# BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

On-Tat Lee, M.D.

Physician's & Surgeon's Certificate No. A 138659

Case No. 800-2019-057909

Respondent.

# **DECISION**

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on October 20, 2023.

IT IS SO ORDERED: September 20, 2023.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Laurie Rose Lubiano, J.D., Chair Panel A

1	ROB BONTA		
2	Attorney General of California ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JANNSEN TAN		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 237826		
	1300 I Street, Suite 125	·	
5	P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550		
6	Telephone: (916) 210-7549 Facsimile: (916) 327-2247		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFOR	E THE	
9	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11			
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-057909	
13		OAH No. 2022090208	
14	ON-TAT LEE, M.D. 139 S. Vista Hermosa St. Mayortain House, CA 95391 2088		
15	Mountain House, CA 95391-2088	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER	
16	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 138659		
17	Respondent.		
18			
19			
20			
21	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-		
22	entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:		
23	PARTIES		
24	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) is the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board		
25	of California (Board). He brought this action solely in his official capacity and is represented in		
26	this matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California, by Jannsen Tan, Deputy		
27	Attorney General.		
28	111		
_0	•	1	

- 2. Respondent On-Tat Lee, M.D. (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by attorney Matthew A. Brinegar, Esq., whose address is: Medical Arts Building 2000 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 512, San Francisco, CA 94109.
- 3. On or about October 2, 2015, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 138659 to On-Tat Lee, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 800-2019-057909, and will expire on January 31, 2025, unless renewed.

## **JURISDICTION**

- 4. Accusation No. 800-2019-057909 was filed before the Board, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on July 12, 2022. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.
- 5. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2019-057909 is attached as exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

# ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 6. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2019-057909. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with his counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 7. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 8. Having had the benefit of counsel, Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

28 | ///

22.

2.7

# **CULPABILITY**

- 9. Respondent understands and agrees that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2019-057909, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate.
- 10. Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a prima facie case or factual basis for the charges in the Accusation, and that Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest those charges.
- 11. Respondent does not contest that, at an administrative hearing, Complainant could establish a prima facie case with respect to the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2019-057909, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and that he has thereby subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate, No. A 138659 to disciplinary action.
- 12. Respondent agrees that his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate is subject to discipline and he agrees to be bound by the Board's imposition of discipline as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

## RESERVATION

13. The admissions made by Respondent herein are only for the purposes of this proceeding, or any other proceedings in which the Medical Board of California or other professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be admissible in any other criminal or civil proceeding.

# **CONTINGENCY**

14. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Medical Board of California. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Medical Board of California may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by Respondent or his counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal

action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.

### ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

- 15. This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is intended by the parties herein to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of the agreements of the parties in the above-listed matter.
- 16. The parties agree that copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, including copies of the signatures of the parties, may be used in lieu of original documents and signatures and, further, that such copies shall have the same force and effect as originals.
- 17. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or opportunity to be heard by the Respondent, issue and enter the following Disciplinary Order:

## **DISCIPLINARY ORDER**

# A. PUBLIC REPRIMAND

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 138659 issued to Respondent On-Tat Lee, M.D., shall be and is hereby publicly reprimanded pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, section 2227, subdivision (a) (4). This public reprimand, which is issued in connection Respondent's care and treatment of Patients A and B, as set forth in Accusation No. 800-2019-057909, is as follows:

"Respondent failed to select cases during his proctorship appropriate to his level of training."

B. EDUCATION COURSE Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board or its designee for its prior approval, educational program(s) or course(s) which shall not be less than 40 hours, in addition to the 25 hours required for license renewal. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be aimed at correcting any areas of deficient practice or knowledge and shall be Category I certified. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure. Following the

completion of each course, the Board or its designee may administer an examination to test Respondent's knowledge of the course. Within 12 months of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 65 hours of CME of which 40 hours were in satisfaction of this condition.

Failure to successfully complete and provide proof of attendance to the Board or its designee of the educational program(s) or course(s) within 12 months of the effective date of this Decision, unless the Board or its designee agrees in writing to an extension of time, shall constitute general unprofessional conduct and may serve as the grounds for further disciplinary action.

