1				
1	ROB BONTA			
2	Attorney General of California JUDITH T. ALVARADO			
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MARSHA E. BARR-FERNANDEZ			
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 200896			
5	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013			
6	Telephone: (213) 269-6249 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117			
7	Attorneys for Complainant			
8	DEEOD	r Tur		
	BEFORE THE PODIATRIC MEDICAL BOARD			
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 500-2023-001442		
12	HENRY RICK TSENG, D.P.M. 2707 E. Valley Boulevard, Suite 303	ACCUSATION		
13	West Covina, CA 91792			
14	Doctor of Podiatric Medicine License No. E-4127,			
15	Respondent.			
16		,		
17	<u>PARTIES</u>			
18	1. Brian Naslund (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as			
19	the Executive Officer of the Podiatric Medical Board, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).			
20	2. On or about February 11, 1998, the Board issued Podiatrist License Number E-4127			
21	to Henry Rick Tseng, D.P.M. (Respondent). The Podiatrist License was in full force and effect at			
22	all times relevant to the charges brought herein an	nd will expire on September 30, 2025, unless		
23	renewed.			
24	<u>JURISD</u> 1	<u>ICTION</u>		
25	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following			
26	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise			
27	indicated.			
28	///			
		1		

4. Section 2222 of the Code states:

The California Board of Podiatric Medicine shall enforce and administer this article as to doctors of podiatric medicine. Any acts of unprofessional conduct or other violations proscribed by this chapter are applicable to licensed doctors of podiatric medicine and wherever the Medical Quality Hearing Panel established under Section 11371 of the Government Code is vested with the authority to enforce and carry out this chapter as to licensed physicians and surgeons, the Medical Quality Hearing Panel also possesses that same authority as to licensed doctors of podiatric medicine.

The California Board of Podiatric Medicine may order the denial of an application or issue a certificate subject to conditions as set forth in Section 2221, or order the revocation, suspension, or other restriction of, or the modification of that penalty, and the reinstatement of any certificate of a doctor of podiatric medicine within its authority as granted by this chapter and in conjunction with the administrative hearing procedures established pursuant to Sections 11371, 11372, 11373, and 11529 of the Government Code. For these purposes, the California Board of Podiatric Medicine shall exercise the powers granted and be governed by the procedures set forth in this chapter.

5. Section 2227 of the Code states:

- (a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:
 - (1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.
- (2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the board.
- (3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.
- (4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the board.
- (5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.
- (b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters, medical review or advisory conferences, professional competency examinations, continuing education activities, and cost reimbursement associated therewith that are agreed to with the board and successfully completed by the licensee, or other matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and shall be made available to the public by the board pursuant to Section 803.1.

27 //

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

6. Section 2228 of the Code states:

The authority of the board or the California Board of Podiatric Medicine to discipline a licensee by placing him or her on probation includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) Requiring the licensee to obtain additional professional training and to pass an examination upon the completion of the training. The examination may be written or oral, or both, and may be a practical or clinical examination, or both, at the option of the board or the administrative law judge.
- (b) Requiring the licensee to submit to a complete diagnostic examination by one or more physicians and surgeons appointed by the board. If an examination is ordered, the board shall receive and consider any other report of a complete diagnostic examination given by one or more physicians and surgeons of the licensee's choice.
- (c) Restricting or limiting the extent, scope, or type of practice of the licensee, including requiring notice to applicable patients that the licensee is unable to perform the indicated treatment, where appropriate.
- (d) Providing the option of alternative community service in cases other than violations relating to quality of care.

