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

Case No.: 800-2019-059670

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D.

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796

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 February 28, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED: January 29, 2024.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Laurie Rose Lubiano, J.D., Chair

Panel A

, S

1	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California		
2	MICHAEL C. BRUMMEL Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
3	State Bar No. 236116		
4	2550 Mariposa Mall, Room 5090 Fresno, CA 93721		
5	Telephone: (559) 705-2307 E-mail: Michael.Brummel@doj.ca.gov		
6	Attorneys for Complainant		
7	BEFOR		
8	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
9	STATE OF C.	ALIFORNIA	
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-059670	
12	JASON PAUL HELLIWELL, M.D. 8501 Brimhall Road #300	OAH No. 2023040838	
13	Bakersfield, CA 93312	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796	DISCH LINARY ORDER	
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	In the interest of a prompt and speedy settle	ment of this matter, consistent with the public	
18	interest and the responsibility of the Medical Boar	rd of California of the Department of Consumer	
19	Affairs, the parties hereby agree to the following	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order	
20	which will be submitted to the Board for approval	and adoption as the final disposition of the	
21	Accusation.		
22	PART	<u> FIES</u>	
23	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) is the E	xecutive Director of the Medical Board of	
24	California (Board). He brought this action solely	in his official capacity and is represented in this	
25	matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the Sta	te of California, by Michael C. Brummel,	
26	Supervising Deputy Attorney General.		
27	111		
28	111		
		1	

- 2. Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by attorney Derek F. O'Reilly-Jones, Esq., whose address is: 355 South Grand Ave., Ste. 1750, Los Angeles, CA 90071-1562.
- 3. On or about June 1, 2001, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796 to Jason Paul Helliwell, 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. 800-2019-059670, and will expire on April 30, 2025, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

- 4. Accusation No. 800-2019-059670 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 September 12, 2022. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.
- 5. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2019-059670 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. 800-2019-059670. 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. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

- 9. Respondent understands and agrees that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2019-059670, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate.
- 10. 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. 800-2019-059670, 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 74796 to disciplinary action.
- 11. Respondent agrees that his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate is subject to discipline and he agrees to be bound by the Board's probationary terms as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

RESERVATION

12. 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

13. 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.

- 14. Respondent agrees that if he ever petitions for early termination or modification of probation, or if an accusation and/or petition to revoke probation is filed against him before the Board, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 800-2019-059670 shall be deemed true, correct and fully admitted by respondent for purposes of any such proceeding or any other licensing proceeding involving Respondent in the State of California.
- 15. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, including PDF and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 16. 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

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796 issued to Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and Respondent is placed on probation for five (5) years on the following terms and conditions:

1. MEDICAL RECORD KEEPING COURSE. Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a course in medical record keeping approved in advance by the Board or its designee. Respondent shall provide the approved course provider with any information and documents that the approved course provider may deem pertinent. Respondent shall participate in and successfully complete the classroom component of the course not later than six (6) months after Respondent's initial enrollment. Respondent shall successfully complete any other component of the course within one (1) year of enrollment. The medical record keeping course shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A medical record keeping course taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Board or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the course would have been approved by the Board or its designee had the course been taken after the effective date of

4

5

6 7

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Board or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

2. PROFESSIONALISM PROGRAM (ETHICS COURSE). Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a professionalism program, that meets the requirements of Title 16, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1358.1. Respondent shall participate in and successfully complete that program. Respondent shall provide any information and documents that the program may deem pertinent. Respondent shall successfully complete the classroom component of the program not later than six (6) months after Respondent's initial enrollment, and the longitudinal component of the program not later than the time specified by the program, but no later than one (1) year after attending the classroom component. The professionalism program shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A professionalism program taken after the acts that gave rise to the charges in the Accusation, but prior to the effective date of the Decision may, in the sole discretion of the Board or its designee, be accepted towards the fulfillment of this condition if the program would have been approved by the Board or its designee had the program been taken after the effective date of this Decision.

Respondent shall submit a certification of successful completion to the Board or its designee not later than 15 calendar days after successfully completing the program or not later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

3. MONITORING - BILLING. Within 30 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board or its designee for prior approval as a billing monitor(s), the name and qualifications of one or more licensed physicians and surgeons whose licenses are valid and in good standing, and who are preferably American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) certified. A monitor shall have no prior or current business or personal relationship with Respondent, or other relationship that could reasonably be expected to

compromise the ability of the monitor to render fair and unbiased reports to the Board, including but not limited to any form of bartering, shall be in Respondent's field of practice, and must agree to serve as Respondent's monitor. Respondent shall pay all monitoring costs.

