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

In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:

Prakashchandra Chhotabhai Patel, M.D.

Case No. 800-2019-052747

Physician's & Surgeon's Certificate No. A 32995

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 May 22, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED: April 22, 2024.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Richard E. Thorp, M.D, Chair

Panel B

-					
1	Rob Bonta				
2	Attorney General of California ROBERT MCKIM BELL				
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General COLLEEN M. MCGURRIN				
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar Number 147250 California Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702				
5					
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6546				
7	Facsimile: (916) 731-2117 Attorneys for Complainant				
8					
9	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA				
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS				
11	STATE OF CALIFORNI	A			
12					
13	In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-052747			
14	PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL, M.D.	OAH No. 2023080725			
15	395 N. San Jacinto St., Suite B Hemet, CA 92543	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER			
16	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 32995				
17	Respondent.				
18					
19	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and	between the parties to the above-			
20	entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:				
21	<u>PARTIES</u>				
22	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) is the Executive Director of the Medical Board of				
23	California (Board). His predecessor brought this action solely in his official capacity and				
24	Complainant is represented in this matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of				
25	California, by Colleen M. McGurrin, Deputy Attorney General.				
26	2. Prakashchandra Chhotabhai Patel, M.D. (Respondent) is represented in this				
27	proceeding by attorney Raymond J. McMahon of Doyle Schafer McMahon, LLP, located at 5440				
28	Trabuco Road, Irvine, CA 92620.				
	1				

3. On or about October 11, 1978, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 32995 to Prakashchandra Chhotabhai Patel, 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 First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747, and will expire on July 31, 2024, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

- 4. First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747 was filed before the Board, and is currently pending against Respondent. The First Amended Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on March 2, 2022. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the First Amended Accusation.
- 5. A copy of First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747 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 First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747. 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 First Amended 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 freely, 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 First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747, 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 with respect to the charges and allegations in First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, hereby gives up his right to contest those charges, and has thereby subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 32995 to disciplinary action.
- 11. Respondent agrees that his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate is subject to discipline and agrees to be bound by the Board's imposition of discipline as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

CONTINGENCY

- 12. 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.
- 13. 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.
- 14. 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 Number A 32995 issued to Respondent, PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL, M.D., shall be and is hereby Publicly Reprimanded pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2227, subdivision (a)(4). This Public Reprimand is issued in connection with Respondent's care and treatment of Patient 1 as set forth in First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747, as follows and on the following terms and conditions:

On or about October 2018 through June 2019, in caring for Patient 1, you failed to personally review the patient's CURES report in a patient that had an opioid addiction and failed to adequately document its review and results, or place a copy of the report reviewed in the patient's records, and failed to perform and document random urine drug screenings of the patient while treating him for an opioid addiction in violation of Business and Professions Code sections 2234 and 2266.

- B. <u>EDUCATION COURSES</u>. 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 20 hours for this public reprimand. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be in the areas of addictionology and treating patients with opioid abuse/or addiction or a history of opioid addiction/or abuse. These courses are 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. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 45 hours of CME of which 20 hours were in satisfaction of this condition.
- C. <u>PRESCRIBING PRACTICES COURSE</u>. Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall enroll in a course in prescribing practices

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 prescribing practices course shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education (CME) requirements for renewal of licensure.

A prescribing practices 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 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.

D. <u>MEDICAL RECORD KEEPING COURSE</u>. 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

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.

E. <u>INVESTIGATION/ENFORCEMENT COST RECOVERY</u>. Respondent is hereby ordered to reimburse the Board its costs of enforcement of this action, including, but not limited to, amended accusations, communications with witnesses and experts, legal reviews, and other related matters, as applicable, in the amount of \$22,334 (twenty-two thousand three hundred thirty-four dollars and no cents). Costs shall be payable to the Medical Board of California. Failure to pay such costs shall be considered a violation of this public reprimand.

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 this order.

