27

BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

> RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D. 2232 Carleton Street Berkeley, CA 94704 Physician and Surgeon Certificate No. C-28370,

D-3219 NO.

ACCUSATION

Respondent.

Complainant, KENNETH J. WAGSTAFF, charges and alleges as follows:

- He is the Executive Director of the Board of 1. Medical Quality Assurance (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and makes these charges and files this Accusation in his official capacity as such.
- 2. On August 17, 1966, the Board issued Physician and Surgeon Certificate No. C-28370 to Ronald A. Bortman (hereinafter referred to as the "respondent").
- Business and Professions Code sections 2227 and 2234 provide, in pertinent part, that the Division of Medical Quality

shall take disciplinary action against any licensee who is guilty of unprofessional conduct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 l

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 4. Business and Professions Code section 2236 provides that the conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- Welfare and Institutions Code section 14107 5. provides that any person who, with intent to defraud, presents for allowance or payment by the California Medical Assistance Program (hereinafter referred to as the "Medi-Cal Program" Welfare and Institutions Code section 14000, et seq.) any false or fraudulent claim for furnishing services or merchandise, knowingly submits false information for the purpose of obtaining greater compensation than that to which he is legally entitled for furnishing services or merchandise, or knowingly submits false information for the purpose of obtaining authorization for furnishing services or merchandise under Division 9, Part 3, Chapters 7 or 8 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, is punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not longer than one year or in the state prison not exceeding five years, or by fine not exceeding five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00), or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The enforcement remedies provided under Welfare and Institutions Code section 14107 are not exclusive and shall not preclude the use of any other criminal or civil remedy.

6. Respondent has been guilty of unprofessional conduct pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2236,

thereby providing grounds for disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234 of said Code in that respondent was convicted of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a physician and surgeon, as is more particularly set forth as follows:

Section 1

On or about January 19, 1984, respondent was convicted by guilty plea in the Municipal Court, County of Alameda, Case No. 93938, on two counts of violation of Welfare and Institutions Code section 14107 (presenting false claims). Pursuant to said conviction, respondent was sentenced to three years probation, ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$10.000.00, to make restitution in the amount of \$33,112.41 and perform 300 hours of service. The circumstances of the aforementioned offense involved respondent's submission of false and fraudulent claims to the Medi-Cal Program and the acceptance of payment therefore.

The aforementioned offense was substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a physician and surgeon in that it evidences unfitness to perform the functions authorized by a physician's and surgeon's certificate in a manner consistent with the public health, safety and welfare.

/

.3

-7

-19

WHEREFORE, complainant prays that a hearing be held and respondent's license be suspended or revoked or such other action be taken as may be deemed proper.

DATED: July 18, 1984.

KENNETH J. WAGSTAFF

Executive Director
Board of Medical Quality Assurance

Complainant.

|    |  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·            |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 1  | DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California             |  |  |
| 2  |  |  |  |
| 3  | 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 6200<br>San Francisco, California 94102-3658 |  |  |
| 4  | Telephone: (415) 703-2509  |  |  |
| 5  | Attorneys for Complainant  |  |  |
| 6  |  |  |  |
| 7  | BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY                                     |  |  |
| 8  | MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA<br>STATE OF CALIFORNIA                         |  |  |
| 9  |  |  |  |
| 10 | In the Matter of the Accusation  | ) No.: D-4687                                    |  |
| 11 | and Petition to Revoke Probation Against:                                  | )<br>)   |  |
| 12 | RONALD A. BORTMAN, M.D.  | ) FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL                             |  |
| 13 | 2232 Carleton Street<br>Berkeley, CA 94704                                 | ) ACCUSATION AND PETITION<br>TO REVOKE PROBATION |  |
| 14 | Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. C28370,                          | )<br>)   |  |
| 15 | Respondent.  | )<br>)   |  |
| 16 |  | <b>)</b><br>}                                    |  |
| 17 | Kenneth J. Wagstaff, complainant herein, as causes for                     |  |  |
| 18 | disciplinary action and revocation of probation against the above          |  |  |
| 19 | named respondent, Ronald A. Bortman, M.D., (hereinafter referred           |  |  |
| 20 | to as "respondent") further charges and alleges as follows:                |  |  |
| 21 | 1. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 15,                             |  |  |
| 22 | inclusive, of the amended accusation heretofore filed in this              |  |  |
| 23 | matter are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set                |  |  |
| 24 | forth.   |  |  |
| 25 | 2. Section 2234 provides, in pertinent part, that                          |  |  |
| 26 | unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, (c)                |  |  |
| 27 | repeated negligent acts.   |  |  |