The Board or its designee shall provide the approved monitor with copies of the Decision(s) and Accusation(s), and a proposed monitoring plan. Within 15 calendar days of receipt of the Decision(s), Accusation(s), and proposed monitoring plan, the monitor shall submit a signed statement that the monitor has read the Decision(s) and Accusation(s), fully understands the role of a monitor, and agrees or disagrees with the proposed monitoring plan. If the monitor disagrees with the proposed monitoring plan with the signed statement for approval by the Board or its designee.

Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, and continuing throughout probation, Respondent's billing monitor shall be monitored by the approved monitor.

Respondent shall make all records available for immediate inspection and copying on the premises by the monitor at all times during business hours and shall retain the records for the entire term of probation.

If Respondent fails to obtain approval of a monitor within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall receive a notification from the Board or its designee to cease the practice of medicine within three (3) calendar days after being so notified. Respondent shall cease the practice of medicine until a monitor is approved to provide monitoring responsibility.

The monitor(s) shall submit a quarterly written report to the Board or its designee which includes an evaluation of Respondent's performance, indicating whether Respondent's practices are within the standards of practice of billing, and whether Respondent is practicing medicine safely, billing appropriately or both. It shall be the sole responsibility of Respondent to ensure that the monitor submits the quarterly written reports to the Board or its designee within 10 calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

If the monitor resigns or is no longer available, Respondent shall, within 5 calendar days of such resignation or unavailability, submit to the Board or its designee, for prior approval, the

name and qualifications of a replacement monitor who will be assuming that responsibility within 15 calendar days. If Respondent fails to obtain approval of a replacement monitor within 60 calendar days of the resignation or unavailability of the monitor, Respondent shall receive a notification from the Board or its designee to cease the practice of medicine within three (3) calendar days after being so notified. Respondent shall cease the practice of medicine until a replacement monitor is approved and assumes monitoring responsibility.

In lieu of a monitor, Respondent may participate in a professional enhancement program approved in advance by the Board or its designee that includes, at minimum, quarterly chart review, semi-annual practice assessment, and semi-annual review of professional growth and education. Respondent shall participate in the professional enhancement program at Respondent's expense during the term of probation.

4. <u>PROHIBITED PRACTICE</u>. During probation, Respondent is prohibited from owning or operating a laboratory testing service. After the effective date of this Decision, all patients being treated by the Respondent shall be notified that the Respondent is prohibited from owning or operating a laboratory testing service. Any new patients must be provided this notification at the time of their initial appointment.

Respondent shall maintain a log of all patients to whom the required oral notification was made. The log shall contain the: 1) patient's name, address and phone number; 2) patient's medical record number, if available; 3) the full name of the person making the notification; 4) the date the notification was made; and 5) a description of the notification given. Respondent shall keep this log in a separate file or ledger, in chronological order, shall make the log available for immediate inspection and copying on the premises at all times during business hours by the Board or its designee, and shall retain the log for the entire term of probation.

5. <u>NOTIFICATION</u>. Within seven (7) days of the effective date of this Decision, the Respondent shall provide a true copy of this Decision and Accusation to the Chief of Staff or the Chief Executive Officer at every hospital where privileges or membership are extended to Respondent, at any other facility where Respondent engages in the practice of medicine, including all physician and locum tenens registries or other similar agencies, and to the Chief

Executive Officer at every insurance carrier which extends malpractice insurance coverage to Respondent. Respondent shall submit proof of compliance to the Board or its designee within 15 calendar days.

This condition shall apply to any change(s) in hospitals, other facilities or insurance carrier.

- 6. <u>OBEY ALL LAWS</u>. Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, all rules governing the practice of medicine in California and remain in full compliance with any court ordered criminal probation, payments, and other orders.
- 7. <u>INVESTIGATION/ENFORCEMENT COST RECOVERY</u>. Respondent is hereby ordered to reimburse the Board its costs of investigation and enforcement, including, but not limited to, expert review, amended accusations, legal reviews, investigation(s), and subpoena enforcement, as applicable, in the amount of \$45,000 (forty-five thousand dollars). Costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of California. Failure to pay such costs shall be considered a violation of probation.