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

- F. <u>VIOLATION OF PUBLIC REPRIMAND</u>. Failure to fully comply with any term or condition of this public reprimand is a violation of this stipulation. If Respondent violates the provisions of this stipulation in any respect, the Board, after giving Respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may take further disciplinary charges against Respondent. If an Accusation or an Interim Suspension Order is filed against Respondent during the public reprimand, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of this public reprimand shall be extended until the matter is final.
- G. <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 this public reprimand, Respondent may request to surrender his
 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 this public reprimand. If Respondent re-applies for a medical license, the application shall be treated as a petition for reinstatement of a revoked

FUTURE ADMISSIONS CLAUSE. 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, the charges and allegations contained in First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747 shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Raymond McMahon. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order freely, voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the

DATED:	2/26/24	Total Chall

PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL,

I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Prakashchandra Chhotabhai Patel, M.D. the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and

Attorney for Respondent

7

ENDORSEMENT The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California. DATED: March 1, 2024 Respectfully submitted, ROB BONTA Attorney General of California ROBERT MCKIM BELL Supervising Deputy Attorney General Colleen M. McGurrin COLLEEN M. MCGURRIN Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant LA2020603177 66598366.docx

ľ				
1	ROB BONTA			
2	Attorney General of California ROBERT MCKIM BELL			
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General COLLEEN M. MCGURRIN			
	COLLEEN M. McGURRIN Deputy Attorney General State Bar Number 147250			
4	State Bar Number 147250 California Department of Justice			
5	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702			
6	Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6546 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117			
7	E-mail: Colleen.McGurrin@doj.ca.gov			
8	Attorneys for Complainant			
9	BEFORE THE			
	MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS			
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
11				
12	In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2019-052747		
13	PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL,	FIRST AMENDED		
14	M.D.			
15	395 N. San Jacinto St., Ste. B Hemet, CA 92543	ACCUBATION		
16	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 32995,			
17	Respondent.	•		
18	PARTIES	! !		
19	:			
20	William Prasifka ("Complainant") brings this F	First Amended Accusation solely in his		
21	official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of			
22	Consumer Affairs ("Board").			
23	2. On October 11, 1978, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number			
24	A 32995 to Prakashchandra Chhotabhai Patel, M.D. ("Respondent"). That certificate was in full			
25	force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on July 31,			
26	2022, unless renewed.			
27	JURISDICTION			
28	3. This First Amended Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of			
	1			

(PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL, M.D.) First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747

the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code ("Code") unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation, and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Board deems proper.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

5. Section 2234 of the Code (effective from January 1, 2014, to December 31, 2019) 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 practice of medicine from this state into another state or country without meeting the legal requirements of that state or country for the practice of medicine. Section 2314 shall not apply to this subdivision. This subdivision shall become operative upon the implementation of the proposed registration program described in Section 2052.5.

- (h) The repeated 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 (effective from February 21, 1996, to the Present) 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.
- 7. Health and Safety Code section 11165.4 (effective from October 2, 2018, to December 31, 2019) states:
 - (a)(1)(A)(i) A health care practitioner authorized to prescribe, order, administer, or furnish a controlled substance shall consult the CURES database to review a patient's controlled substance history before prescribing a Schedule II, Schedule III, or Schedule IV controlled substance to the patient for the first time and at least once every four months thereafter if the substance remains part of the treatment of the patient.
 - (ii) If a health care practitioner authorized to prescribe, order, administer, or furnish a controlled substance is not required, pursuant to an exemption described in subdivision (c), to consult the CURES database the first time he or she prescribes, orders, administers, or furnishes a controlled substance to a patient, he or she shall consult the CURES database to review the patient's controlled substance history before subsequently prescribing a Schedule II, Schedule III, or Schedule IV controlled substance to the patient and at least once every four months thereafter if the substance remains part of the treatment of the patient.
 - (B) For purposes of this paragraph, "first time" means the initial occurrence in which a health care practitioner, in his or her role as a health care practitioner, intends to prescribe, order, administer, or furnish a Schedule II, Schedule III, or Schedule IV controlled substance to a patient and has not previously prescribed a controlled substance to the patient.
 - (2) A health care practitioner shall obtain a patient's controlled substance history from the CURES database no earlier than 24 hours, or the previous business day, before he or she prescribes, orders, administers, or furnishes a Schedule II, Schedule III, or Schedule IV controlled substance to the patient.
 - (b) The duty to consult the CURES database, as described in subdivision (a), does not apply to veterinarians or pharmacists.
 - (c) The duty to consult the CURES database, as described in subdivision (a), does not apply to a health care practitioner in any of the following circumstances:
 - (1) If a health care practitioner prescribes, orders, or furnishes a controlled substance to be administered to a patient while the patient is admitted to any of the following facilities or during an emergency transfer between any of the following facilities for use while on facility premises:
 - (A) A licensed clinic, as described in Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 1200) of Division 2.