7. Section 2497 of the Code states:

- (a) The board may order the denial of an application for, or the suspension of, or the revocation of, or the imposition of probationary conditions upon, a certificate to practice podiatric medicine for any of the causes set forth in Article 12 (commencing with Section 2220) in accordance with Section 2222.
- (b) The board may hear all matters, including but not limited to, any contested case or may assign any such matters to an administrative law judge. The proceedings shall be held in accordance with Section 2230. If a contested case is heard by the board itself, the administrative law judge who presided at the hearing shall be present during the board's consideration of the case and shall assist and advise the board.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

8. 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.

shall not be increased by the board unless the board does not adopt a proposed

28

prominence of the ankle) of 2 out of 4. Respondent did not indicate whether this finding referred to the pulses of the right foot only or pulses of both the right and left feet. Respondent did not record the capillary refill time.

- 15. Respondent documented a finding of tinea pedis (a fungal skin infection commonly known as athlete's foot) on the bottom of Patient 1's foot. Respondent did not document whether the tinea pedis was found on one or both of Patient 1's feet.
 - 16. Respondent did not record any examination findings regarding the calluses.
 - 17. Respondent did not document skin temperature.
- 18. Respondent noted muscle strength of 5/5, normal joint range of motion, normal gait, and a normal neurologic examination (normal sensation and reflexes).
- 19. Respondent documented that he performed a partial nail avulsion (a surgical procedure during which the healthcare provider cuts the nail along the edge that is growing into the skin and removes it). Respondent sent the toenail specimen to a pathology lab for evaluation. Respondent did not author a procedure note, a record or operation, or otherwise document the partial nail avulsion in the record.
- 20. During Respondent's interview with the Board, Respondent stated that he did not use anesthesia during the nail avulsion of the right hallux (right big toe) and that he removed about 80% of the nail margin during the avulsion on December 11, 2021.
- 21. Respondent billed Patient 1's medical insurance for the visit. As is required, Respondent used CPT codes to bill the insurance. CPT stands for Current Procedural Terminology. CPT codes are used to reflect testing, procedures, evaluations, and other services provided to a client or patient in the healthcare field. CPT modifiers are two characters (letter or numbers) appended to a CPT code. They are used to provide additional information or adjust care descriptions about the medical procedure, service, or supply involved without changing the meaning of the code. CPT modifiers may describe various aspects of the procedure, such as multiple procedures, necessity, or location.
- 22. When Respondent billed Patient 1's insurance company for the partial nail avulsion, Respondent billed using CPT Code 11730 with TA modifier. When billing CPT Code

///

11730, local anesthetic is considered inclusive to the procedure. The TA modifier indicates the nail avulsion was performed on the great toe of the left foot. There is no documentation in the record that indicates that Patient 1 had complaints relating to the great toe of the left foot on December 11, 2021.

- 23. Patient 1 stated that Respondent trimmed all ten of her toenails at the time of the visit of December 11, 2021. Toenail debridement involves the significant reduction in the thickness and length of the nail. The office note does not reflect any documentation of toenail trimming or toenail debridement on that date. Respondent billed Patient 1's insurance company for toenail debridement using CPT Code 11721, which is the code for debridement of six (6) or more toenails by any method.
- 24. Respondent also billed CPT Code 11055 for Patient 1's visit of December 11, 2021. CPT Code 11055 is a code use to describe the paring or cutting of a single benign hyperkeratotic lesion, such as a corn or callus. This procedure is performed by a healthcare provider using surgical instruments, like a scalpel or curette, to remove the lesion. There is no documentation in Patient 1's office visit note of December 11, 2021, that indicates Respondent performed any callus removal procedure on Patient 1 on that date.
- 25. Respondent dispensed to Patient 1 a medicated gel ointment to address the tinea pedis and recommended to Patient 1 the use of over-the-counter orthotics (Superfeet) and more comfortable footwear, such as New Balance tennis shoes and Oofos sandals. In addition, Respondent ordered blood work and recommended Patient 1 undergo a vascular evaluation. A vascular ultrasound was performed on that date in Respondent's office by a technician from Diasound Services, Inc. Respondent did not document the clinical indication for ordering the blood work or recommending the vascular evaluation.
- 26. The report of the ultrasound performed on December 11, 2021, became available on or about December 15, 2021. The report indicated that there was "no evidence of DVT," (deep vein thrombosis or blood clot), "no abnormalities noted," and that the testing on the arteries of both lower extremities was indicative of normal blood flow with no stenotic lesions.

