

1. ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2. ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3. CHRISTINE A. RHEE
Deputy Attorney General
4. State Bar No. 295656
600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
5. San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
6. San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 738-9455
7. Facsimile: (619) 645-2061

8. *Attorneys for Complainant*

9
10. **BEFORE THE**
MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
11. **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
12. **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

13. In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation
Against:

14. **GEORGE WILLIAM WILSON, M.D.**
15. **72-780 Country Club Drive**
Building B, Suite 205A
16. **Rancho Mirage, CA 92270**

17. **Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate**
18. **No. G 10335,**

19. Respondent.

Case No. 800-2021-074116

DEFAULT DECISION
AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER

[Gov. Code, §11520]

20. **FINDINGS OF FACT**

21. 1. On or about July 7, 2023, Complainant Reji Varghese, in his official capacity as the
22. Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, filed
23. First Amended Accusation No. 800-2021-074116 against George William Wilson, M.D.
24. (Respondent) before the Medical Board of California.

25. 2. On or about December 21, 1964, the Medical Board of California (Board) issued
26. Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335 to Respondent. The Physician's and
27. Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought
28. herein and will expire on December 31, 2023, unless renewed. A true and correct copy of

1 Respondent's Certificate of Licensure is attached as Exhibit A to the accompanying Default
2 Decision Evidence Packet.¹

3 3. On or about March 15, 2023, Regina Rodriguez, an employee of the Board, served by
4 Certified Mail a copy of Accusation No. 800-2021-074116, Statement to Respondent, Request for
5 Discovery, Notice of Defense, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to
6 Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is 72-780 Country Club Drive,
7 Building B, Suite 205A, Rancho Mirage, CA 92270. True and correct copies of the Accusation,
8 the aforementioned related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as Exhibit B in the
9 accompanying Default Decision Evidence Packet, and are incorporated by reference herein.

10 4. On or about May 1, 2023, Regina Rodriguez, an employee of the Board, served by
11 Certified Mail a copy of First Amended Accusation No. 800-2021-074116, Supplemental
12 Statement to Respondent, Supplemental Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections
13 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and
14 is 72-780 Country Club Drive, Building B, Suite 205A, Rancho Mirage, CA 92270. True and
15 correct copies of the First Amended Accusation, the aforementioned related documents, and
16 Declaration of Service are attached as Exhibit C in the accompanying Default Decision Evidence
17 Packet, and are incorporated herein by reference.

18 5. Service of the Accusation and First Amended Accusation was effective as a matter of
19 law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

20 6. On or about March 29, 2023, Deputy Attorney General Christine A. Rhee (DAG
21 Rhee) received an email from Carolyn Lindholm, Esq., stating that she represented Respondent.
22 (Exhibit D, ¶ 6.) DAG Rhee and Ms. Lindholm agreed to an extension of the Notice of Defense
23 filing deadline to April 13, 2023. (Exhibit D, ¶ 6.) From approximately March to July 2023,
24 DAG Rhee continued communication with Ms. Lindholm about the instant case and about
25 settling the matter via a license surrender. (Exhibit D, ¶ 7.)

26 ///

27 ¹ All exhibits are true and correct copies of the originals, and are attached to the
28 accompanying Default Decision Evidence Packet. The Default Decision Evidence Packet is
hereby incorporated by reference, in its entirety, as if fully set forth herein.

1 7. On or about July 6, 2023, DAG Rhee spoke to Jeffrey Raynes, Esq., who claimed that
2 he represented Respondent, not Ms. Lindholm. DAG Rhee requested a letter of representation
3 from Mr. Raynes and sent him copies of the Notice of Defense form to complete and return.
4 (Exhibit D, ¶ 8.)

5 8. On or about July 11, 2023, Mr. Raynes sent DAG Rhee an email stating that he would
6 not be filing a Notice of Defense form. On or about July 12, 2023, DAG Rhee emailed Ms.
7 Lindholm, Mr. Raynes, and Respondent (via his email address on record with the Board) and
8 notified the parties that if a completed Notice of Defense form was not received by the end of the
9 week, a default decision would be prepared. (Exhibit D, ¶ 9.)

10 9. On or about July 12, 2023, having not yet received a Notice of Defense from
11 Respondent, Atur Gilou, an employee of the Attorney General's office, served a Courtesy Notice
12 of Default along with a copy of the First Amended Accusation, the related documents, and
13 Declaration of Service by Certified and First Class Mail to Respondent's address of record with
14 the Board. (Exhibit D, ¶ 10.) True and correct copies of the Courtesy Notice of Default, the
15 related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as Exhibit E in the accompanying
16 Default Decision Evidence Packet.

