		FILED
1	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	JUDITH T. ALVARADO	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO June 7 20 (8
,3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General REBECCA L. SMITH	BY K. Voorg ANALYST
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 179733	
5	California Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702	
6	Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6475	,
7	Facsimile: (213) 897-9395 Attorneys for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE	
9	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF C	ALIFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2015-014602
12	JACK JYH-PERNG WU, M.D.	ACCUSATION
13	28720 Roadside Drive, Suite 399 Agoura Hills, California 91301-3316	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A93228,	
15	. *	
16	Respondent.	
17		•
18	Complainant alleges:	
19	<u>PARTIES</u>	
20	1. Kimberly Kirchmeyer ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in her official	
21	capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer	
22	Affairs ("Board").	
23	2. On November 2, 2005, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate	
24	number A93228 to Jack Jyh-Perng Wu, M.D. ("Respondent"). That license was in full force and	
25	effect at all times relevant to the charges brought here and will expire on November 30, 2019,	
26	unless renewed.	
27	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
28	· ///	
	•	1

11

1213

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

2425

26

27

28

| ///

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code ("Code") unless otherwise indicated.
  - 4. Section 2004 of the Code states:
  - "The board shall have the responsibility for the following:
- "(a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice

  Act.
  - "(b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- "(c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.
- "(d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- "(e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board.
  - "(f) Approving undergraduate and graduate medical education programs.
- "(g) Approving clinical clerkship and special programs and hospitals for the programs in subdivision (f).
  - "(h) Issuing licenses and certificates under the board's jurisdiction.
  - "(i) Administering the board's continuing medical education program."
  - 5. Section 2234 of the Code states:
- "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.

"…"

- 6. Section 2227 of the Code states:
- "(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 period 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 proper.
- "(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."

## 7. Section 2266 of the Code states:

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

#### 8. Section 801.01 of the Code states:

"The Legislature finds and declares that the filing of reports with the applicable state agencies required under this section is essential for the protection of the public. It is the intent of the Legislature that the reporting requirements set forth in this section be interpreted broadly in order to expand reporting obligations.

- "(a) A complete report shall be sent to the Medical Board of California, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, or the Physician Assistant Board with respect to a licensee of the board as to the following:
- "(1) A settlement over thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) or arbitration award of any amount or a civil judgment of any amount, whether or not vacated by a settlement after entry of the judgment, that was not reversed on appeal, of a claim or action for damages for death or personal injury caused by the licensee's alleged negligence, error, or omission in practice, or by his or her rendering of unauthorized professional services.
- "(2) A settlement over thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000), if the settlement is based on the licensee's alleged negligence, error, or omission in practice, or on the licensee's rendering of unauthorized professional services, and a party to the settlement is a corporation, medical group, partnership, or other corporate entity in which the licensee has an ownership interest or that employs or contracts with the licensee.
  - "(b) The report shall be sent by the following:

"(2) The licensee, or his or her counsel, if the licensee does not possess professional liability insurance.

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

"(c) The entity, person, or licensee obligated to report pursuant to subdivision (b) shall send the complete report if the judgment, settlement agreement, or arbitration award is entered against or paid by the employer of the licensee and not entered against or paid by the licensee. "Employer," as used in this paragraph, means a professional corporation, a group practice, a health care facility or clinic licensed or exempt from licensure under the Health and Safety Code, a licensed health care service plan, a medical care foundation, an educational institution, a professional institution, a professional school or college, a general law corporation, a public entity, or a nonprofit organization that employs, retains, or contracts with a licensee referred to in this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the employment of, or contracting with, any licensee in violation of Section 2400.

"(d) The report shall be sent to the Medical Board of California, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, or the Physician Assistant Board as appropriate, within 30 days after the written settlement agreement has been reduced to writing and signed by all parties thereto, within 30 days after service of the arbitration award on the parties, or within 30 days after the date of entry of the civil judgment.

"(f) Failure to substantially comply with this section is a public offense punishable by a fine of not less than five hundred dollars (\$500) and not more than five thousand dollars (\$5,000).