27. The surgical pathology report of the examination of the nail plate from the partial nail avulsion performed on December 11, 2021, became available on or about December 22, 2021. It indicated that the specimen examined was "without evidence of fungal organism," and that "no fungal elements were seen with microscopy."

Office Note Dated January 22, 2022.

- 28. Patient 1's chart includes an office note dated January 22, 2022. On that note, Respondent documented DP and PT pulses of 2 out of 4, a capillary refill time of less than 3 seconds, and edema of 2 out of 4. The location of the edema is not noted.
- 29. Respondent's documented findings on examination of Patient 1's toenails include, but is not limited to, "ingrown," "fungal," "discolored," "long," "odorous," "thick," and "brittle." Respondent notes calluses are "painful with walking" and "painful to the touch." Respondent did not document the appearance, location, or size of the calluses.
- 30. Respondent's assessment includes "painful onychomycosis" (fungal infection of the nail plate, nail bed, or both), "painful onychocryptosis" (ingrown toenail), "painful abscess" (a mass filled with pus caused by infection), "painful nucleated IPK" (intractable plantar keratomas or calluses), and "painful feet." Respondent's plan was to "debride painful nails," "debride painful IPK's (sic)" (removal of calluses usually by scraping with a scalpel), "I&D (incision and drainage) abscess," and "nail avulsion" (nail removal). Respondent did not record any information regarding the appearance, location, or size of the abscess. Respondent did not author procedure notes, records of operation, or otherwise make any entry in the record documenting the incision and drainage of the abscess, the debridement of the toenails and calluses, or the removal of the toenail.
- 31. Respondent noted that Patient 1 was to continue "meds," but did not specify what medications she was taking or was to continue.
- 32. When Respondent billed Patient 1's insurance company for the nail avulsion purportedly performed on January 22, 2022, Respondent again billed using CPT Code 11730 with TA modifier. The TA modifier indicates the nail avulsion was performed on the great toe of the

2.7

left foot. There is no documentation in the record that indicates that Patient 1 had complaints relating to the great toe of the left foot on January 22, 2022.

- 33. The office note does not reflect any documentation of toenail trimming or toenail debridement on January 22, 2022. Respondent billed Patient 1's insurance company for toenail debridement using CPT Code 11721.
- 34. Patient 1 subsequently received a billing statement and/or an explanation of benefits statement outlining charges totaling over \$600.00 for treatment purportedly provided by Respondent on December 11, 2021, and January 22, 2022.

The Summary of Care Dated August 18, 2023.

35. On or about August 18, 2023, Respondent authored a Summary of Care for Patient 1 setting forth the treatment rendered on December 11, 2021, and January 22, 2022. The summary of the two visits authored eighteen (18) months after the purported last visit of Patient 1 with Respondent was more detailed and included information that was either different than what was recorded in the office visit notes or was new information that was not included in the office visit notes

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

- 36. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (b) of the Code in that Respondent was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of one patient. The circumstances are as follows:
- 37. Paragraphs 12 through 35 are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. The standard of care for medical record keeping is to provide comprehensive chart notes that may easily be interpreted by another medical practitioner if necessary, so that patient care is not compromised if the originator of the notes is not available and for clarification of treatment rationale, findings, interpretation of tests and treatment plans. In Patient 1's case, Respondent's documentation was mostly illegible and did not include relevant and/or sufficient clinical information to clarify treatment rationale, findings, interpretation of tests, or treatment

plans, or to justify treatment provided and treatment recommendations. For example, Respondent's documentation did not include, among other things, the location, size, and appearance of significant skin findings, such as tinea pedis, calluses, or abscesses; details regarding the vascular and neurologic findings, including skin temperature and color, and whether findings were unilateral or bilateral. Respondent did not author and/or include procedure notes for surgical procedures performed, including but not limited to, nail avulsions, nail and callus debridement, and incision and drainage of abscesses. Respondent's note also did not include information justifying the referral for a vascular evaluation or the order for blood tests. Respondent's failure to provide comprehensive and/or legible chart notes that may be easily interpreted by another medical practitioner, if necessary, to avoid compromising the future care and treatment of the patient constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