Payment must be made in full within 30 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 a violation of probation.

The filing of bankruptcy by respondent shall not relieve respondent of the responsibility to repay investigation and enforcement costs, including expert review costs (if applicable).

8. QUARTERLY DECLARATIONS. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Board, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations not later than 10 calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

GENERAL PROBATION REQUIREMENTS.

Compliance with Probation Unit

Respondent shall comply with the Board's probation unit.

Address Changes

Respondent shall, at all times, keep the Board informed of Respondent's business and residence addresses, email address (if available), and telephone number. Changes of such addresses shall be immediately communicated in writing to the Board or its designee. Under no circumstances shall a post office box serve as an address of record, except as allowed by Business and Professions Code section 2021, subdivision (b).

Place of Practice

Respondent shall not engage in the practice of medicine in Respondent's or patient's place of residence, unless the patient resides in a skilled nursing facility or other similar licensed facility.

License Renewal

Respondent shall maintain a current and renewed California physician's and surgeon's license.

Travel or Residence Outside California

Respondent shall immediately inform the Board or its designee, in writing, of travel to any areas outside the jurisdiction of California which lasts, or is contemplated to last, more than thirty (30) calendar days.

In the event Respondent should leave the State of California to reside or to practice Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing 30 calendar days prior to the dates of departure and return.

- 10. <u>INTERVIEW WITH THE BOARD OR ITS DESIGNEE</u>. Respondent shall be available in person upon request for interviews either at Respondent's place of business or at the probation unit office, with or without prior notice throughout the term of probation.
- 11. <u>NON-PRACTICE WHILE ON PROBATION</u>. Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing within 15 calendar days of any periods of non-practice lasting more than 30 calendar days and within 15 calendar days of Respondent's return to practice. Non-practice is defined as any period of time Respondent is not practicing medicine as defined in Business and Professions Code sections 2051 and 2052 for at least 40 hours in a calendar month in direct

patient care, clinical activity or teaching, or other activity as approved by the Board. If Respondent resides in California and is considered to be in non-practice, Respondent shall comply with all terms and conditions of probation. All time spent in an intensive training program which has been approved by the Board or its designee shall not be considered non-practice and does not relieve Respondent from complying with all the terms and conditions of probation. Practicing medicine in another state of the United States or Federal jurisdiction while on probation with the medical licensing authority of that state or jurisdiction shall not be considered non-practice. A Board-ordered suspension of practice shall not be considered as a period of non-practice.

In the event Respondent's period of non-practice while on probation exceeds 18 calendar months, Respondent shall successfully complete the Federation of State Medical Boards Special Purpose Examination, or, at the Board's discretion, a clinical competence assessment program that meets the criteria of Condition 18 of the current version of the Board's "Manual of Model Disciplinary Orders and Disciplinary Guidelines" prior to resuming the practice of medicine.

Respondent's period of non-practice while on probation shall not exceed two (2) years.

Periods of non-practice will not apply to the reduction of the probationary term.

Periods of non-practice for a Respondent residing outside of California will relieve Respondent of the responsibility to comply with the probationary terms and conditions with the exception of this condition and the following terms and conditions of probation: Obey All Laws; General Probation Requirements; Quarterly Declarations; Abstain from the Use of Alcohol and/or Controlled Substances; and Biological Fluid Testing..

obligations (e.g., restitution, probation costs) not later than 120 calendar days prior to the completion of probation. This term does not include cost recovery, which is due within 30 calendar days of the effective date of the Order, or by a payment plan approved by the Medical Board and timely satisfied. Upon successful completion of probation, Respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.