E. INVESTIGATION/ENFORCEMENT COST RECOVERY. Respondent is hereby ordered to reimburse the Board its costs of investigation and enforcement, including, but not limited to, expert review, legal reviews, and investigation and other costs, in the amount of \$28,706.50 (twenty eight thousand seven hundred six dollars and fifty cents). Costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of California. Failure to pay such costs shall be considered unprofessional conduct and may serve as the grounds for further disciplinary action.

Payment must be made in full within 365 calendar days of the effective date of the Order, or by a payment plan approved by the Medical Board of California. Any and all requests for a payment plan shall be submitted in writing by Respondent to the Board. Failure to comply with the payment plan shall be considered unprofessional conduct and may serve as the grounds for further disciplinary action.

The filing of bankruptcy by Respondent shall not relieve Respondent of the responsibility to repay investigation and enforcement costs, including expert review costs.

/// 111 ///

26 ///

27 /// 28

111

### **ACCEPTANCE** I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully 2 discussed it with my attorney, Matthew A. Brinegar, Esq. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated 4 Settlement and Disciplinary Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be 5 bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California. 6 7 8 ON-TAT LEE, M.D. 9 Respondent I have read and fully discussed with Respondent On-Tat Lee, M.D., the terms and 10 conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. 11 12 I approve its form and content. 5-11-23 DATED: 13 MATTHEW A. BRINEGAR, ESQ. 14 Attorney for Respondent 15 **ENDORSEMENT** 16 The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully 17 submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California. 18 19 5/12/2023 Respectfully submitted, DATED: 20 ROB BONTA 21 Attorney General of California ALEXANDRA M. ALVAREZ 22 Supervising Deputy Attorney General 23 24 JANNSEN TAN Deputy Attorney General 25 Attorneys for Complainant

1

3

26

27

28

STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER (800-2019-057909)

(Accusation No. 800-2019-057909)

	, • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	
1	ROB BONTA		
2	Attorney General of California STEVEN D. MUNI		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JANNSEN TAN	•	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 237826		
5	1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255		
6	Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7549		
7	Facsimile: (916) 327-2247 Attorneys for Complainant		
8	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
9	BEFORE THE		
10	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11		•	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-057909	
13	ON-TAT LEE, M.D.	ACCUSATION	
14	139 S. Vista Hermosa St. Mountain House, CA 95391-2088		
15	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate		
16	No. A 138659,		
17	Respondent.		
18		•	
19	·		
20	PAR'	PARTIES	
21	1. William Prasifka (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity		
22	as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs		
23	(Board).		
24	2. On or about October 2, 2015, the Medical Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's		
25	Certificate Number A 138659 to On-Tat Lee, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon'		
26	Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will		
27			
28	expire on January 31, 2023, unless renewed.		

(ON-TAT LEE, M.D.) ACCUSATION NO. 800-2019-057909

### **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.

### COST RECOVERY

6. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to 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, with failure of the licensee to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

# FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Respondent is a physician and surgeon who was employed by The Permanente Medical Group (TPMG) in Santa Rosa, CA, at all times alleged herein.
- 8. On or about June 3, 2019, TPMG limited Respondent's surgery privileges on concerns that his surgical complication rate was higher than normal and based on proctor reports for the six surgeries performed on five patients. On all five proctor reports, Respondent was found to not possess the surgical skills to meet the standard of care.
  - 9. On or about July 2, 2019, Respondent resigned from TPMG.

10. Patient A was an 86-year-old-female who presented with visually significant cataract on the right eye, causing difficulty with activities of daily living. She was the fourth patient treated by Respondent under proctorship. Her eye examination indicated that she had pseudoexfoliation, which is a bilateral generic condition causing weak lens zonules and an increased risk of complications during cataract surgery.

