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

In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation and Accusation Against: Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267 Respondent.	Case No. 800-2024-104800

DECISION

The attached Default Decision 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 October 9, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED September 9, 2024.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Reji Varghese
Executive Director

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
EDWARD KIM
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
DANG VU
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 306393
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6277
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
E-mail: Dang.Vu@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

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

In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation and Accusation Against: **MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D.** **515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120** **Santa Ana, CA 92701-5016** **Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267,** Respondent.	Case No. 800-2024-104800 Consolidated with 800-2021-078555 **DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER** [Gov. Code, §11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On July 1, 1980, the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board) issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267 to Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. (Respondent). That Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in the petition to revoke probation and accusation referenced herein and will expire on April 30, 2026, unless renewed. A copy of a Certificate of Licensure for Respondent, including his address of record with the Board, is attached to the "Default Decision Evidence Packet ("Evidence Packet")" as **Exhibit A** and is incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein. [1]

[1] The exhibits referred to herein, which are true and correct copies of the originals, are contained in the separate accompanying Evidence Packet, which is hereby incorporated by reference, in its entirety, as if fully set forth herein.

Service of Petition to Revoke Probation

2. On March 15, 2024, Complainant Reji Varghese (Complainant), in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Board, filed Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800 against Respondent before the Board, a copy of which is included in **Exhibit B** to the "Evidence Packet" (see below) and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

3. On March 15, 2024, an employee of the Complainant Agency served by certified mail and first class mail a copy of Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800 (Petition to Revoke Probation), Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense (two copies), Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, 11507.7, and 11455.10 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is: 515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120, Santa Ana, California 92701-5016. A copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as **Exhibit B** to the "Evidence Packet" and are incorporated herein by reference.

4. According to the tracking information provided by the United States Postal Service ("USPS"), a copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record on March 18, 2024. A copy of the USPS delivery confirmation is attached as **Exhibit C** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

5. On April 23, 2024, an employee of the California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, served by certified mail a Courtesy Notice of Default to Respondent's address of record, which included a copy of the Petition to Revoke Probation and Notice of Defense previously served on Respondent and advised him that if he failed to take action to file a Notice of Defense by May 7, 2024, the Board would enter a Default Decision against his license which may be revoked or suspended without any hearing. A copy of the Courtesy Notice of Default is attached as **Exhibit D** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference. According to the tracking information provided by the USPS, the Courtesy Notice of Default was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record on April 25, 2024. A copy of that USPS delivery confirmation is also attached to **Exhibit D** (see above) and is incorporated herein by

reference.

Service of Accusation

6. On May 31, 2024, Complainant, in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Board, filed Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 against Respondent before the Board, a copy of which is included in **Exhibit E to** the "Evidence Packet" (see below) and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

7. On May 31, 2024, an employee of the Complainant Agency served by certified and first class mail a copy of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 (Accusation), Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense (two copies), Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is: 515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120, Santa Ana, California 92701-5016. A copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as **Exhibit E** to the "Evidence Packet" and are incorporated herein by reference.

8. According to the tracking information provided by the USPS, a copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record on June 3, 2024. A copy of the USPS delivery confirmation is attached as **Exhibit F** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

9. On June 14, 2024, an employee of the California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, served by certified mail a Courtesy Notice of Default to Respondent's address of record, which included a copy of the Accusation and Notice of Defense previously served on Respondent and advised him that if he failed to take action to file a Notice of Defense by June 28, 2024, the Board would enter a Default Decision against his license which may be revoked or suspended without any hearing. A copy of the Courtesy Notice of Default is attached as **Exhibit G** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference. According to the certified mail return receipt provided by the USPS, the Courtesy Notice of Default was successfully delivered to Respondent's address of record on or about June 17, 2024. A copy of the USPS certified mail return receipt is also attached to **Exhibit G** (see above) and is incorporated herein by reference.

10. Service of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 and Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800 was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

11. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

> (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

12. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of each of Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800 and Accusation No. 800-2021-078555, respectively, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of the charges and allegations contained therein. A copy of the Declaration of the Deputy Attorney General, stating that no Notice of Defense has been received since Respondent was served with each of the Petition to Revoke Probation and the Accusation, respectively, is attached as **Exhibit H** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

13. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

> (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.

14. Respondent's license is subject to discipline for committing unprofessional conduct, including gross negligence and repeated negligent acts under Business and Professions Code (hereinafter, "Code") section 2234, subdivisions (b) and (c); failing to maintain adequate and accurate medical records under Code section 2266; and prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs without an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication under Code section 2242, in connection with his care and treatment of three patients as alleged in Accusation No. 800-2021-078555. A copy of the declaration of the Board's expert is attached as **Exhibit I** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

15. Business and Professions Code section 125.3 states, in pertinent part:

> (a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a

disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may 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.