- 13. <u>VIOLATION OF PROBATION</u>. Failure to fully comply with any term or condition of probation is a violation of probation. If Respondent violates probation in any respect, the Board, after giving Respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an Accusation, or Petition to Revoke Probation, or an Interim Suspension Order is filed against Respondent during probation, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- 14. <u>LICENSE SURRENDER</u>. Following the effective date of this Decision, if
 Respondent ceases practicing due to retirement or health reasons or is otherwise unable to satisfy
 the terms and conditions of probation, Respondent may request to surrender his or her license.
 The Board reserves the right to evaluate Respondent's request and to exercise its discretion in
 determining whether or not to grant the request, or to take any other action deemed appropriate
 and reasonable under the circumstances. Upon formal acceptance of the surrender, Respondent
 shall within 15 calendar days deliver Respondent's wallet and wall certificate to the Board or its
 designee and Respondent shall no longer practice medicine. Respondent will no longer be subject
 to the terms and conditions of probation. If Respondent re-applies for a medical license, the
 application shall be treated as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked certificate.
- 15. PROBATION MONITORING COSTS. Respondent shall pay the costs associated with probation monitoring each and every year of probation, as designated by the Board, which may be adjusted on an annual basis. Such costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of California and delivered to the Board or its designee no later than January 31 of each calendar year.
- 16. <u>FUTURE ADMISSIONS CLAUSE</u>. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license, by any other health care licensing action agency in the State of California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 800-2019-059670 shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict license.

1	Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or	
2	restrict license.	
3	<u>ACCEPTANCE</u>	
4	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully	
5	discussed it with my attorney, Derek F. O'Reilly-Jones, Esq. I understand the stipulation and the	
6	effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated	
7	Settlement and Disciplinary Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be	
8	bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.	
9	DATED:	
10	JASON PAUL HELLIWELL, M.D. Respondent	
11	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. the terms and	
12	conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.	
13	I approve its form and content.	
14	DATED:	
15	DEREK F. O'REILLY-JONES, ESQ. Attorney for Respondent	
16		
17	ENDORSEMENT	
18	The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully	
19	submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California.	
20	DATED: October 23, 2023 Respectfully submitted,	
21	ROB BONTA	
22	Attorney General of California STEVE DIEHL	
23	Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
24	MerBul	
25	MICHAEL C. BRUMMEL	
26	Supervising Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant	
27	FR2021304646	
28	95519841	
	l 12	

1	ACCEPTANCE
2	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully
3	discussed it with my attorney, Derek F. O'Reilly-Jones, Esq. I understand the stipulation and the
4	effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated
5	Settlement and Disciplinary Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be
6	bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.
7	DATED: (v 23)23
8	JASON PAUL HELLIWELL, M.D. Respondent
9	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. the terms and
10	conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Orde
11	I approve its form and content.
12	DATED: W 23 W23 DEREK F. O'REILLY-JONES, ESO
13	Attorney for Respondent
14	
15	<u>ENDORSEMENT</u>
16	The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully
17	submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California.
18	DATED: Respectfully submitted,
19	ROB BONTA
20	Attorney General of California STEVE DIEHL
21	Supervising Deputy Attorney General
22	
23	MICHAEL C. BRUMMEL
24	Supervising Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant
25	FR2021304646
26	95519841
27	
28	
	. 12

	II		
1	ROB BONTA		
2	Attorney General of California STEVE DIEHL Supervising Deputy Attorney General MICHAEL C. BRUMMEL Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 236116 California Department of Justice 2550 Mariposa Mall, Room 5090		
3			
4			
5			
6	Fresno, CÂ 93721 Telephone: (559) 705-2307		
7	Facsimile: (559) 445-5106 E-mail: Michael.Brummel@doj.ca.gov		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	DEFO.	RE THE	
10	MEDICAL BOARD	OF CALIFORNIA	
11	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFÀIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12			
	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-059670	
13	Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D.	ACCUSATION	
14 15	8501 Brimhall Road #300 Bakersfield, CA 93312	A C C C S II I C I	
16	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796,		
17	Respondent.		
18			
19			
20	<u>PAR</u>	<u>TIES</u>	
21	1. William Prasifka (Complainant) brin	gs this Accusation solely in his official capacity	
22	as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of	of California, Department of Consumer Affairs	
23	(Board).		
24	2. On or about June 1, 2001, the Medic	al Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's	
25	Certificate No. A 74796 to Jason Paul Helliwell,	M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and	
26	Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect	at all times relevant to the charges brought	
27	herein and will expire on April 30, 2023, unless renewed.		
28	111		
	1		

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.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 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 provision 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."

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 2266 of the Code states: 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.

