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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D.

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609

Respondent.

MBC File # 800-2020-064630

ORDER CORRECTING NUNC PRO TUNC CLERICAL ERROR IN DECISION

On its own motion, the Medical Board of California (hereafter "Board") finds that there is a clerical error in the Decision of the above-entitled matter, and that such clerical error shall be corrected.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Decision in the above-entitled matter be and is hereby amended and corrected nunc pro tunc as of the date of entry of the Order to reflect that Respondent's name is David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D.

April 11, 2024

Laurie Rose Lubiano, J.D., Chair

Panel A

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

ln	the	Matter	of	the	Accusation
Αg	gain	st:			

David Zhing Jian Chu, M.D.

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609

Respondent.

Case No. 800-2020-064630

DECISION

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License and 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 January 12, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED December 15, 2023.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Reji Varghese Executive Director

1	ROB BONTA									
2	Attorney General of California ROBERT MCKIM BELL									
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General TRINA L. SAUNDERS									
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 207764									
5	California Department of Justice 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702									
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6516									
7	Facsimile: (916) 731-2117 Attorneys for Complainant									
8	Timornoys for Compramam									
9	BEFORE THE									
10	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS									
11	STATE OF CA	ALIFORNIA								
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2020-064630								
13	DAVID ZHONG JIAN CHU, M.D.	OAH No. 2023050040								
14	P.O. Box 386 San Gabriel, CA 91778	STIPULATED SURRENDER OF LICENSE AND ORDER								
15 16	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609									
17	Respondent.									
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AG	REED by and between the parties to the above-								
19	entitled proceedings that the following matters are	e true:								
20	PART	TIES								
21	Reji Varghese (Complainant) is the Expression	xecutive Director of the Medical Board of								
22	California (Board). He brought this action solely in his official capacity and is represented in this									
23	matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California, by Trina L. Saunders, Deputy									
24	Attorney General.									
25	2. David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. (Respon	ident) is represented in this proceeding by								
26	attorney Mark B. Guterman, of LaFollette, Johnson, DeHaas, Fesler & Ames, 701 North Brand									
27	Boulevard, Suite 600, Glendale, California 91203.									
28	//									
		1								

3. On August 3, 1976, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609 to David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. (Respondent). That license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 800-2020-064630 and will expire on April 30, 2024, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 800-2020-064630 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 February 1, 2023. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2020-064630 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2020-064630. Respondent also has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.
- 6. 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.
- 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

8. Respondent understands that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2020-064630, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate.

//

- 9. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest that cause for discipline exists based on those charges.
- 10. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to issue an order accepting the surrender of his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 11. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and surrender, without notice to or participation by Respondent. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that she may not withdraw her 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 Surrender 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.
- 12. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including PDF and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 13. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

- IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609, issued to Respondent David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D., is surrendered and accepted by the Board.
- 1. The surrender of Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate and the acceptance of the surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline

against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the Board.

- Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a physician and surgeon in
 California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.
- Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was
 issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.
- 4. If Respondent ever files an application for licensure or a petition for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked or surrendered license in effect at the time the petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 800-2020-064630 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the petition.
- 5. Respondent shall pay the agency its costs of investigation and enforcement in the amount of \$14,600.00, prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license.
- 6. 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 agency in the State of California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation, No. 800-2020-064630 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 licensure.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney Mark B. Guterman, Esq. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.

DATED: 8/24/2023

DAVIOZHONGIAN CHU, M.D.

Respondent

1.	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. the terms at							
2	conditions and other matters contained in this Stipulated Surreguler of License and Order. I							
3	approve its form and content.							
4	DATED: 8/25/27							
5	MARK B. GUTERMAN. Attorney for Respondent							
6	,							
7								
8	ENDORSEMENT							
9	The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted							
10	for consideration by the Medical Board of California of the Department of Consumer Affairs.							
11								
12	DATED: Mov. 13, 2023 Respectfully submitted,							
13	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California							
14	ROBERT MCKIM BELL Supervising Deputy Attorney General							
15								
16	TRINA L. SAUNDERS							
17	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant							
18	morneys for Complainant							
19								
20	LA2022600294 Stipulated Surrender of License and Order - SDAG Reviewed,docx							
21	Supulated Busselides of Dicease Hill Order - BDAC Acytews20,000x							
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 800-2020-064630

l l	f I									
1	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California									
2	ROBERT MCKIM BELL Supervising Deputy Attorney General									
3	TRINA L. SAUNDERS Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 207764									
5	California Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702									
6	Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6516									
7	Facsimile: (916) 731-2117 Attorneys for Complainant									
8	BEFORE THE									
9	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS									
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA									
11										
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 800-2020-064630									
13	DAVID ZHONG JIAN CHU, M.D. A C C U S A T I O N Post Office Box 386									
14	San Gabriel, California 91778									
15	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 32609,									
16	Respondent.									
17										
18	PARTIES									
19 20	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as									
21	the Deputy Director of the Medical Board of California (Board).									
22	2. On August 3, 1976, the Board Issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number G									
23	32609 to David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. (Respondent). That license was in full force and effect at									
24	all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2024, unless renewed.									
25	JURISDICTION									
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following									
27	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise									
28	indicated.									
	1	_								
	(DAVID ZHONG JIAN CHU, M.D.) ACCUSATION NO. 800-2020-064630									

6.

