|                                      | ·   |                          |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8 | ROB BONTA Attorney General of California JUDITH T. ALVARADO Supervising Deputy Attorney General LATRICE R. HEMPHILL Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 285973 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6198 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117 Attorneys for Complainant  BEFOR |                          |
| 9                                    | MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA   |                          |
| ,                                    | DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA  |                          |
| 10                                   | STATE OF C.   | ALIFORNIA                |
| 11                                   |   |                          |
| 12                                   | In the Matter of the Accusation Against:  | Case No. 800-2021-076670 |
| 13                                   | JOHN NATHANIEL ALVAREZ, M.D.<br>401 East Imperial Highway   | ACCUSATION               |
| 14                                   | Fullerton, CA 92835-1145  | ·                        |
| 15                                   | Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate<br>No. A 155288,  |                          |
| 16                                   | Respondent.   | ·                        |
| 17                                   |   |                          |
| 18                                   |   |                          |
| 19                                   | <u>PARTIES</u>  |                          |
| 20                                   | 1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as  |                          |
| 21                                   | the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer   |                          |
| 22                                   | Affairs (Board).  |                          |
| 23                                   | 2. On or about April 9, 2018, the Medical Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's  |                          |
| 24                                   | Certificate Number A 155288 to John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's   |                          |
| 25                                   | and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought   |                          |
| 26                                   | herein and will expire on July 31, 2023, unless renewed.  |                          |
| 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 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.

## STATUTORY PROVISIONS

# 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.
  - (d) Incompetence.
- (e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
  - (f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a certificate.
- (g) The failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview by the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board.

## 6. Section 2236 of the Code states:

- (a) The conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter [Chapter 5, the Medical Practice Act]. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.
- (b) The district attorney, city attorney, or other prosecuting agency shall notify the Medical Board of the pendency of an action against a licensee charging a felony or misdemeanor immediately upon obtaining information that the defendant is a licensee. The notice shall identify the licensee and describe the crimes charged and the facts alleged. The prosecuting agency shall also notify the clerk of the court in which the action is pending that the defendant is a licensee, and the clerk shall record prominently in the file that the defendant holds a license as a physician and surgeon.
- (c) The clerk of the court in which a licensee is convicted of a crime shall, within 48 hours after the conviction, transmit a certified copy of the record of conviction to the board. The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- (d) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction after a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section and Section 2236.1. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred.

#### 7. Section 2239 of the Code states:

(a) The use or prescribing for or administering to himself or herself, of any controlled substance; or the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic beverages, to the extent, or in such a manner as to be dangerous

///

27

28

or injurious to the licensee, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice medicine safely or more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this section, or any combination thereof, constitutes unprofessional conduct. The record of the conviction is conclusive evidence of such unprofessional conduct.

(b) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section. The Medical Board may order discipline of the licensee in accordance with Section 2227 or the Medical Board may order the denial of the license when the time for appeal has elapsed or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, complaint, information, or indictment.

#### 8. Section 490 of the Code states:

- (a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- (b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- (c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.
- (d) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that the application of this section has been made unclear by the holding in Petropoulos v. Department of Real Estate (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 554, and that the holding in that case has placed a significant number of statutes and regulations in question, resulting in potential harm to the consumers of California from licensees who have been convicted of crimes. Therefore, the Legislature finds and declares that this section establishes an independent basis for a board to impose discipline upon a licensee, and that the amendments to this section made by Chapter 33 of the Statutes of 2008 do not constitute a change to, but rather are declaratory of, existing law.

#### Section 493 of the Code states:

- (a) Notwithstanding any other law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact.
- (b) (1) Criteria for determining whether a crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession the board regulates
  - (B) The number of years elapsed since the date of the offense.
  - (C) The nature and duties of the profession.
- (2) A board shall not categorically bar an applicant based solely on the type of conviction without considering evidence of rehabilitation.
- (c) As used in this section, "license" includes "certificate," "permit,"
- (d) This section does not in any way modify or otherwise affect the existing authority of the following entities in regard to licensure:
  - (2) The Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education.
- (e) This section shall become operative on July 1, 2020.