16. The reasonable costs for the investigation and enforcement of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 are $27,574.75. Respondent owes the Board outstanding probation costs owed in the amount $11,058.00. The certifications of costs for Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 are attached as **Exhibits J-1, J-2 and J-3** to the "Evidence Packet" and are incorporated herein by reference. The certification of outstanding probation monitoring costs in Board Case No. 800-2017-030868 is attached as **Exhibit J-4** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

17. Further, Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 15 of the Board's Decision and Order in Board Case No. 800-2017-030868, effective November 13, 2020 (2020 Order). A copy of the Declaration from the Board's Probation Inspector is attached as **Exhibit K** to the "Evidence Packet" and is incorporated herein by reference.

18. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, contained in Exhibits A through K, finds that the allegations in Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800 and Accusation No. 800-2021-078555, and each of them, separately and severably, are true.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. has subjected his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267 to discipline.

2. A copy of Petition to Revoke Probation No. 800-2024-104800, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached hereto as Exhibit B.

3. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached hereto as Exhibit E.

4. The Medical Board of California has jurisdiction to adjudicate these cases by default.

5. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate based upon the following violations alleged in the Petition to Revoke Probation:

a. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 1 of the 2020 Order (Education Course);

b. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 4 of the 2020 Order (Ethics Course);

c. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 5 of the 2020 Order (Monitoring – Practice);

d. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 7 of the 2020 Order (Obey All Laws; Fictitious Name Permit);

e. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 8 of the 2020 Order (Quarterly Declarations);

f. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 15 of the 2020 Order (Probation Monitoring Costs);

g. Respondent failed to comply with Probation Condition 9 of the 2020 Order (General Probation Requirements); and

h. Respondent violated the conditions of his probation pursuant to Condition 13 of the 2020 Order (Violation of Probation).

(See Exhibit K.)

6. The Medical Board of California is authorized to revoke Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate based upon his unprofessional conduct, including the following violations alleged in the Accusation:

a. Respondent was grossly negligent in his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C, pursuant to Code section 2234, subdivision (b);

b. Respondent was repeatedly negligent in his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C, pursuant to Code section 2234, subdivision (c);

c. Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate medical records of his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C, pursuant to Code section 2266; and

d. Respondent prescribing without indication, pursuant to Code section 2242. (See Exhibit I.)

7. Pursuant to Code section 125.3, the Board is authorized to order Respondent to pay the Board the reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 totaling $27,574.75. (See Exhibits J-1, J-2 and J-3.)

8. Pursuant to Probation Condition 15 of the Decision and Order in case number 800-2017-030868, Respondent owes $11,058.00 in outstanding probation monitoring costs to the Board. (See Exhibit J-4.)

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267, heretofore issued to Respondent MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D., is revoked for each of the violations, separately and severally, found in the Determination of Issues above.

Respondent is ordered to pay the Board the costs of the investigation and enforcement of Accusation No. 800-2021-078555 in the amount of $27,574.75. Further, Respondent is ordered to reimburse the Board the amount of $11,058.00, for its outstanding probation monitoring costs. The filing of bankruptcy by Respondent shall not relieve Respondent of his responsibility to reimburse the Board for its costs. Respondent must pay the entire amount of costs prior to petitioning for reinstatement.

If Respondent ever files an application for re-licensure or 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 license in effect at the time the petition is filed.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The Board in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on October 9, 2024.

It is so ORDERED September 9, 2024.



REJI VARGHESE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FOR THE MEDICAL BOARD OF
CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Attachment: Default Decision Evidence Packet

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
EDWARD KIM
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 195729
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6000
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
Attorneys for Complainant

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

In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation Against: **MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D.** **515 Cabrillo Park Dr., Suite 120** **SANTA ANA, CA 92701-5016** **Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267** Respondent.	Case No. 800-2024-104800 **PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION**

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Petition to Revoke Probation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).

2. On or about July 1, 1980, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number G 42267 to Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2024, unless renewed.

3. In a Board disciplinary action entitled "In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.," Case No. 800-2017-030868, the Board issued a decision, effective

November 13, 2020 (the Decision), in which Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was revoked. However, that revocation was stayed and Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was placed on probation for a period of three (3) years with certain terms and conditions. A copy of the Decision is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference.

JURISDICTION

4. This Petition to Revoke Probation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws and the Board's Decision. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

5. Section 118 of the Code provides:

> (a) The withdrawal of an application for a license after it has been filed with a board in the department shall not, unless the board has consented in writing to such withdrawal, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a proceeding against the applicant for the denial of the license upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order denying the license upon any such ground.
>
> (b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground.
>
> (c) As used in this section, "board" includes an individual who is authorized by any provision of this code to issue, suspend, or revoke a license, and "license" includes "certificate," "registration," and "permit."