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20. 21

2223

24

25

26 27

28

(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.

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.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 7. Respondent David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234 (c) of the Code in that he failed to appropriately manage five patients by taking each of them for definitive suspected cancer surgery based on imaging without a prior core needle biopsy as recommended by radiology and required by the standard of care in the community.

 Patient A¹
- 8. Patient A, a then 41-year-old female, first saw Respondent on April 17, 2018. Patient A was referred to Respondent due to a mammogram demonstrating a left breast lesion. Patient A presented with Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System 5 (BI-RADS 5)² suspicious for cancer

¹ The patients herein are identified by letters to protect their privacy."

² Doctors assign a category BI-RADS 5 when there is a very high probability of breast cancer. Such a finding requires that the patient's medical practitioner request an immediate biopsy. BI-RADS category 5 is usually reserved for lesions having a 95% probability of malignancy. After biopsy the average rate of carcinoma in category 5 biopsies is about 75-97%.

l

ġ

and a second suspicious area by MRI. The radiology report contained a recommendation for image guided biopsy for the areas.

- 9. Respondent waited for an additional MRI result to be returned before proceeding with surgery. An MRI was completed on April 20, 2018. The Respondent's plan was to review the MRI findings to characterize the area better and if imaging revealed a low suspicion of cancer, to do a needle biopsy. However, if the imaging revealed a high suspicion, he planned to take Patient A to surgery. The MRI demonstrated a 1.7 cm. suspicious left breast lesion.
- 10. Respondent offered Patient A lumpectomy with a frozen section at the time of surgery and then to proceed with Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy (SNLB)³ if cancer was found on the frozen section.
- 11. Respondent biopsied the other suspicious area by palpation without imaging at the time of surgery.
- 12. On May 3, 2018, Patient A underwent surgery for a 1.7 cm mass, which on frozen section showed invasive ductal carcinoma. The surrounding breast tissues were dense. A needle core biopsy of the retro arcolar dense breast tissue was taken, and the sentinel node 2 cm node was removed clinically and was possibly negative since Patient A had previous hidradenitis.
- 13. Pathology following surgery showed that Patient A had infiltrative ductal carcinoma of the left breast. Patient A was referred to medical oncology and radiation oncology.
- 14. Respondent was negligent in that he failed to perform a preoperative biopsy and tumor receptors analysis, thereby denying Patient A a potential treatment option. The standard of care for SLN is a pre-procedure injection of Technetium and, in most cases, blue dye. There is no data to support the method used by the Respondent.

Patient B

15. Patient B, a then 63-year-old female, first presented to Respondent on March 7, 2019. Patient B was referred to Respondent for a left breast mass. She had a prior mammogram. The

³ A sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLN) is a procedure in which the sentinel lymph node is identified, removed, and examined to determine whether cancer cells are present. It is used in people who have already been diagnosed with cancer.

mammogram and ultrasound showed a 2.4, 2.1, and 2.5 left breast lesion. The radiologist recommended a biopsy.

- Respondent to Patient B that she had options that included a needle biopsy, or surgical intervention without biopsy. Respondent recommended that, due to insurance delays which could have been as long as two months, the fact that the mass was greater than 2 cm, and the fact that Patient B wanted breast conservation, that Patient B undergo surgery without a pre-surgical biopsy.
- 17. On March 12, 2019, Patient B underwent a left breast partial mastectomy and SNL dissections. The frozen sections were positive for cancer. The pathology report showed infiltrative ductal carcinoma.
- 18. Respondent was negligent in failing to perform a pre-operative biopsy and tumor receptors analysis, thereby denying Patient B potential treatment options. The standard of care for SLN is pre-procedure injection of Technetium and, in most cases, blue dye. There is no data to support the method used by the Respondent.

Patient C

- 19. Patient C, a then 65-year-old female, first presented to Respondent on July 3, 2018. Patient C was referred to Respondent for a left breast mass by mammogram and physical exam suspicious for carcinoma. The radiologist recommended an ultrasound guided biopsy.
- 20. Respondent discussed the above finding with Patient C. He explained that, based on the mammogram, there was a 95% chance of cancer and that Patient C could have a biopsy before surgery, or she could undergo surgery without a needle biopsy. Respondent explained to Patient C that even if the biopsy were negative, based on the mammogram, surgical intervention would be necessary. Therefore, it was his recommendation that she have surgery without a needle biopsy.