17 10. On or about July 24, 2023, the aforementioned Courtesy Notice of Default sent by
18 First Class mail was returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Unable to Forward." (Exhibit
19 D, ¶ 11.) A true and correct copy of the envelope returned by the U.S. Postal Service is attached
20 as Exhibit F, and is incorporated by reference herein.

21 11. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

22 ...

23 (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent
24 files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts
25 of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall
26 constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion
27 may nevertheless grant a hearing.

28 ...

///

///

1 12. To date, Respondent has not filed a Notice of Defense. (Exhibit D, ¶ 12.)

2 13. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him
3 of both the Accusation and First Amended Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing
4 on the merits of First Amended Accusation No. 800-2021-074116.

5 14. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

6 (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the
7 hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions
8 or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to
9 respondent.

10 ...
11 15. California Business and Professions Code section 125.3 states:

12 (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of
13 a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the
14 Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the
15 administrative law judge may direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or
16 violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the
17 investigation and enforcement of the case.

18 (b) In the case of a disciplined licensee that is a corporation or a partnership, the
19 order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.

20 (c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where
21 actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its
22 designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of
23 investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of
24 investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not
25 limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.

26 (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount
27 of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested
28 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.

1 (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion,
2 conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any
3 licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement
4 with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid
5 costs.

6 (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement
7 for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs
8 to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.

9 (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of
10 the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.

11 (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in
12 that board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative
13 disciplinary proceeding.

14 16. Business and Professions Code section 2021 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

15 ...

16 (b) Each licensee shall report to the board each and every change of address,
17 including an email address, within 30 days after each change, giving both the old and
18 new address. If an address reported to the board at the time of application for
19 licensure or subsequently is a post office box, the applicant shall also provide the
20 board with a street address. If another address is the licensee's address of record, the
21 licensee may request that the second address not be disclosed to the public.

22 ...

23 17. Section 2227 of the Business and Professions Code states, in pertinent part:

24 (a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of
25 the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government
26 Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered
27 into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the
28 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.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

...

18. Section 2234 of the Business and Professions Code, states, in pertinent part:

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:

...

(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 constitute 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.

...

19. Business and Professions Code section 2266 states that 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.

20. Respondent has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335 to disciplinary action under sections 2220, 2227, and 2234, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, in that he committed gross negligence in the care and treatment of Patient A and Patient B, as more particularly alleged hereafter:

a. Respondent inappropriately prescribed hydroxychloroquine and/or azithromycin to Patient A, putting Patient A at risk for a serious adverse event or death;

b. Respondent failed to document and/or failed to properly store medical records pertaining to his telephone encounter to treat Patient A for COVID-19, prescribe medications to Patient A to treat COVID-19, and discuss the risks and benefits of prescribing these high risk medications off-label to Patient A.

1 c. Respondent inappropriately prescribed hydroxychloroquine and/or
2 azithromycin to Patient B, putting patient B at risk for a serious adverse event or death; and

3 d. Respondent failed to document and/or failed to properly store medical records
4 pertaining to his telephone encounter to treat Patient B for COVID-19, prescribe
5 medications to Patient B to treat COVID-19, and discuss the risks and benefits of
6 prescribing these high risk medications off-label to Patient B. (Exhibit F, ¶ 6.)

7 21. Respondent has further subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate
8 No. G 10335 to disciplinary action under sections 2220, 2227, and 2234, as defined by section
9 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he committed repeated negligent acts in the care and
10 treatment of Patient A and Patient B, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 20, above, which
11 is hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

12 22. Respondent has further subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate
13 No. G 10335 to disciplinary action under sections 2220, 2227, and 2234, as defined by section
14 2266, of the Code, in that he failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for the care and
15 treatment of Patient A and Patient B, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 20, above, which
16 is hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

17 23. The costs of investigation and enforcement of this case prayed for in the First
18 Amended Accusation total \$24,746.00. (Exhibit D, ¶ 18.)

19 **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

20 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent George William Wilson, M.D.,
21 has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335 to discipline.

22 2. True and correct copies of the First Amended Accusation, the related documents, and
23 Declaration of Service are attached.

24 3. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

25 4. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician's
26 and Surgeon's Certificate based on the following violations alleged in the First Amended
27 Accusation:

28 ///

1 a. Respondent committed gross negligence in the care and treatment of Patient A
2 and Patient B;

3 b. Respondent committed repeated negligent acts in the care and treatment of
4 Patient A and Patient B; and

5 c. Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records for Patient A and
6 Patient B.

7 5. Respondent is liable to the Board for the cost of investigation and enforcement in the
8 amount of twenty-four thousand, seven hundred and forty-six dollars (\$24,746.00).