"(k) For purposes of this section, "licensee" means a licensee of the Medical Board of California, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, or the Physician Assistant Board."

#### 9. Section 822 of the Code states:

"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.

28 ||

- "(b) Suspending the licentiate's right to practice.
- "(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."

10. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1360, states:

"For the purposes of denial, suspension or revocation of a license, certificate or permit pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the code, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a person holding a license, certificate or permit under the Medical Practice Act if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a person holding a license, certificate or permit to perform the functions authorized by the license, certificate or permit in a manner consistent with the public health, safety or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include but not be limited to the following: Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of the Medical Practice Act."

#### DRUG LAWS

- 11. Section 725 of the Code states:
- "(a) 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.

" ,,,,

///

28 ||

///

12. Section 2238 of the Code states:

"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."

- 13. Section 2242 of the Code states:
- "(a) Prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- "(b) No licensee shall be found to have committed unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this section if, at the time the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished, any of the following applies:
- "(1) The licensee was a designated physician and surgeon or podiatrist serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and if the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished only as necessary to maintain the patient until the return of his or her practitioner, but in any case no longer than 72 hours.
- "(2) The licensee transmitted the order for the drugs to a registered nurse or to a licensed vocational nurse in an inpatient facility, and if both of the following conditions exist:
- "(A) The practitioner had consulted with the registered nurse or licensed vocational nurse who had reviewed the patient's records.
- "(B) The practitioner was designated as the practitioner to serve in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be.
- "(3) The licensee was a designated practitioner serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and was in possession of or had utilized the patient's records and ordered the renewal of a medically indicated prescription for an amount not exceeding the original prescription in strength or amount or for more than one refill.
- "(4) The licensee was acting in accordance with Section 120582 of the Health and Safety Code."

9. Health and Safety Code section 11175 states:

"No person shall obtain or possess a prescription that does not comply with his division, nor shall any person obtain a controlled substance by means of a prescription which does not comply with this division or possess a controlled substance obtained by such a prescription."

# DRUGS INVOLVED

- 20. Lorazepam is a Schedule IV controlled substance as defined by section 11057, subdivision (d)(16), of the Health and Safety Code and is a dangerous drug as defined in Section 4022 of the Code.
- 21. Hydromorphone, also known as Dilaudid, is a Schedule II controlled substance as defined by section 11055, subdivision (a)(1)(J), of the Health and Safety Code and is a dangerous drug as defined in Section 4022 of the Code.
- 22. Oxycodone is a Schedule II controlled substance as defined by section 11055, subdivision (a)(1)(M), of the Health and Safety Code and is a dangerous drug as defined in Section 4022 of the Code.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 23. Respondent is a psychiatrist. He met J.M.<sup>1</sup> in approximately 2008 or 2009 while they both worked at UCLA. Respondent was the medical director for the Adult Eating Disorder Program and a psychiatrist in the UCLA Partial Hospitalization Program. J.M. worked at UCLA Adult Psychiatry as a clinical liaison/assistant. At that time, Respondent and J.M.'s interactions were limited to the workplace and both characterized their relationship as "being friends".
- 24. Respondent left his positions at UCLA in August 2010 and began a private outpatient psychiatry practice.
  - 25. J.M. and her mother were invited to and attended Respondent's wedding in 2010.
  - 26. J.M. left her position at UCLA in 2011.
- 27. Respondent and J.M. remained in contact following their respective departures from UCLA. In January 2013, Respondent began visiting J.M. at her home. J.M. and her mother reported to Respondent that J.M. had been having debilitating chest pains since 2011.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Initials are used to protect privacy interests.