24

25

26

27

28

- On July 13, 2018, Patient C underwent a left breast segmentectomy4 and left axillary node, sentinel node mapping and dissection. A lumpectomy was performed for a 1.9 cm invasive cancer and SLN dissection, removing 12 nodes. The nodes were all negative for cancer. As a result, the operation performed amounted to a complete axillary dissection with an increased risk of lymphedema⁵, compared to an SLN biopsy.
- 22. Respondent was negligent in failing to perform a preoperative biopsy and tumor receptors analysis, thereby denying Patient C a potential treatment option. The standard of care for SLN is pre-procedure injection of Technetium⁶ and in most cases, blue dye. There is no data to support the method used by the Respondent.

Patient D

- 23. Patient D, a then 58-year-old female, first presented to Respondent on July 5, 2018. Patient D was referred to Respondent for a mammogram and a left breast ultrasound. The imaging demonstrated microcalcifications in the medial upper left breast and spiculated lesion in the right breast. Ultrasound was recommended for both breasts.
- 24. Respondent discussed the above findings and impressions with Patient D. Respondent explained that, because of the density of Patient D's breasts, there was a higher risk of carcinoma. Respondent explained Patient D's options to her, which included a pre-surgical biopsy, or in the alternative, surgical intervention without a biopsy.
- On July 10, 2018, Patient D presented to the Respondent for further discussion and evaluation.
- 26. On or about July 11, 2018, Patient D underwent a left breast partial mastectomy and removal of additional medial margin. SLN was performed.

⁴ A segmentectomy is the excision (removal) of the diseased portion of any organ or gland. The procedure has several variations and many names, including segmental resection, wide excision, lumpectomy, tumorectomy, quadrantectomy, and partial mastectomy.

⁵ Lymphedema is a build-up of lymph fluid in the fatty tissues just under the skin. It can cause swelling and discomfort, sometimes become severe and cause serious problems, and is often a long-term or chronic condition.

⁶ Technetium is a radioactive isotope.

- 27. A 3.6 cm DCIS⁷ and 0.8 cm invasive cancer was found.
- 28. There is no record of evaluation of the spiculated lesion in the right breast.
- 29. The Respondent referred Patient D out for further treatment.
- 30. Respondent was negligent in failing to perform a pre-operative biopsy and tumor receptors analysis, thereby denying Patient D a potential treatment option. The standard of care for SLN is pre-procedure injection of Technetium and, in most cases, blue dye. There is no data to support the method used by the Respondent.

Patient E

- 31. Patient E, a then 52-year-old female, first presented to Respondent on February 8, 2018. Patient E was referred to Respondent with a right breast mass. She had a mammogram that was performed in China, which showed abnormalities. On physical exam, it felt suspicious.
- 32. The Respondent ordered a mammogram that was performed on February 9, 2018. It demonstrated a $1.6 \times 1.5 \times .5$ cm right breast lesion. A follow-up ultrasound was recommended, by the radiologist.
- 33. On February 20, 2018, Patient E presented to Respondent. Respondent discussed the above findings and impressions with Patient E. Respondent explained that Patient E had a possible fibroadenoma⁸ that appeared to be growing. He discussed the treatment of it if carcinoma was found during surgery. Patient E opted for surgical intervention without a prior guided needle biopsy and breast conservation as recommended by Respondent.
- 34. On or about February 22, 2018, Patient E underwent surgery. A 4 cm right breast lumpectomy was completed for a less than 2 cm benign fibroadenoma.
- 35. Respondent was negligent in that he failed to conduct a pre-operative image-guided needle biopsy, and conducted a blind injection into Patient E's breast tissue after lumpectomy for

⁷ Ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) is the presence of abnormal cells inside a milk duct in the breast. DCIS is considered the earliest form of breast cancer. DCIS is noninvasive, meaning it hasn't spread out of the milk duct and has a low risk of becoming invasive. DCIS is usually found during a mammogram done as part of breast cancer screening or to investigate a breast lump.

⁸ Fibroadenomas vary in size, and they can enlarge or shrink on their own. Fibroadenomas are among the most common noncancerous (benign) breast lumps in young women. Treatment might include monitoring to detect changes in size or feel, a biopsy to evaluate the lump, or surgery to remove it.

SLN identification. A benign lesion such as a fibroadenoma requires a limited resection, and some lesions can be managed with observation alone, without surgery.

36. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in Paragraphs 8 through 35, whether proven individually, jointly or in combination, constitute repeated acts of negligence under Code section 2234, subdivision (c). Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

- 37. Respondent David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234 (d) in that he failed to perform pre-operative biopsies in the cases of Patients A, B, C, D, and E, in violation of the standard of care in the community and thereby deprived each of the patients of potential treatment options. The circumstances are as follows:
- 38. Paragraphs 8 through 35, are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 39. Respondent demonstrated a lack of knowledge. His current level of knowledge, as demonstrated by his choice of procedure, is not within the standard of care. Excisional biopsy is reserved for lesions that are determined equivocal or non-concordant on core needle biopsy but not for initial evaluation of the legion beyond imaging.
- 40. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in Paragraphs 8 through 35, whether proven individually, jointly or in combination, constitute incompetence pursuant to Code section 2234 (d). Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

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 G 32609, issued to David Zhong Jian Chu, M.D.;