

## **BEFORE THE VIRGINIA BOARD OF MEDICINE**

**IN RE: KESHAVPAL GUNNA REDDY, M.D.**  
**License Number: 0101-053228**  
**Case Number: 183651**

---

### **ORDER**

---

#### **JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 2.2-4019 and 54.1-2400(10), a Special Conference Committee of the Virginia Board of Medicine ("Board") held an informal conference on November 5, 2020, in Henrico County, Virginia, to inquire into evidence that Keshavpal Gunna Reddy, M.D., may have violated certain laws and regulations governing the practice of medicine in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Dr. Reddy appeared at this proceeding and was represented by Colleen M. Gentile, Esquire.

Upon consideration of the evidence, the Committee adopts the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and issues the Order contained herein.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Keshavpal Gunna Reddy, M.D. was issued License Number 0101-053228 to practice medicine on September 29, 1995, which is scheduled to expire on November 30, 2020. At all times relevant to the findings contained herein, said license was current and active.

2. In October 2011, Patient A began treating with Dr. Reddy for medication management for diagnoses including mood disorder NOS, bipolar II disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder ("PTSD"). From March 2013 – April 2015, Dr. Reddy prescribed Patient A Geodon for insomnia, racing thoughts and mood lability. By Dr. Reddy's own admission, at Patient A's six-month medication management office visits with him on August 27, 2016 and February 20, 2017, the patient

complained of tongue swelling, which she attributed to the Geodon that Dr. Reddy was prescribing her. Despite these recurrent complaints, there is no indication in the treatment record that, at either of these office visits or at any other time during the treatment period, Dr. Reddy: clinically assessed Patient A for tongue swelling (i.e. examined her tongue and mouth); instructed Patient A to discontinue taking Geodon to determine if there was a direct correlation between the patient's ingestion of this medication and her complaint of tongue swelling; referred the patient to an ENT specialist for an evaluation or opinion to determine a potential alternate etiology (i.e. glossitis) of her tongue swelling; and/or prospectively referred her to an acute care facility for evaluation during a symptom flare-up. Despite these adverse reactions, Dr. Reddy determined the benefits to Patient A from continued Geodon use outweighed the risks, and he instructed the patient to continue taking Geodon along with Benadryl (C-VI) to counteract the tongue swelling. On June 27, 2017, Patient A experienced tongue swelling that was unresponsive to Benadryl. On or about June 28, 2017, she was transported to a Virginia hospital emergency department, where she was diagnosed with anaphylactic shock, metabolic and lactic acidosis, elevated troponin, and renal failure. Patient A was admitted to the hospital intensive care unit and treated with Levophed, steroids, antihistamines, fluids and bicarbonate.

3. Dr. Reddy violated Virginia Code § 54.1-2915(A)(18) and 18 VAC 85-20-26(C) of the Regulations Governing the Practice of Medicine, Osteopathy, Podiatry and Chiropractic in that, by his own admission, he failed to document in his treatment record for Patient A any discussion, assessment and/or diagnosis of Patient A's tongue swelling complaint, discussion regarding risk-benefit considerations of continued Geodon use, or his recommendation to treat this condition with Benadryl.

4. Dr. Reddy explained to the Committee that Patient A had been very satisfied with managing her symptoms with Geodon, and that the patient's history with Geodon had been successful

for several years prior to her mention of tongue swelling in August 2016. Dr. Reddy stated to the Committee that he examined Patient A's tongue, that he did not think it looked bad, and that Patient A denied breathing or swallowing difficulties. However, Dr. Reddy could not identify for the Committee documentation of such discussion with Patient A in his treatment record, nor could he point to documentation of a physical examination of the patient.

5. Dr. Reddy's expert, David R. Spiegel, M.D., opined to the Committee that although it was possible that Patient A reacted to the Geodon, he believes it was unlikely. Dr. Spiegel acknowledged to the Committee that Dr. Reddy's documentation of Patient A's tongue swelling complaint "could have been better."


6. The Board's expert, Yaacov R. Pushkin, M.D., opined to the Committee that he believed Dr. Reddy viewed Patient A's reported symptoms as extrapyramidal. However, as Patient A was reporting swelling and was attributing the swelling to the medication Dr. Reddy was providing, Dr. Pushkin opined to the Committee that he would have brought Patient A into the office for a thorough evaluation to form an assessment and plan via a history and physical examination, and would have documented the same. Dr. Pushkin opined to the Committee that he believed when Dr. Reddy continued prescribing Geodon for Patient A despite her tongue swelling complaint, he was acting with compassion to manage the patient's psychiatric symptoms.

### **ORDER**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Virginia Board of Medicine hereby ORDERS that Keshavpal Gunna Reddy, M.D., is REPRIMANDED.

Pursuant to Virginia Code §§ 2.2-4023 and 54.1-2400.2, the signed original of this Order shall remain in the custody of the Department of Health Professions as a public record, and shall be made available for public inspection and copying upon request.

FOR THE BOARD

  
Jennifer Deschenes, J.D., M.S.  
Deputy Executive Director, Discipline  
Virginia Board of Medicine

ENTERED: 11/12/2020

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

As provided by Rule 2A:2 of the Supreme Court of Virginia, you have 30 days from the date you are served with this Order to which to appeal this decision by filing a Notice of Appeal with William L. Harp, M.D., Executive Director, Board of Medicine, 9960 Mayland Drive, Suite 300, Henrico, Virginia 23233. The service date shall be defined as the date you actually received this decision or the date it was mailed to you, whichever occurred first. In the event this decision is served upon you by mail, three days are added to that period.