costs are not available, signed by the entity bringing the proceeding or its designated representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of investigative and enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.

- (d) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to costs shall not be reviewable by the board to increase the cost award. The board may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).
- (e) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as directed in the board's decision, the board may enforce the order for repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the board may have as to any licensee to pay costs.
- (f) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the board's decision shall be conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.
- (g) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board shall not renew or reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.
- (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the board may, in its discretion, conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the board to reimburse the board within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.
- (h) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for costs incurred and shall be deposited in the fund of the board recovering the costs to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- (i) Nothing in this section shall preclude a board from including the recovery of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.
- (j) This section does not apply to any board if a specific statutory provision in that board's licensing act provides for recovery of costs in an administrative disciplinary proceeding.¹

DEFINITIONS

9. Buprenorphine (Subutex) is an opioid medication. It is used for the long-term "medication-assisted treatment" of opioid use disorder or opioid addiction. Buprenorphine and naloxone (Suboxone) are also used to treat opiate addiction. Naloxone blocks the effects of

¹ Effective January 1, 2022, subdivision (k) of Section 125.3, which exempted physicians and surgeons from paying recovery of the costs of investigation and prosecution by the Board, was repealed.

opioid medication, including pain relief or feelings of well-being that can lead to opioid abuse. Buprenorphine and all products containing buprenorphine are Schedule III controlled substances, as defined by section 1308.13, subdivision (e)(2)(i) of the Code of Federal Regulations. Buprenorphine is a Schedule V controlled substance, as defined by California Health and Safety Code section 11058, subdivision (d). Buprenorphine is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

10. **Hydrocodone**/acetaminophen (Norco, Lortab, Vicodin) is an opioid pain medication. It is a Schedule II controlled substance, as defined by section 1308.12, subdivision (b)(1)(vi), of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations and California Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (b)(1)(I). It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code Section 4022.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

11. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234, subdivision (b), and Health and Safety Code section 11165.4, subdivision (a), in that he was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of Patient 1.² The circumstances are as follows:

Patient 1

- 12. From approximately October 5, 2018, to approximately June 6, 2019, Respondent provided psychiatric care and treatment to Patient 1, a then fifty-four-year-old male patient. During that time period, Respondent treated Patient 1 for opioid use disorder.
- 13. Patient 1 had a history of back pain as a result of being involved in a car accident in approximately 2006. He took Norco 10 mg, up to six tablets daily, for approximately ten years, for his pain. This was followed by at least two years of buprenorphine maintenance. At one time, in approximately 2015, his buprenorphine was discontinued and he experienced severe withdrawal symptoms and depression with suicidal thoughts. On or about September 18, 2018, Patient 1's primary care physician performed laboratory testing on Patient 1. The test results showed Patient 1 was positive only for buprenorphine.

² The name of the patient is omitted in order to protect his right of privacy.