COST RECOVERY

7. 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

- 8. At all times relevant to this Accusation, Respondent practiced as an OB-GYN. Respondent practiced out of an office known as Advanced Women's Health Center / Advanced Health Group. In addition to offering typical OB-GYN services, Respondent began to offer additional laboratory tests for his patients within his own office that generated additional revenue for his practice. Respondent purchased the Hitachi CLA-1 machine in 2014, that allowed him to perform allergy tests in his own office. Later, Respondent purchased a new machine known as the EXCELTOX, which allowed him to conduce urine toxicology tests within his own practice. In the following years, Respondent ordered that patients undergo many laboratory tests at his own office for allergy testing, HgA1c, urine analysis, lipid testing, toxicology testing, mercury and lead testing, and cystic fibrosis testing. Respondent subsequently billed insurance companies for the laboratory work performed, even when the patient may not have needed or consented to the procedure. The fees for processing those labs were billable and served as a source of significant additional revenue for the practice.
- 9. On or about October 3, 2019, a First Amended Felony Complaint was filed against Respondent and two others in Kern County Superior Court Case No. 16FX011775. The Felony Complaint alleges that Respondent committed multiple acts of insurance fraud in excess of \$100,000 relating to billing for testing performed at his medical office. The Felony Complaint remains pending at this time.

CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO PATIENT A1

10. On or about January 21, 2019, Patient A presented to Respondent as a new prenatal patient at 24 years old. Patient A was gravida 2, para 1, pregnant at 7 weeks and 6 days gestational age. Patient A's history included bipolar disease and anxiety, for which she was taking lithium and Seroquel. Respondent recommended that she stop taking her medications immediately, and begin taking Zoloft in their place. Respondent documented "potential track"

¹ To protect the privacy of patients, the Accusation does not identify individual names.

marks" on her extremities, but in social history only wrote "no." The records indicate that Patient A had a family history of diabetes, heart disease, and Lupus. The assessment noted that Patient A had a history of bipolar disease and potential drug use. Respondent's documented plan included urine cultures, toxicology, gonorrhea, and chlamydia, as well as prenatal labs and allergy testing due to a history of asthma. Respondent did not document any history of asthma in the medical problems section of the medical record, but simply wrote "asthma." The records do not indicate whether Patient A suffered from intermittent, mild persistent, moderate persistent, or severe persistent asthma, whether it was well controlled, or if she was taking medications for her asthma. Patient A underwent allergy testing at Respondent's clinic the same day, and her allergy test results returned within normal limits. The records note that Patient A declined the Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program (CPSP). Respondent ordered standard prenatal labs, pap-smear screening and management, a diabetes screening test, urine drug toxicology, and a hepatitis C test, all to be conducted at Respondent's clinic. Patient A underwent toxicology testing the same day at Respondent's clinic, and was positive for the presence of cannabinoids.

- 11. On or about January 22, 2019, Patient A underwent a rapid lipid panel at Respondent's clinic, despite her normal body mass index (BMI). Respondent did not document any justification or rationale for performing the test in the medical records.
- 12. On or about June 4, 2019, Patient A underwent toxicology testing a second time at Respondent's clinic, and was positive for cannabinoids. A note on the test results suggests that Respondent planned to repeat the urine toxicology test in two weeks, and to ask Patient A if she stopped smoking marijuana.
- 13. On or about June 18, 2019, Patient A declined to provide another sample for urine toxicology testing. A note on the test results states that Patient A did not want to stop using marijuana.
 - 14. On or about May 16, 2019, the records state "URINE x 3 ORDER."
- 15. On or about February 22, 2021, the Board's investigators interviewed Patient A regarding the treatment she received from Respondent. Patient A reported that Respondent performed genetic testing on her early in her pregnancy without her consent. She believes that

Respondent may have performed Cystic Fibrosis testing as well without her consent or knowledge. Patient A stated that she never discussed allergies or anything allergy related with Respondent. Patient A was surprised to learn that Respondent had performed a comprehensive food and inhalant allergy panel with her blood sample, as she was never informed that the test was performed.

CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO PATIENT B

- 16. On or about January 15, 2018, Patient B presented as a new patient after testing positive on a home pregnancy test. The records state that Patient B was estimated to be 11 weeks and 0/7 days pregnant at the time of this visit. She complained of gastro esophageal reflux disease, and provided a past medical history. The records state that Respondent ordered prenatal labs, urine X3 UTZ, and called in medications to the pharmacy. Patient B underwent a urinalysis, urine pregnancy test, blood type testing, hepatitis testing, HIV testing, blood serology testing, glucose testing and a lipid panel, all performed at Respondent's clinic. The results indicated that Patient B had elevated cholesterol and triglycerides. The records document that a urine toxicology was ordered and obtained at Respondent's clinic, but the records do not contain any findings or risk factors that suggest a need for the test. There is no record of Patient B providing consent for a toxicology test.
- 17. On or about January 30, 2018, Patient B returned to Respondent's office for an initial obstetrical visit. Patient B presented at 36 years old, gravida 4, para 3, at 11 weeks gestational age. Patient B's history included GERD and advanced maternal age. The records documented that Patient B's BMI was 48, consistent with class 3 morbid obesity. Patient B's blood pressure was 130/90, and her family history was positive for diabetes. Respondent did not document any past medical history related to asthma or substance abuse. Respondent ordered standard prenatal labs and planned for a pap smear at the following visit. Patient B's HgA1c was 6.5, consistent with the diagnosis of pre-gestational diabetes. Respondent referred Patient B to the diabetes educator for diet and lifestyle education.
- 18. On or about February 15, 2018, Patient B completed testing at Respondent's clinic to determine if she was a carrier for the cystic fibrosis gene as well as allergy testing. The records

stated that the allergy test was performed due to a history with asthma, but Patient B's records contain no other history of asthma and it was never listed as a health problem in prior visits. The following day, the results indicated that Patient B was a carrier for cystic fibrosis. The lab results contain a handwritten note that states "need to test FOB," referring to the father of the baby. There is no documentation regarding a discussion with Patient B about the test results, or if any attempt was made to consult with and/or test the father of the baby to see if he was a carrier of cystic fibrosis.

- 19. On or about March 5, 2018, at 14 weeks and 4 days gestation, Patient B reported a brown watery discharge. An ultrasound was performed which revealed that she had suffered a miscarriage. The notes state that the cause of the miscarriage was believed to be cervical incompetence, due to the cervix being too weak and unable to hold the pregnancy in place.
- 20. On or about March 21, 2018, Patient B presented to Respondent for a follow-up after her recent miscarriage. Respondent prescribed oral birth control pills for contraception and referred Patient B to her primary care physician for follow-up regarding diabetes.
- 21. On or about February 18, 2021, Patient B met with the Board's investigators to discuss the care and treatment she received from Respondent. Patient B recalled a previous interview with investigators from the Department of Healthcare Services regarding Respondent. Patient B was not aware that Respondent ever performed a test for cystic fibrosis, and she never discussed the test results with Respondent.

CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO PATIENT C

22. On or about January 16, 2018, Patient C presented for her initial visit with Respondent. Patient C presented at 27 years old, gravida 2, para 1, after testing positive on a home pregnancy test performed at Planned Parenthood. Patient C reported some spotting and passage of clots since her pregnancy test, and was unsure if she was having a miscarriage. The medical records state "none" for past medical history, family history, and social history. Patient C's BMI was recorded as 37, and she was tested for HCG and her blood type.

| ///

28 | ///

23. On or about	January 30, 2018, Patient C presented to Respondent stating that the
bleeding had stopped. P	atient C's hormone levels were decreasing, and she was diagnosed with
likely miscarriage.	

- 24. On or about March 12, 2018, Patient C presented to Respondent for an annual examination. Patient C stated that she wanted to discontinue birth control and try to conceive again. The record states that her last period was one week prior, but no pregnancy test was performed during the visit.
- 25. On or about March 15, 2018, Patient C presented to Respondent with a positive home pregnancy test. The record states that her last period was on February 23, 2018. Patient C was 28 years old, presenting as gravida 3, para 1, in the first trimester of her pregnancy.
- 26. On or about April 9, 2018, Respondent ordered standard prenatal labs, HgA1c, and a lipid panel. Patient C was noted to have a BMI of 40, which is considered morbid obesity.
- 27. On or about April 11, 2018, Patient C presented for an obstetric visit. Respondent ordered a urine toxicology test and a cystic fibrosis test, both of which were negative. Patient C did not report any drug use, and the records contained no documentation of risk factors for drug use.
- 28. On or about June 4, 2018, Patient C presented to Respondent for a first-trimester genetic screening.
- 29. On or about October 2, 2018, allergy testing was performed for what the records state was a history of asthma. Patient C's prior records and medical history contained no mention of asthma or allergy problems.
- 30. On or about February 18, 2021, the Board's investigators met with Patient C to discuss the care and treatment she received from Respondent. Patient C stated that she did not recall ever undergoing a genetic test for cystic fibrosis and that she was never consulted about the reason for the test or the results of the test. Patient C stated that it was possible that she was given the test because she provided so many blood test samples for Respondent that he easily could have taken another vial to perform the cystic fibrosis test.