3. The following dangerous drug is involved in this proceeding.

A. Norpramine, a trade name for desipramine hydrochloride, is a dangerous drug as defined in section 4211.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- 4. The allegations of paragraphs 1 and 2 are \_\_\_\_\_incorporated herein by reference.
- year old female, was admitted to the psychiatric inpatient unit of Alta Bates-Herrick Hospital pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 5150 (involuntary hospitalization of any person who, as a result of a mental disorder, is a danger to others or to himself or herself) following an apparent suicide attempt. At Herrick hospital, on or about June 8, 1989, respondent, undertook to treat C.H. who was suffering from severe depression. Prior to the June 6, 1989 hospitalization, C.H. had been hospitalized several times for depression and had made at least three previous suicide attempts during her depressive illness. C.H. also suffered from problems with alcoholism.
- 6. Respondent began treating C.H., on June 6, 1989 with 20 mg of Prozac, an antidepressant, daily, which was increased to 40 mg daily. On or about June 19, 1989, the Prozac was discontinued and respondent prescribed Norpramine at 50 mg daily. On or about June 20, 1989, respondent increased the

<sup>1.</sup> The name of the patient will be disclosed in discovery to be furnished to the respondent.

dosage of Norpramine to 75 mg daily. On or about June 22, 1989, respondent increased the dosage of Norpramine to 125 mg daily. On or about June 24, 1989, respondent increased the dosage of Norpramine to 150 mg daily. On or about June 24, 1989 respondent discharged C.H. On or about June 23, 1989, respondent gave C.H. a prescription for 15 tablets of Norpramine at a dosage of 50 mg each. That prescription was filled at Herrick Hospital Pharmacy on June 23, 1989. When C.H. was discharged, respondent also gave C.H. a prescription for 100 Norpramine tablets at a dosage of 50 mg each, despite nursing notations in C.H.'s medical chart that referred to C.H.'s persistent suicidal ideation. That prescription was filled at Long's Drugs in Alameda on June 24, 1989.

- 7. On or about June 26, 1989 C.H. was found dead in her home by a friend. After an autopsy, the coroner determined that the cause of death was acute designamine intoxication and estimated the time of death as June 24, 1989.
- 8. Respondent's conduct as set forth above constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or incompetence and/or clearly excessive prescribing in that respondent gave C.H., a patient with a known previous history of suicide attempts and continuing suicidal ideation, the means to commit suicide by prescribing one hundred and fifteen 50 milligram tablets of Norpramine at the time of C.H.'s discharge. Therefore cause for disciplinary action exists pursuant to section 2234 (b), 2234 (c), and 2234 (d) and section 725 and respondent's conduct is a violation of condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-

3219.

#### FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- 9. The allegations of paragraphs 4 through 7 are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth.
- 10. Respondent failed to make a multi-axial diagnosis using DSM 3R and thereby not diagnosing C.H.'s alcoholism and other personality traits which predisposed her to depression. Respondent also failed to diagnose on Axis IV the psychosocial stressors which contributed to C.H.'s depression. Respondent's conduct as set forth above constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or incompetence therefore cause for disciplinary action exists pursuant to sections 2234 (b) and (d) and is a violation pursuant to condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-3219.

## SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- 11. The allegations of paragraphs 4 through 7 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 12. Respondent failed to monitor C.H.'s response to Norpramine (desipramine) following two weeks of Prozac treatment with vital signs, blood level of desipramine and electrocardiogram. Respondent's conduct constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or incompetence and therefore cause for disciplinary action exists pursuant to sections 2234 (b) and (d) and is a violation of condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-3219.

### SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

13. The allegations of paragraphs 4 through 7 are

incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

14. Respondent discharged C.H. from the hospital before C.H. was medically stable and medically safe because of the rapid increase in Norpramine (desipramine) following treatment with Prozac without monitoring her blood level and exposing here to probable toxic levels. Respondent's conduct constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or incompetence and therefore cause for disciplinary action exists pursuant to sections 2234 (b) and (d) and is a violation of condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-3219.

# EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- 15. The allegations of paragraphs 4 through 7 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- 16. Respondent failed to make arrangements to see C.H. sooner than two to three weeks after her discharge from the hospital. Respondent's conduct constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or incompetence and therefore cause for disciplinary action exists pursuant to sections 2234 (b) and (d) and is a violation of condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-3219.

#### NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND REVOCATION OF PROBATION

- 17. The allegations of the fourth through eighth causes of action for disciplinary action, inclusive, above, are incorporated herein by reference.
- 18. Respondent's conduct as alleged in paragraphs 17 above whether singularly, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitutes gross negligence and/or negligence and/or

incompetence and/or repeated acts of negligence and therefore is cause for disciplinary action pursuant to sections 2234 (b), (c) and (d) and is a violation of condition 3 of respondent's probation in Case No. D-3219.

WHEREFORE, complainant requests that the Board hold a hearing on the matters hereinabove alleged and after that bearing

wherefore, complainant requests that the Board hold a hearing on the matters hereinabove alleged and after that hearing issue an order suspending or revoking physician's and surgeon's certificate No. C-28370, heretofore issued to respondent Ronald A. Bortman and taking such other and further action as is deemed just and proper.

DATED: 7-28-92

Medical Board of California State of California

Complainant