6. 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.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

7. On or about November 12, 2020, a Board representative spoke to Respondent via telephone to discuss the terms and conditions of his probation contained in the Decision. During the call, a Board representative told Respondent that his probation with the Board would be effective November 13, 2020 and would last for three (3) years, and explained the terms and

conditions of the probationary order in the Decision (Order) to Respondent, including, without limitation, the following conditions: (i) 1. Education Course; (ii) 4. Professionalism Program (Ethics Course); (iii) 5. Monitoring - Practice; (iv) 7. Obey All Laws; (v) 8. Quarterly Declarations; and (vi) Other Standard Conditions, including costs. Respondent acknowledged that he understood and would comply with the terms and conditions of the Order.

8. Thereafter, Respondent failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. Each such failure to comply was described in and coincided with the issuance of a letter to Respondent from the Board, as described in more detail below. In addition, although Respondent received an enrollment letter to the Physician Enhancement Program (PEP) at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Medical School in connection with his practice monitor condition, Condition 5 of the Order, which required that he submit all required documents to UCSD Medical School PEP Program within 60 days of that date to complete his enrollment in UCSD Medical School PEP Program, he repeatedly failed to do so. On or about September 2, 2022, the Board issued a Cease Practice Order to Respondent, pursuant to the terms of the Order based upon his failure to comply with Condition 5 (Monitoring - Practice) of the Order. On or about October 5, 2022, the Board issued a Termination of Cease Practice Order. On or about April 20, 2023, the Board issued a Cease Practice Order to Respondent, pursuant to the terms of the Order based upon his failure to comply with Condition 5 (Monitoring - Practice) of his Order. On or about May 10, 2023, the Board issued a Termination of Cease Practice Order. On or about November 13, 2023, the Board issued a Cease Practice Order to Respondent, pursuant to the terms of the Order based upon his failure to comply with Condition 5 (Monitoring - Practice) of the Order. Accordingly, based on his repeated failures to comply with the terms of his Order, Respondent's probationary term with the Board that was originally scheduled to end on March 20, 2024 was extended to April 9, 2024 due to the issuance of the Cease Practice Orders. Further, on or about May 11, 2023, the Board sent a letter to Respondent explaining the forgoing probation extension to him and also informing Respondent that his outstanding probation costs in the amount of $11,544.00 were due by November 20, 2023.

///

FIRST CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Education Course)

9. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 1 (Education Course) of the Order stated:

> Within sixty (60) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, 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 forty (40) hours per year, for each year of probation. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be aimed at correcting any areas of deficient practice or knowledge and shall be Category I certified. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education ("CME") requirements for renewal of licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Board or its designee may administer an examination to test Respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 65 hours of CME of which forty (40) hours were in satisfaction of this condition.

10. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 1 of the Order referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about October 5, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that pursuant to Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course), he was required to complete an additional 68 hours by November 13, 2022.

C. On or about January 5, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course), and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by January 10, 2023 could result in further action.

D. On or about March 9, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course) and that he was required to complete another 128 hours by December 31, 2023.

E. On or about June 9, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course), and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by June 16, 2023

could result in further action.

F. On or about June 30, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course) and that he was deficient for 17 hours. Respondent was also reminded that he was required to complete his deficiency by July 15, 2023.

G. On or about August 29, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course) and that he was required to complete another 65 hours by February 9, 2024.

H. On or about October 23, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of 77 additional hours of continuing medical education and that 12 of those were required to have been completed by November 13, 2022 by the terms of the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by October 30, 2023 could result in further action.

I. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course) and that he had only submitted proof of completion of 53 hours out of the required 65 hours, and that he was required to complete 77 hours by February 9, 2024.

J. On or about January 4, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of 65 hours of continuing medical education for each year of probation[1] as required by the terms of the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by January 8, 2024 could result in further action.

K. Respondent failed to complete the required continuing medical education hours for each of the following years during his probationary term: year 2021 through 2022 and year 2022 through 2023, in violation of Condition 1 of the Order (Education Course). This non-compliance has continued to date.

[1] 65 hours multiplied by three years is 195 hours. Respondent only submitted proof of attendance for 110 hours and was deficient by 85 hours.

SECOND CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Professionalism Program – Ethics Course)

11. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 4 (Professionalism Program – Ethics Course) of the Order stated:

> Within sixty (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 fifteen (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.

12. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about August 5, 2021, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. He was further advised to comply with the condition by August 13, 2021.