- 14. When Patient 1 began treating Respondent, Respondent continued buprenorphine treatment. However, starting on February 13, 2019, Respondent discussed his recommendation of tapering and stopping the buprenorphine with Patient 1 on several occasions. The taper began on March 14, 2019, when Patient 1 began reducing his buprenorphine treatment from 45 tabs to 40 tabs per month. The taper continued on April 8, 2019, and again on May 8, 2019. Patient 1 was taking 35 tabs instead of 45 tabs. On the final visit, June 6, 2019, Respondent reduced the number of buprenorphine tabs to 30. Patient 1 did not return to see Respondent for care and treatment after that date.
- 15. Patient 1's prescription records reflect the following buprenorphine prescriptions from Respondent.
- A. On or about October 5, 2018; November 2, 2018; December 18, 2018; January 18, 2019; February 13, 2019; and March 14, 2019, Respondent prescribed buprenorphine, 8 mg, 45 tabs, 30 day supply.
- B. On or about April 8, 2019; and May 8, 2019, Respondent prescribed buprenorphine, 8 mg, 35 tabs, 28 day supply.
- C. On or about June 6, 2019, Respondent prescribed buprenorphine, 8 mg, 30 tabs, 30 day supply.
- 16. During the time that he treated Patient 1, Respondent failed to order laboratory tests for Patient 1, failed to review Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System ("CURES") reports for Patient 1 or document that he reviewed CURES reports for Patient 1, and failed to maintain adequate and accurate medical records concerning the care and treatment that he provided to Patient 1.
- 17. Respondent committed the following extreme departures from the standard of care with respect to his care and treatment of Patient 1:
- A. Respondent committed an extreme departure from the standard of care by tapering and stopping buprenorphine in a patient with a documented long history of opioid use disorder. Respondent incorrectly tapered to discontinue buprenorphine maintenance treatment for opioid addiction, although Patient 1 was stable. This risked Patient 1 restarting Norco, or other opioids.

There is no evidence that Patient 1 was abusing buprenorphine. When a patient is on buprenorphine, the patient is unlikely to use potentially lethal opiates.

- B. Respondent committed an extreme departure from the standard of care by failing to order any laboratory tests in his treatment of a patient with opioid use disorder. He failed to order drug toxicology screens and liver and serology tests to: (1) determine whether the prescribed medication was being diverted, given, or sold to other people; (2) learn of and recognize concurrent or comorbid medical or physical conditions and medications, e.g., liver function tests, hepatitis screening and HIV testing; and (3) learn of concurrent use of other substances of abuse. The failure to order laboratory testing risked missed diagnosis of serious medical conditions and substance abuse. The testing was especially important since Respondent was tapering down Patient 1's dose of buprenorphine, risking that Patient 1 may restart opioids or abuse other substances.
- C. Respondent committed an extreme departure from the standard of care by failing to review the information in CURES reports for Patient 1, whom Respondent was treating for an opioid use disorder and prescribing a controlled substance. To meet the standard of care, the Respondent was required to review the reports themselves and to document that he reviewed the CURES reports. A staff member or other proxy cannot review CURES on a physician's behalf. Respondent's failure to review CURES reports for Patient 1 risked harm to Patient 1 for overdose, as Respondent was unaware if the patient was obtaining narcotics from other providers.
- D. Respondent committed an extreme departure from the standard of care by failing to maintain adequate and accurate medical records. Respondent's documentation was deficient, risking his patient's life. The main diagnosis documented in the patient's medical records is undated and unsigned. There is no documentation in the clinical record supporting the quantity and dose of buprenorphine that Patient 1 received from his prior physician. It is unclear how Respondent arrived at the starting dose of 4 mg three times a day. Respondent's notes for the patient do not reveal the duration of each session. In the "mental status" section, the notes fail to mention potential suicide or homicide risks.
 - E. By failing to record a pill count or if the patient had a left-over supply of

6

11

12

13 :14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

buprenorphine. Overdosing is common in opioid users. Because of the risk of overdosing and diversion, it is significant that there is no pill count documented. Keeping an accurate and frequent pill count is part of the treatment of opioid use.