## REGULATORY PROVISIONS

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.

27

28

- 11. Section 125.3 of the Code states:
- (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.
- (b) In the case of a disciplined licensee that is a corporation or a partnership, the order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.
- (c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.
- (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).
- (e) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.
- (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.
- (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.
- (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion, conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.
- (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.
  - (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in

that board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative disciplinary proceeding.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 12. On or about March 28, 2021, officers with the San Luis Obispo Police Department observed a vehicle driving the wrong way on a one-way street, at a high rate of speed. Officers also observed the vehicle run through stop signs. Officers began pursuing the vehicle but soon lost sight of the vehicle. The vehicle was eventually located parked.
- 13. Officers approached the vehicle and found two passengers inside, but the driver's seat was empty. The passengers indicated that the driver, later identified as Respondent, parked the car and fled on foot. Soon thereafter, Respondent returned to the scene and indicated that he was the driver of the vehicle. Respondent denied drinking any alcohol before, during, or after driving. Officers detected of the odor of alcohol emitting from Respondent's person and noticed that Respondent's eyes were watery and unfocused, his speech was slurred, and his gait was unsteady as he walked.
- 14. Officers administered a series of Field Sobriety Tests (FSTs), to which Respondent performed poorly and failed to follow instructions. Officers attempted to retrieve Respondent's blood alcohol concentration, by using a Preliminary Alcohol Screen device, but Respondent avoided blowing into the machine and stated that he did not want to provide a sample.
- 15. Respondent was placed under arrest and a non-consensual blood draw warrant was obtained. Respondent was transported to French Hospital for the blood draw. Respondent continually pulled away from the staff trying to draw his blood. Officers admonished Respondent's behavior, but he repeatedly pulled the needle out of his arm and hand, flailed his arms, and yelled. The hospital staff tried three times to obtain Respondent's blood but was unable to do so.
- 16. Respondent was transported to the jail, where he began crying and made threats against himself. Officers placed Respondent in a padded safety cell.

26 || ///

27 | ///

28 | ///

- 17. On or about July 12, 2021, in the case of *The People of the State of California vs.*John Nathaniel Alvarez, Superior Court of California for the County of San Luis Obispo, case number 21M-04572, Respondent was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor. Respondent was also charged with obstruction and resisting a public officer, in violation of Penal Code section 148, subdivision (a)(1), a misdemeanor.
- 18. On or about March 7, 2022, Respondent pled no contest to driving under the influence, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a). The other count was dropped as a result of the plea agreement. The parties agreed to stipulate to a blood alcohol concentration of .08%.
- 19. Respondent was sentenced on March 7, 2022, to three years' supervised probation and a two-day jail sentence. Respondent was also ordered to complete a three-month alcohol education program and ordered to pay fines and court fees.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Conviction of a Crime)

20. Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 2236 and 490, and the California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1360 in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician or surgeon, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 12 through 19 above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Use of Alcohol in a Dangerous Manner)

21. Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2239 insofar as Respondent used alcoholic beverages to the extent, or in such a manner, as to be dangerous or injurious to himself and to the public, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 12 through 19, above, which are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth.

III

#### 1 THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 2 (Unprofessional Conduct) Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under 22. 3 4 Code section 2234 in that he engaged in unprofessional conduct. The circumstances are as 5 follows: The allegations in the First and Second Causes for Discipline are incorporated herein. 6 23. by reference as if fully set forth. 7 8 **PRAYER** WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 9 10 and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision: Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 155288, 11 issued to Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D.; 12 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, 13 M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses; 14 Ordering Respondent John Nathaniel Alvarez, M.D., to pay the Board the costs of the 3. 15 investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of probation 16 monitoring; and 17 Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 18 19 MAR 0 3 2023 20 DATED: VARGHESE 21 Interim Executive Director Medical Board of California 22 Department of Consumer Affairs State of California 23 Complainant 24 25 LA2022603271 65733625.docx 26 27 28