- 11. On or about May 21, 2019, Patient A underwent surgery. Respondent was the primary surgeon, and Dr. GY was the proctor. Operating room logs reveal that the surgery started at 2:16 pm and ended at 5:03 pm.
- 12. The operative report indicated that a lid speculum was placed in the eye, and a paracentesis was made temporally. Sugarcane solution was then placed in the anterior chamber. Viscoat was injected into the anterior chamber. A clear corneal incision was made temporally using a 2.75 keratome. A cystitome and Utrata forceps were used to complete a continuous curvilinear capsulorrhexis. Balanced saline solution was used to hydrodisect and hydrodelineate the lens. Phacoemulsification handpiece was brought into the eye and the lens removal was begun.
- 13. A zonalur dehiscence occurred, requiring the placement of capsular tension rings. Shortly thereafter, a posterior capsular tear was noted, with dislocation of some lens fragments, which required an anterior vitrectomy, enlargement of the incision, and implantation of an anterior chamber lens. These complications necessitated a second surgery to remove the lens fragments. Respondent felt that his performance was negatively influenced by the lack of instruments that he was familiar with.
- 14. In his report dated May 22, 2019, Dr. GY gave Respondent a satisfactory rating on his performance, despite the complications and an unsatisfactory rating on his surgical skills.

  Dr. GY wrote:

Patient names are withheld to protect patient confidentiality, and will be produced to Respondent in Discovery.

"1. Surgeon satisfied indication for procedure, documentation, time out, diagnosis, and communication. However, there seemed to be a lack of manual dexterity to complete the case in a safe and efficient manner. The phaco and nuclear (sic) was insufficient which led to the complications that were next.

"The case was a difficult surgery. Observation of the surgeon showed rough handling of the tissue that resulted in complications for this patient.

There was a general uneasiness observing the surgeon operate.

"This case was complex surgery better suited for a senior surgeon. I think that if the surgeon recognized the complexity, the complication could have been avoided. If this surgeon were to continue to operate, easy cases should be started and not complex surgery."

# Patient B

- 15. Patient B was a 65-year-old female who presented for left eye age related cataract surgery on May 22, 2019. Patient B was the fifth and last patient treated by Respondent under proctorship. Patient B complained of difficulties with activities of daily living secondary to decreased vision. Respondent was the primary surgeon, and Dr. YL, was the proctor.
- 16. The operative report indicated that a lid speculum was placed in the eye, and a paracentesis was made temporally. Lidocaine/phenylephrine was injected into the anterior chamber. Viscoat was injected into the anterior chamber. A clear corneal incision was made temporally using a 2.75 keratome. A cystitome and Utrata forceps were used to complete a continuous curvilinear capsulorrhexis. BSS was used to hydrodisect and hydrodelineate the lens. A Phacoemulsification handpiece was brought into the eye and lens was sculpted. While rotating the lens, a posterior capsule tear occurred, causing dislocation of the lens posteriorly into the vitreous, and necessitating an anterior vitrectomy. The operative report also indicated that a 3-piece posterior chamber lens was also opened.

- 17. In a second subsequent surgery to remove the lens fragments, the vitreoretinal surgeon's operative note confirmed that the posterior chamber lens was used.
- 18. Dr. YL wrote his proctor report dated June 4, 2019. Dr. YL wrote, "1. Intraoperative: complication (broken posterior capsule with lens dropping to the vitreous cavity) 2. Cataract surgery skill is not adequate. 3. Not ready to perform surgery independently." Respondent felt that his performance was negatively influenced by the lack of instruments he was more familiar with.

# <u>CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE</u> (Repeated Negligent Acts and Lack of Knowledge)

- 19. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he committed repeated negligent acts and had a lack of knowledge in his care and treatment of Patients A and B. The circumstances are set forth in paragraphs 7 through 18 above, which are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth. Additional circumstances are as follows:
- 20. Respondent committed repeated negligent acts and possessed a lack of knowledge which included, but was not limited to the following:
  - A. Respondent lacked manual dexterity and skill in the treatment of Patient A.
  - B. Respondent lacked manual dexterity and skill in the treatment of Patient B.
- C. Respondent lacked the level of surgical skills that a residency trained ophthalmologist ordinarily possesses.

### PRAYER

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

- 1. Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 138659, issued to On-Tat Lee, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of On-Tat Lee, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;