- During an interview with an investigator for the Board, Respondent speculated that Patient 1 was "abusing" medications. However, he failed to document in the clinical record that he was taking precautions to rule that out in order to prevent any suspected abuse. Documenting a pill count, urine toxicology screening results, and periodic review of CURES reports would have addressed any issue of suspected abuse. Although Respondent relied on the negative drug screen from the prior treating physician from almost a month earlier, Respondent never dated and initialed when he reviewed the lab report. It is also unknown if or when he looked at any of the prior physician's medical records for Patient 1.
- Respondent committed an extreme departure from the standard of care by prescribing Subutex instead of Suboxone, which is safer. Because Subutex does not contain naloxone, while Suboxone contains both buprenorphine and naloxone, Subutex is considered more dangerous. Subutex can be injected intravenously and abused. The addition of the opioid blocker naloxone to a partial opioid agonist, buprenorphine, prevents Suboxone from producing a high when inappropriately injected. When Suboxone is taken as prescribed, by mouth, naloxone is not absorbed and does not prevent Suboxone from being effective as an opioid blocker.
- H. Respondent prescribed the more dangerous Subutex rather than safer Suboxone even. though he believed, without proof, that Patient 1 was abusing buprenorphine. The standard of care in opioid abuse treatment is to use Suboxone, not Subutex. Occasionally Subutex is prescribed to a pregnant woman (to decrease the risk of exposure of the fetus to naloxone) or to individuals allergic to naloxone. Respondent did not prescribe or offer Suboxone to Patient 1. There was no discussion noted in the patient's medical records why Respondent prescribed Subutex in lieu of Suboxone. Since Respondent believed Patient 1 was abusing Subutex, he should have switched Patient 1 to Suboxone.
- Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, inclusive above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute

grossly negligent acts under Code section 2234, subdivision (b). Therefore, cause for discipline

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 19. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234, subdivision (c), and Health and Safety Code section 11165.4, subdivision (a), in that he committed repeated negligent acts with respect to his care and treatment of Patient 1. The circumstances are as follows:
- 20. The facts and allegations as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, above, are incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 21. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, inclusive above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute repeated negligent acts under Code section 2234, subdivision (c). Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

- 22. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234, subdivision (d), in that he demonstrated a lack of knowledge in his care and treatment of Patient 1. The circumstances are as follows:
- 23. The facts and allegations as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, above, are incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 24. During his treatment of Patient 1, Respondent demonstrated a lack of knowledge as to the safe, current medical standards currently employed by addiction specialists for the treatment of opioid use disorder.
- 25. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, and 24, inclusive above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute incompetence under Code section 2234, subdivision (d). Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Medical Records)

- 26. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2266 in that he failed to maintain adequate and accurate medical records with respect to the care and treatment that he provided to Patient 1. The circumstances are as follows:
- 27. The facts and allegations as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, above, are incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 28. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 17, inclusive above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute a failure to maintain adequate and accurate medical records under Code section 2266. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

- 29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234 and Health and Safety Code section 11165.4, subdivision (a), in that he engaged in unprofessional conduct with respect to his care and treatment of Patient 1. The circumstances are as follows:
- 30. The facts and allegations as set forth in paragraphs 11 through 28, above, are incorporated by reference and re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 31. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 28, inclusive above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute unprofessional conduct under Code section 2234. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

32. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges that, on February 21, 2020, in a prior disciplinary matter entitled *In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against Prakashchandra Patel, M.D.*, Case No. 800-2016-020370, Respondent was publicly reprimanded in connection with his violations of the Medical Practice Act, as set forth in First Amended Accusation No. 800-2016-020370, as follows: "In or about 2012 through 2017, Dr. Patel failed to adequately follow up on the prior

(PRAKASHCHANDRA CHHOTABHAI PATEL, M.D.) First Amended Accusation No. 800-2019-052747