29. Respondent agreed to become involved in J.M.'s medical care and treatment, by speaking with her providers and reviewing her medical records to assist in determining the etiology of her complaints. Respondent stated that the authorizations were executed so that Drs. H.H. and N.B.M. would speak with him regarding J.M.'s cardiac condition.<sup>2</sup> Drs. H.H. and N.B.M. did not provide him with J.M.'s medical records. Respondent reviewed J.M.'s medical records that she had at her home and made copies of portions of those records for his file on J.M. Respondent spoke on the phone on one occasion with Dr. H.H. and on one occasion with Dr. N.B.M.'s nurse practitioner. Respondent told them both that he was a psychiatrist and a friend of J.M. He asked their thoughts and opinions regarding her cardiac condition.

- 30. On August 12, 2013, Respondent prescribed 45 tablets of Lorazepam, 1 milligram, to J.M.
- 31. On August 23, 2013, Respondent prescribed 15 tablets of Dilaudid, 4 milligrams, to J.M.
- 32. On February 15, 2014, Respondent prescribed 11 tablets of Sertraline HCL, 50 milligrams, to J.M.
- 33. On February 16, 2014, Respondent prescribed 24 tablets of Dilaudid, 4 milligrams, to J.M. The pharmacist filling the prescription noted that Respondent dropped this prescription off at the pharmacy himself and that J.M. had not previously filled prescriptions at this location.
- 34. On March 19, 2014, Respondent prescribed 40 tablets of Hydromorphone, 4 milligrams, to J.M.

24 | ///

2<u>6</u> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Respondent advised Board representatives that he was "temporarily" J.M.'s treating physician in August 2013 when she asked him for his opinion regarding her chest pain. Respondent has also stated that he did not consider himself J.M.'s treating physician when he had her execute the medical information release authorizations.

35. In April 2014, J.M. underwent bladder surgery at UCLA-Santa Monica Hospital.

Respondent was not part of J.M.'s medical team. Once J.M. was discharged home, Respondent stayed with J.M. at her home to watch over her while J.M.'s mother was at work.

- 36. On April 19, 2014, Respondent prescribed 24 tablets of Dilaudid, 4 milligrams, to J.M.
- 37. On April 24, 2014, Respondent prescribed 30 tablets of Oxycodone, 5 milligrams, to J.M.
- 38. On April 29, 2014, Respondent prescribed 45 tablets of Oxycodone, 10 milligrams, to J.M.
- 39. On May 10, 2014, Respondent prescribed 60 tablets of Oxycodone, 5 milligrams, to J.M.
- 40. Respondent advised Board representatives that the controlled substance prescriptions that he issued following J.M.'s bladder surgery were at J.M. and her mother's request for J.M.'s post-operative surgical pain. He explained: "I wrote it because I know how bad her pain is, and a lot of providers do not believe how bad her pain can be."
- 41. Respondent did not speak with J.M.'s surgeon or primary care physician nor did he perform a CURES review before prescribing pain medications for J.M.<sup>3</sup> He did not make notes of any examination nor record any pain scale when he was prescribing to J.M. He also did not instruct J.M. to inform her surgeon or primary care physician that he had prescribed controlled substances for her.
- 42. Respondent told his wife that he was in love/infatuated with J.M. In August 2014, Respondent's wife filed for divorce. On August 11, 2014, following Respondent's arrest for alleged domestic battery, his wife sought a restraining order requesting that he be removed from the family home.

25 | ///

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> CURES is the Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System which stores Schedule II, III and IV controlled substance prescription information reported as dispensed in California. Prescribers authorized to prescribe, order, administer, furnish, or dispense Schedule II, III, or IV controlled substances, and pharmacists, may access CURES data for patient care purposes.