39. The standard of care requires health care providers to bill accurately for services and treatment that were justified and/or medically necessary and delivered. Failure to do so may constitute falsification of patient services and is a major disruptor in the healthcare system because it results in payments for patient services that were not provided. This adversely affects multiple aspects of the healthcare system and can result in patient harm by depriving patients of potentially necessary treatment, particularly when there are limited resources or limits on the number of covered services. When the CPT 11730 is billed to an insurance company it is inherent in the code that local anesthesia is required, except in those cases where there is documentation that the patient is neuropathic. In addition, a procedure note, a report of operation, or at least a descriptive paragraph documenting the administration of local anesthesia and the details of the procedure is required to be recorded in the medical record. In Patient 1's care and treatment, Respondent's billing for CPT 11730 was not supported by his documentation. This constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

25 | ///

26 | ///

27 || ///

28 | ///

1	SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
2	(Repeated Negligent Acts)		
3	40. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234,		
4	subdivision (c) of the Code in that Respondent provided negligent care and treatment to Patient 1.		
5	The circumstances are as follows:		
6	41. The facts and allegations set forth in the First Cause for Discipline are		
7	incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.		
8	42. Each of the alleged acts of gross negligence set forth in the First Cause for		
9	Discipline, above, is also a negligent act.		
0	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
1	(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records)		
12	43. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 2266 of the		
13	Code in that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate medical records relating to the		
4	care and treatment he provided to Patient 1. The circumstances are as follows:		
15	44. The facts and allegations set forth in the First and Second Causes for Discipline		
16	are realleged herein as if fully set forth.		
17	FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
8	(False Representations)		
9	45. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2261 of the Code in that		
20	Respondent made false representations with respect to the care and treatment provided to Patient		
21	1. The circumstances are as follows:		
22	46. The facts and allegations in the First, Second, and Third Causes for Discipline are		
23	incorporated herein as if fully set forth.		
24	FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
25	(Unprofessional Conduct)		
26	47. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (a), of		
27	the Code in that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct. The circumstances are as		
28	follows:		
•	11		
	(HENRY RICK TSENG, D.P.M.) ACCUSATION (500-2023-001442)		

1	48. The facts and allegations in the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Causes for		
2	Discipline are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.		
3	DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS		
4	49. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent,		
5	Complainant alleges that on or about April 5, 2004, in a prior disciplinary action titled In the		
6	Matter of the Accusation Against Henry Rick Tseng, D.P.M. before the Podiatric Medical Board,		
7	in Case Number 1B-2001-121809, Respondent's license was revoked, the revocation stayed and		
8	placed on three (3) years' probation with certain terms and conditions, for unauthorized practice		
9	beyond the scope of his license with respect to his care and treatment of five patients. That		
10	decision is now final.		
11	PRAYER		
12	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,		
13	and that following the hearing, the Podiatric Medical Board issue a decision:		
14	1. Revoking or suspending Doctor of Podiatric Medicine License Number E-4127,		
15	issued to Respondent Henry Rick Tseng, D.P.M.;		
16	2. Ordering Respondent Henry Rick Tseng, D.P.M. to pay the Podiatric Medical Boa	rd	
17	the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and		
18	Professions Code section 2497.5;		
19	3. If placed on probation, ordering Respondent Henry Rick Tseng, D.P.M. to pay the		
20	Podiatric Medical Board the costs of probation monitoring; and,		
21	4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
22			
23	DATED: 0CT 0 9 2024		
24	BRIAN NASLUND Executive Officer		
25	Podiatric Medical Board Department of Consumer Affairs		
26	State of California Complainant		
27	LA2024604156		
28			