

PETER C. HARVEY
ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY
Division of Law 5th Floor
124 Halsey Street
P.O. Box 45029
Newark, New Jersey 07101
Attorney for the State Board
of Medical Examiners

FILED

May 22, 2003

**NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD
OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS**

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF LAW & PUBLIC SAFETY
DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUSPENSION :
OR REVOCATION OF THE LICENSE OF : Administrative Action
 :
GEORGE STEPHEN LAKNER : FINAL ORDER
License No. MA 41726 : OF DISCIPLINE
 :
TO PRACTICE MEDICINE AND SURGERY :
IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY :
 :

This matter was opened to the New Jersey State Board of Medical Examiners upon receipt of information which the Board has reviewed and on which the following findings of fact and conclusions of law are made;

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent, George S. Lakner, M.D., License No. MA 41726 is a physician licensed in the State of New Jersey. Respondent's license is currently active.

2. On or about December 19, 2001, an Order was entered by the Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Nevada revoking respondent's license to practice.

3. The complaint alleged that on March 28, 2001, respondent signed his application for registration renewal as a physician in the State of Nevada and answered "No" to question number 7, which

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

inquired whether he had "ever been denied a license, permission to practice medicine or any other healing art, or permission to take an examination to practice medicine or an other healing art in any state, country or U.S. territory." It was further alleged that on July 19, 2000, the Medical Board of California informed respondent that his application for medical licensure in the State of California was denied based upon grounds that respondent committed an act involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit with the intent to substantially benefit himself or another or substantially injure another; or committed an which if done by a licentiate of the business or profession in question, would be grounds for disciplinary action.

4. The Nevada Board found that by answering "No" to question number 7 on his renewal application, respondent engaged in the act of renewing a license to practice medicine by misrepresentation, or by false, misleading, or inaccurate statement, which conduct violates Nevada statutory provisions.

5. It was also found that by answering "No" to question number 7 on his renewal application, respondent engaged in the act of conduct intended to deceive.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The above Nevada action provides grounds to take disciplinary action against respondent's license to practice medicine and surgery in New Jersey pursuant to N.J.S.A. 45:1-21(g) in that respondent has had his license revoked in another state.

DISCUSSION

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, a Provisional Order of Discipline suspending respondent's license to practice medicine and surgery in the State of New Jersey was entered on November 15, 2002, and a copy served on respondent. The Provisional Order was subject to finalization by the Board at 5:00 p.m. on the 30th business day following entry unless Respondent requested a modification or dismissal of the stated Findings of Fact or Conclusions of Law by submitting a written request for modification or dismissal setting forth in writing any and all reasons why said findings and conclusions should be modified or dismissed and submitting any and all documents or other written evidence supporting Respondent's request for consideration and reasons thereof.

Respondent responded by faxed letter dated November 26, 2002 requesting modification of the Provisional Order. Respondent began by stating that the New Jersey Board office has been "misused [and] manipulated by licensing staff from the West Coast". Respondent stated that his Nevada license was revoked on December 19, 2001, however, he claims that the Executive Director of the Nevada Psychiatric Association has ordered an investigation of the process, and that attorneys for the California Medical and Psychiatric Associations, have appealed the decision. Respondent provides no documentation of an investigation in Nevada or an appeal of the decision by said organizations. Respondent further claims that under guidance from an Administrative Law Judge, the California Board offered to issue him a license on February 1,

2002. Respondent did not provide any documentation to support this claim, and an on-line search of California licensees shows that respondent does not hold a California license. Respondent also claims that he checked "No" to question number 7 on the Nevada renewal form after being instructed to do so by the Nevada Board's Deputy Administrator, Joseph Franz. Mr. Franz later stated that he did not recall speaking with respondent.

Respondent then went on to dispute the underlying facts for his denial of licensure in California. Respondent claims he was denied licensure in California due to a Medical Board staffer's "shameful discrimination against Eastern European countries" which led her to question the authenticity of respondent's credentials from Hungary. Respondent alleges that two of the staffers in California involved in denying his license "have since been removed for 'abuse of office', and the board has voted to issue a license". Again, no documentation to support these claims are supplied. Finally, respondent claims that both Kansas and Virginia suspended his license based on the California denial, but later retracted the suspensions and reinstated his licenses in those states. Once again, no documentation to support these claims was provided.

Respondent's submissions were reviewed by the Board, and the Board found that respondent did not submit any documentation to support his dispute with the underlying facts. The Board determined that further proceedings were not necessary and that no material discrepancies had been raised. The Board was not

persuaded that the submitted materials merited further consideration.


ACCORDINGLY, IT IS on this 22nd day of May, 2003, ORDERED that:

1. Respondent's license to practice medicine and surgery in the State of New Jersey is hereby suspended until such time that he can show that all of his sister state licenses have been reinstated, without restrictions.*

2. Prior to resuming active practice in New Jersey, Respondent shall be required to appear before the Board (or a committee thereof) to demonstrate fitness to resume practice, and any practice in this State prior to said appearance shall constitute grounds for the a charge of unlicensed practice. In addition, the Board reserves the right to place restrictions on Respondent's practice should his license be reinstated.

NEW JERSEY STATE BOARD OF
MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By:



William V. Harrer, M.D., B.L.D.
Board President

* Respondent has indicated that he has been called to active duty in the armed forces. Therefore, the Board shall waive the forty-five (45) day time period in which he may seek appellate review. Said forty-five (45) days shall run from the date respondent returns from active duty.