(Gross Negligence)

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

31. Respondent has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796 to disciplinary action under section 2227, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, in that he committed multiple acts and/or omissions constituting gross negligence. The circumstances are set forth in paragraphs 8 through 30 which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. Additional circumstances are as follows:

Patient A

- 32. Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient A on January 21, 2019, despite failing to document any problem with asthma in Patient A's past medical history. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent ordered allergy testing for Patient A even though allergy testing is not a typical part of the management of a patient during pregnancy. Respondent, while providing obstetric care to Patient A, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient A's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of asthma or allergy problems, to be conducted at his own lab, in order to collect reimbursement from Patient A's insurance company. Respondent ordered Patient A to undergo unnecessary allergy testing and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 33. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient A on January 21, 2019, and June 4, 2019, to be conducted at his clinic. Respondent documented his concerns for ordering the tests, but he failed to document a social history for Patient A. Respondent did not document any discussion of possible smoking, drinking, and/or drug use with Patient A during the initial patient intake. Respondent suspected that Patient A could be using drugs during pregnancy, but failed to provide her with education about the risks to the child, and failed to provide her with appropriate referrals to therapists, social workers, or programs in her area to aid her in decreasing or discontinuing her use during pregnancy. Respondent referred Patient A to the CPSP, but she declined. Respondent did not document Patient A's responses to questions about possible drug

use. If Patient A admitted or denied drug use, it should have been documented in the medical

records. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient A during pregnancy without Patient A's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug toxicology testing for Patient A at his own lab, without Patient A's consent, during her pregnancy, and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

34. Respondent ordered a lipid panel for Patient A on January 19, 2019, during her pregnancy, to be performed at his own lab. Respondent did not document any reasonable justification for a lipid panel for Patient A, who had a normal BMI and no medical history to support the order. Respondent ordered the unnecessary lipid panel and obtained financial gain from the testing, which demonstrates a conflict of interest and an extreme departure from the standard of care.

Patient B

- 35. On or about February 15, 2018, Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient B to be performed at his clinic. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent, providing obstetric care to Patient B, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient B's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of asthma or allergy problems. Respondent ordered Patient B to undergo unnecessary allergy testing without her consent and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 36. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient B on January 15, 2018, during the very first visit with the patient, to be performed at his clinic. Respondent did not document any findings or risk factors to suggest that Patient B had any risk for drug use. Respondent did not document informed consent for urine toxicology testing during Patient B's pregnancy. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient B during pregnancy without Patient B's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug

toxicology testing for Patient B, without Patient B's consent, during her pregnancy, and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

Patient C

- 37. On or about October 2, 2018, Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient C, to be performed at his clinic. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent, providing obstetric care to Patient C, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient C's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of asthma or allergy problems. Respondent ordered Patient C to undergo unnecessary allergy testing and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.
- 38. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient C on August 29, 2018, absent any documented findings or risk factors to suggest that Patient C had any risk for drug use, to be performed at his clinic. Respondent did not document an informed consent from Patient C for urine toxicology testing during her pregnancy. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient C during pregnancy without Patient C's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug toxicology testing without Patient C's consent during her pregnancy and obtained financial gain from the testing, which constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

39. Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 74796 to disciplinary action under section 2227, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he committed repeated negligent acts in the care and treatment of Patient A, Patient B, and Patient C, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 8 through 38, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein. Additional circumstances are as follows:

7

4

9

11

12 13

15 16

14

17 18

19

20

2122

23

24

2526

2728

Patient A

- 40. Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient A on January 21, 2019, despite failing to document any problem with asthma in Patient A's past medical history. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent ordered allergy testing for Patient A even though allergy testing is not a typical part of the management of a patient during pregnancy. Respondent, while providing obstetric care to Patient A, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient A's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of asthma or allergy problems. Respondent ordered Patient A to undergo unnecessary allergy testing, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.
- Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient A on January 21, 2019, and 41. June 4, 2019. Respondent documented his concerns for ordering the tests, but he failed to document a social history for Patient A. Respondent did not document any discussion of possible smoking, drinking, and/or drug use with Patient A during the initial patient intake. Respondent suspected that Patient A could be using drugs during pregnancy, but failed to provide her with education about the risks to the child, and failed to provide her with appropriate referrals to therapists, social workers, or programs in her area to aid her in decreasing or discontinuing her use during pregnancy. Respondent referred Patient A to the CPSP program, but she declined. Respondent did not document Patient A's responses to questions about possible drug use. If Patient A admitted or denied drug use, either response should have been documented in the medical records. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient A during pregnancy without Patient A's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the Patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug toxicology testing for Patient A, without Patient A's consent, during her pregnancy, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.
- 42. Respondent ordered a lipid panel for Patient A during her pregnancy, to be performed at his own lab. Respondent did not document any reasonable justification for a lipid panel for Patient A, who had a normal BMI and no medical history to support the order. Respondent

ordered the unnecessary lipid panel, which demonstrates a conflict of interest and a simple departure from the standard of care.

Patient B

- 43. On or about February 15, 2018, Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient B. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent, providing obstetric care to Patient B, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient B's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of asthma or allergy problems. Respondent ordered Patient B to undergo unnecessary allergy testing without her consent, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.
- 44. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient B on January 15, 2018, during the very first visit with the patient. Respondent did not document any findings or risk factors to suggest that Patient B had any risk for drug use. Respondent did not document informed consent for urine toxicology testing during Patient B's pregnancy. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient B during pregnancy without Patient B's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug toxicology testing for Patient B, without Patient B's consent, during her pregnancy, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.
- 45. Respondent ordered a lipid panel for Patient B during her pregnancy to be performed at his own lab. Respondent did not document any discussion of the abnormal results with Patient B following the test. Respondent ordered the unnecessary lab, obtained financial gain from the testing, and failed to review the abnormal results with Patient B, which demonstrates a conflict of interest and a simple departure from the standard of care.

Patient C

46. On or about October 2, 2018, Respondent ordered unnecessary allergy testing for Patient C. Respondent failed to document an assessment and plan to treat the new diagnosis of asthma. Respondent, providing obstetric care to Patient C, ordered unnecessary testing for Patient C's purported diagnosis of asthma, despite any documentation in the medical record of

asthma or allergy problems. Respondent ordered Patient C to undergo unnecessary allergy testing, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

- 47. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient C on August 29, 2018, absent any documented findings or risk factors to suggest that Patient C had any risk for drug use. Respondent did not document an informed consent from Patient C for urine toxicology testing during her pregnancy. Respondent ordered urine toxicology testing for Patient C during pregnancy without Patient C's consent. Drug testing during pregnancy can have serious implications and requires that the patient provide consent prior to conducting testing. Respondent ordered urine drug toxicology testing without Patient C's consent during her pregnancy, which constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.
- 48. Respondent ordered a lipid panel for Patient C on April 9, 2018, during her pregnancy. While a lipid panel is not a standard test, it may have been an appropriate test to consider given Patient C's high BMI and morbid obesity. Respondent ordered a non-standard lipid test for Patient C during pregnancy without her consent, to be performed at his own lab. Respondent ordered a non-standard lab test, without Patient C's consent, and obtained financial gain from the testing, which demonstrates a conflict of interest and a simple departure from the standard of care.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate Records)

49.	Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D. has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's
Certificate	No. A 74796 to disciplinary action under section 2227, as defined by section 2266, of
the Code, i	n that he failed to maintain adequate and accurate records in the care and treatment of
Patient A,	Patient B, and Patient C, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 8 through 48,
which are l	hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

26 | // 27 | //

III

28 || //

234

6

5

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

2526

27

28

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

50. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D., Complainant alleges that on or about October 12, 2018, in a prior disciplinary action titled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D.* before the Medical Board of California, in Case Number 08-2013-234073, Respondent's license was revoked, the revocation was stayed, and he was placed on probation for a period of forty-two months with specific terms and conditions. That decision is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

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 74796, issued to Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;
- 3. Ordering Jason Paul Helliwell, M.D., to pay the Board the costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of probation monitoring;
 - 5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: SEP 1.2 2022

WILLIAM PRASIFKA Executive Director

Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Reji Varghese

Deputy Director

Complainant

FR2021304646/95470235