- 43. Respondent moved out of the family home and Respondent stayed with J.M. and her mother for approximately one-week. Respondent slept in J.M.'s bed with her on two of the nights that he stayed at J.M.'s home. J.M. indicated that one evening during that week she fell asleep while Respondent and she were lying on her bed discussing his current family situation. She woke up with Respondent lying next to her and facing her with his leg positioned over her body. On another occasion that week, J.M. had agreed to spend the evening with Respondent but then chose to go out to dinner with friends, at which time Respondent became angry that she had changed her plans and refused to let her leave. J.M. complained to her mother that she no longer felt comfortable with Respondent staying with them and J.M.'s mother then asked him to leave.
- 44. On November 18, 2014, Respondent prescribed 35 tablets of Dilaudid, 4 milligrams, to J.M.
- 45. From March 2013 to December 2014, Respondent provided financial help to J.M. and her mother, totaling approximately \$88,000.
- 46. In December 2014, J.M. began to recollect memories of her time spent with Respondent in 2013 and 2014. She recalled physical intimacy, including Respondent kissing her while sitting on the couch in the living room, waking up to Respondent brushing the outside of her underwear under her sweatpants, waking up to Respondent touching one of her breasts on the outside of the shirt and lying on the kitchen floor without clothes with Respondent's face above her.
- 47. Respondent initially reported to Board representatives that his relationship with J.M. was platonic. He stated that he kissed her on the forehead a couple of times while saying goodbye but never attempted anything else of a romantic nature physically towards her. He also stated that he kissed J.M. on the lips twice. He denied having sexual intercourse with her. He did state, however, that in later 2014, he thought maybe that the friendship was growing more into a love interest.
- 48. Respondent committed extreme departures from the standard of care with respect to his involvement with J.M. More specifically, Respondent excessively prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without a medical basis, without examination and without knowledge of

///

concurrent treatments and prescribing of her treating physicians. Further, Respondent prescribed highly addicting opioids without taking a sufficient history to determine the presence of opioid misuse. It appears that Respondent has minimized his behaviors with J.M. suggesting a serious lack of self-awareness. Respondent's behavior suggests that he is in severe denial or is attempting to minimize his personal psychological problems, both of which raise serious doubt regarding Respondent's ability to safely function as a physician without harming the public.

- 49. The Board requested that Respondent submit to voluntary mental and physical examinations.
- 50. On April 24, 2018, a mental evaluation was performed by psychiatrist, A.L.S., M.D. Following his evaluation, Dr. S concluded that Respondent is unable to practice medicine reasonably and safely without concurrent intensive monitoring, oversight and supervision.
- a. Dr. S opined that Respondent lacks insight and judgment to safely practice medicine without supervision. Dr. S formed the opinion that Respondent failed to realize his egregious series of errors and only after intense prodding was he finally able to acknowledge that he was ill-suited to make the medical interventions he made.
- b. Dr. S opined that Respondent lacks the ability to recognize the need for supervision and counsel, both on a chronic and emergent basis, and the inability to recognize the need for supervision and counsel makes him unsafe to practice medicine without oversight and monitoring. Further, Dr. S opined that Respondent's belief that he could trust J.M.'s mother to pick up on signs and symptoms of a major catastrophic event in J.M.'s medical condition is the kind of error in reasoning that can endanger patient health, safety and welfare.
- 51. On March 29, 2018, the Board received Respondent's Report of Settlement in excess of \$30,000 reporting that on April 28, 2015, J.M. filed a civil lawsuit against Respondent, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC580094. That lawsuit alleged causes of action for negligence; violation of Civil Code section 51.9 (sexual harassment); sexual assault and battery; and intentional inflection of emotional distress. Following the settlement of the action, a Notice of Entry of Dismissal was filed with the Court on May 15, 2017.

 FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Mental Illness and/or Physical Illness Affecting Competency)

- 52. By reason of the facts set forth above in paragraphs 23 through 50, Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 822 of the Code as a result of mental illness and/or physical illness affecting Respondent's competency. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. Respondent is unable to practice medicine reasonably and safely without concurrent intensive monitoring, oversight and supervision.
- b. Respondent lacks insight and judgment to safely practice medicine without supervision. Respondent failed to realize his egregious series of error with respect to J.M. and only after intense prodding was Respondent finally able to acknowledge that he was ill-suited to make the medical interventions he made regarding J.M.
- c. Respondent lacks the ability to recognize the need for supervision and counsel, both on a chronic and emergent basis, and the inability to recognize the need for supervision and counsel makes him unsafe to practice medicine without oversight and monitoring. Respondent's belief that he could trust J.M.'s mother to pick up on signs and symptoms of a major catastrophic event in J.M.'s medical condition is the kind of error in reasoning that can endanger patient health, safety and welfare.
- 53. Respondent's acts and/or omissions set forth in paragraphs 23 through 50 above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute mental illness and/or physical illness affecting Respondent's competency in violation of section 822 of the Code. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence in Excessively Prescribing Controlled Substances to J.M.)

54. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 2234, subdivision (b), and 725, in that he engaged in gross negligence by excessively prescribing controlled substances to J.M. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 23 through 50, above, as though fully set forth herein. The circumstances are as follows:

///

- a. The standard of medical practice in California requires that physicians only prescribe controlled medications or provide other treatments in the context of a professional physician patient relationship. The standard of medical practice in California further requires that the physician make a good faith effort to obtain sufficient information necessary to establish whether or not the patient suffers from an illness or disorder requiring treatment prior to proving any form of treatment.
- b. The standard of medical practice in California requires that physicians prescribing controlled medications have a medical basis, including evidence that the abusable medications are medically indicated, that there are not safer treatments, an awareness of the patient's history of substance use, or a knowledge of other providers also simultaneously prescribing controlled substances.
- c. The standard of medical practice in California for a practitioner prescribing controlled substances requires that the practitioner document the assessment of the indications, benefits, risks, alternatives (and offer of alternatives), adverse effects, effectiveness, and/or precautions regarding the safe prescribing of controlled substances.
- d. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. outside of the professional physician patient relationship.
- e. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without performing any examination.
- f. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without taking a sufficient history to determine the presence of opioid misuse.
- g. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without knowledge of concurrent treatments and prescribing of her treating physicians.
- h. Respondent failed to maintain documentation of his prescriptions for controlled substances for J.M.

55. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 23 through 50, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute gross negligence pursuant to sections 2234, subdivision (b), and 725 of the Code. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

## THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 56. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c), in that he engaged in repeated acts of negligence by excessively prescribing controlled substances to J.M. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 23 through 55, above, as though fully set forth herein. The circumstances are as follows:
- a. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. outside of the professional physician patient relationship.
- b. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without performing any examination.
- c. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without taking a sufficient history to determine the presence of opioid misuse.
- d. Respondent prescribed controlled substances to J.M. without knowledge of concurrent treatments and prescribing of her treating physicians.
- e. Respondent failed to maintain documentation of his prescriptions for controlled substances for J.M.
- 57. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 23 through 55, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute repeated negligent acts pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

## FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Violation of Drug Statutes)

58. By reason of the facts set forth above in paragraphs 23 through 50, Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2238 of the Code for violating drug statutes.

59. Respondent's acts and/or omissions set forth in paragraphs 23 through 50, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute drug statute violations in violation of section 2238. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

### FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Prescribing, Dispensing, or Furnishing Dangerous Drugs Without an Appropriate Prior Examination and Medical Indication)

- 60. By reason of the facts set forth above in paragraphs 23 through 50, Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2242, subdivision (a), of the Code for prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and medical indication.
- 61. Respondent's acts and/or omissions set forth in paragraphs 23 through 50 above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and medical indication in violation of section 2242, subdivision (a), of the Code. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

#### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failing to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Medical Records)

- 62. By reason of the facts set forth above in paragraphs 23 through 50, Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2266 of the Code for failing to maintain adequate and accurate medical records.
- 63. Respondent's acts and/or omissions set forth in paragraphs 23 through 50 above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute failing to maintain adequate and accurate medical records in violation of section 2266 of the Code. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

| ///

26 | ///

27 || ///

28 ||

of probation monitoring; and

25

26

27

1	4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.
2.	1 t. 1 1/1 z
3	DATED: June 7, 2018 MWWy HWWW
4	KIMBERLY KIRCHMEYER  Executive Director
5	Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
6	Complainant
7	LA2018501044
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	
15	•
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	V
21	
22	
23	<u>-</u> · · · · · ,
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	10

ACCUSATION