9 **DISCIPLINARY ORDER**

10 IT IS SO ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335, heretofore
11 issued to Respondent George William Wilson, M.D., is revoked. Respondent George William
12 Wilson M.D., is ordered to pay the Board the costs of the investigation and enforcement of this
13 case in the amount of \$24,746.00.

14 If Respondent ever files an application for relicensure or reinstatement in the State of
15 California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked license.
16 Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations, and procedures for reinstatement of a
17 revoked license in effect at the time the petition is filed.

18 Respondent is ordered to reimburse the Board the amount of \$24,746.00 for its
19 investigative and enforcement costs. The filing of bankruptcy by Respondent shall not relieve
20 Respondent of his responsibility to reimburse the Board for its costs. Respondent's Physician's
21 and Surgeon's Certificate may not be renewed or reinstated unless all costs ordered under
22 Business and Professions Code section 125.3 have been paid.

23 Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a
24 written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within
25 seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on SEP 22 2023

It is so ORDERED AUG 23 2023

JENNA JONES FOR
Reji Varghese, Executive Director
FOR THE MEDICAL BOARD OF
CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

LA2023600017
84061051.docx

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 CHRISTINE A. RHEE
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 295656
600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
5 San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
6 San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 738-9455
7 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061

8 *Attorneys for Complainant*

9
10 **BEFORE THE**
MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
11 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12
13 In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation
Against:

Case No. 800-2021-074116

14 **GEORGE WILLIAM WILSON, M.D.**
15 **72-780 Country Club Drive, Building B,**
Suite 205A
16 **Rancho Mirage, CA 92270**

FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION

17 **Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate**
18 **No. G 10335,**

19 Respondent.

20
21 **PARTIES**

22 1. Reji Verghese (Complainant) brings this First Amended Accusation solely in his
23 official capacity as the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of California,
24 Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).

25 2. On or about December 21, 1964, the Medical Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's
26 Certificate No. G 10335 to George William Wilson, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and
27 Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought
28 herein and will expire on December 31, 2023, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

1
2 3. This First Amended Accusation, which supersedes the Accusation filed on March 15,
3 2023, is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following laws. All section
4 references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

5 4. Section 2227 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

6 (a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of
7 the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government
8 Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered
9 into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the
10 provisions of this chapter:

11 (1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.

12 (2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one
13 year upon order of the board.

14 (3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation
15 monitoring upon order of the board.

16 (4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a
17 requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the
18 board.

19 (5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of
20 probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

21 ...

22 5. Section 2234 of the Code, states, in pertinent part:

23 The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with
24 unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional
25 conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

26 ...

27 (b) Gross negligence.

28 (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

1 not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the
2 licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure
3 constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.

3 ...

4 6. Section 2266 of the Code states that the failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain
5 adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes
6 unprofessional conduct.

7 COST RECOVERY

8 7. Section 125.3 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

9 (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a
10 disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the
11 Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the
12 administrative law judge may direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or
13 violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the
14 investigation and enforcement of the case.

13 (b) In the case of a disciplined licensee that is a corporation or a partnership, the
14 order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.

14 (c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where
15 actual costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its
16 designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of
17 investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of
18 investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not
19 limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.

18 (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount
19 of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested
20 pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to
21 costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may
22 reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the
23 proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision
24 (a).

22 (e) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as
23 directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any
24 appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights
25 the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.

24 (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be
25 conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.

26 (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or
27 reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered
28 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

1 licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement
2 with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid
costs.

3 (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement
4 for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs
to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.

5 (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of
6 the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.

7 ...

8 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**
9 **(Gross Negligence)**

10 8. Respondent has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335 to
11 disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (b), of
12 the Code, in that he committed gross negligence in his care and treatment of Patients A and B,¹ as
more particularly alleged hereafter:

13 **Patient A**

14 9. In or around December 2020, Patient A, an 85-year old male, was an established
15 patient of Respondent, a primary care physician. Patient A had a history of heart disease that was
16 known to Respondent. On or about December 9, 2020, Patient A's wife spoke to Respondent on
17 the phone. She told Respondent that she and her husband had tested positive for COVID-19. At
18 that time, due to the pandemic, Respondent was not seeing COVID-19 patients in person. Patient
19 A's wife told Respondent that Patient A was having breathing issues. Respondent issued
20 prescriptions for azithromycin² and hydroxychloroquine³ to treat Patient A.

21 ///

22 _____
23 ¹ The patients' names have been omitted to protect their privacy.

24 ² Azithromycin, brand name Zithromax, is an antibiotic, with known adverse reactions for
patients with cardiovascular disease.

25 ³ Hydroxychloroquine, brand name Plaquenil, is a medication used to treat malaria and
26 lupus. On or about March 28, 2020, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued an
Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) permitting licensed practitioners to prescribe
27 hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19 in adolescent and adult patients who weigh 50 kilograms
or more, are hospitalized for COVID-19, and for whom a clinical trial is not available or
28 participation is not feasible. On or about June 15, 2020, the FDA revoked the EUA for
hydroxychloroquine because it was no longer reasonable to believe that the medication may be
effective in treating COVID-19, nor was it reasonable to believe that the known potential benefits
of this medication outweigh the known and potential risks.

1 10. On or about December 11, 2020, Respondent faxed the azithromycin and
2 hydroxychloroquine prescriptions to a pharmacy. In response to Respondent's faxed
3 prescriptions, a pharmacist informed Respondent that she would not fill the prescriptions for
4 Patient A because hydroxychloroquine did not benefit most patients and had negative side effects.
5 Shortly thereafter, Respondent contacted another pharmacy, which filled the azithromycin and
6 hydroxychloroquine prescriptions for Patient A without incident.

7 11. On or about December 14, 2020, Patient A went to the hospital for low oxygen
8 saturation and dehydration. In the emergency department, after Patient A's oxygen levels
9 improved, he went home.

10 12. On or about December 16, 2020, Patient A's wife called Respondent and reported
11 that Patient A's oxygen levels were decreasing. On or about the same day, Patient A was
12 admitted to the hospital for acute respiratory failure with hypoxia secondary to COVID-19
13 pneumonia and cardiac ischemia. At admission, Patient A's oxygen saturation was in the mid-
14 eighties. At the hospital, Patient A was given supportive therapies. On or about December 26,
15 2020, given Patient A's poor prognosis, his family elected to pursue comfort measures at home.
16 Patient A died on or about December 27, 2020.

17 13. Respondent committed gross negligence in his care and treatment of Patient A which
18 includes, but is not limited to, the following:

19 a. Respondent inappropriately prescribed hydroxychloroquine and/or
20 azithromycin to Patient A, putting Patient A at risk for a serious adverse event or death; and

21 b. Respondent failed to document and/or failed to properly store medical records
22 pertaining to his telephone encounter to treat Patient A for COVID-19, prescribe
23 medications to treat COVID-19, and discuss the risks and benefits of prescribing these high
24 risk medications off-label.

25 **Patient B**

26 14. In or around December 2020, Patient B, a 72-year old female, was an established
27 patient of Respondent. Patient B was Patient A's wife. Patient B had a history of cardiac
28 conduction delay and hypokalemia that was known to Respondent. On or about December 9,

1 2020, Patient B spoke to Respondent on the phone. She told Respondent that her husband,
2 Patient A, had tested positive for COVID-19, and that both she and her husband were
3 experiencing symptoms. At that time, due to the pandemic, Respondent was not seeing COVID-
4 19 patients in person. Respondent issued prescriptions for azithromycin and hydroxychloroquine
5 to treat Patient B.

6 15. On or about December 11, 2020, Respondent sent prescriptions for azithromycin and
7 hydroxychloroquine to a pharmacy for Patient B. Patient B received the prescribed medications
8 on or about December 12, 2020.

9 16. Respondent committed gross negligence in his care and treatment of Patient B which
10 includes, but is not limited to, the following:

11 a. Respondent inappropriately prescribed hydroxychloroquine and/or
12 azithromycin to Patient B, putting Patient B at risk for a serious adverse event or death; and

13 b. Respondent failed to document and/or failed to properly store medical records
14 pertaining to his telephone encounter to treat Patient B for COVID-19, prescribe
15 medications to treat COVID-19, and discuss the risks and benefits of prescribing these high
16 risk medications off-label.

17 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**
18 **(Repeated Negligent Acts)**

19 17. Respondent has further subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate
20 No. G 10335 to disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234,
21 subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he committed repeated negligent acts in his care and
22 treatment of Patients A and B, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 9 through 16, above,
23 which are hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

24 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**
25 **(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records)**

26 18. Respondent has further subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate
27 No. G 10335 to disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2266, of
28 the Code, in that he failed to maintain adequate and accurate records in his care and treatment of

1 Patients A and B, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 9 through 17, above, which are
2 hereby incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

3 **PRAYER**

4 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
5 and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision:

6 1. Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 10335, issued
7 to Respondent George William Wilson, M.D.;

8 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent George William Wilson,
9 M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;

10 3. Ordering Respondent George William Wilson, M.D., to pay the Board the costs of the
11 investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of probation
12 monitoring; and

13 4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

14
15 DATED: MAY 01 2023



16 REJI VERGHESE
17 Interim Executive Director
18 Medical Board of California
19 Department of Consumer Affairs
20 State of California
21 *Complainant*

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
LA2023600017
83925016.docx