C. On or about July 19, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by July 25, 2022.

D. On or about September 22, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by September 30, 2022.

E. On or about October 31, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

F. On or about January 5, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of a six-month follow-up component of the Ethics Course as required by the terms of the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by January 10, 2023 could result in further action.

G. On or about March 9, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

H. On or about June 12, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of a six-month follow-up component of the Ethics Course as required by the terms of the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by June 16, 2023 could result in further action.

I. On or about June 30, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

J. On or about August 29, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

K. On or about October 23, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of a six-month follow-up component of the Ethics Course as required by the terms of

the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by October 30, 2023 could result in further action.

L. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

M. On or about January 4, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit proof of compliance showing completion of a six-month follow-up component of the Ethics Course as required by the terms of the Order, and that his failure to submit such proof of compliance by January 8, 2024 could result in further action.

N. Respondent failed to complete the required six (6) month longitudinal component of the Professionalism Program (Ethics Course) in violation of Condition 4 of the Order (Ethics Course). This non-compliance has continued to date.

THIRD CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Monitoring - Practice)

13. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 5 (Monitoring - Practice) of the Order stated:

> Within thirty (30) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board or its designee for prior approval as a practice monitor, 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 fifteen (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, the monitor shall submit a revised monitoring plan with the signed statement for approval by the Board or its designee.
>
> Within sixty (60) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, and

continuing throughout probation, Respondent's practice 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 sixty (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 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 medicine, 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 ten (10) calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

If the monitor resigns or is no longer available, Respondent shall, within five (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 fifteen (15) calendar days. If Respondent fails to obtain approval of a replacement monitor within sixty (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.

14. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about January 18, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by January 21, 2022.

C. On or about April 20, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring -

Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by April 25, 2022.

D. On or about June 17, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

E. On or about June 20, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

F. On or about July 1, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), namely, submission and approval of a replacement monitor due to the disqualification of another doctor on or about June 21, 2022, and that he was further advised to comply with the condition by July 10, 2022.

G. On or about July 21, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by July 25, 2022.

H. On or about August 23, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by August 26, 2022.

I. On or about December 22, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to comply with the condition by December 30, 2022.

J. On or about February 14, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was

further advised to comply with the condition by February 21 2023.

K. On or about April 3, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to submit the name of a practice monitor to the Board by April 7, 2023.

L. On or about September 1, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to submit all the required documents to the UCSD Medical School PEP Program, or a nomination to the Board, by September 8, 2023.

M. On or about October 2, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to submit the name of a practice monitor to the Board for approval by October 9, 2023. Respondent was also advised that he was subject to a Cease Practice Oder if he failed to provided patient lists and charts for more than 60 days.

N. On or about October 17, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition. Respondent was further advised to submit the name of a practice monitor to the Board for approval by November 1, 2023.

O. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to comply with Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice), and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

P. On or about January 4, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to ensure that he had a practice monitor as required by the terms of the Order, namely, the UCSD Medical School PEP Program, and that as a result a Cease Practice Order was issued on November 13, 2023 and that as of the date of the letter the

Board had still not received any proof of compliance with his practice monitor condition.

Q. Respondent failed to have a practice monitor in place or provide patient charts to the UCSD Medical School PEP Program, in violation of Condition 5 of the Order (Monitoring - Practice). This non-compliance has continued to date.

FOURTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Obey All Laws; Fictitious Name Permit)

15. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 7 (Obey All Laws) of the Order stated, in pertinent part:

> 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.

16. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 7 of the Order referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about October 23, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to renew his fictitious name permit ["OC Comprehensive Care"], and that his failure to submit such proof of renewal of his fictitious name permit by October 30, 2023 could result in further action.

C. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to renew his fictitious name permit with the Board and that this was considered non-compliance with the Order.

D. On or about January 4, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to renew his fictitious name permit, and that his failure to submit such proof of renewal of his fictitious name permit by January 8, 2024 could result in further action.

E. Respondent failed to renew his fictitious name permit which expired on September 30, 2022, in violation of Business and Profession Code section 2415, in violation of Condition 7 (Obey All Laws) of the Order. This non-compliance has continued to date.

FIFTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Quarterly Declarations)

17. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 8 (Quarterly Declarations) of the Order stated:

> 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 ten (10) calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

18. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 8 of the Order referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about September 14, 2021, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by September 20, 2021 could result in further action.

C. On or about January 14, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by January 20, 2022 could result in further action.

D. On or about April 18, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by April 22, 2022 could result in further action.

E. On or about June 17, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, and that it was overdue.

F. On or about June 20, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, and

that it was due on June 20, 2022, but was still outstanding.

G. On or about July 1, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by July 5, 2022 could result in further action.

H. On or about July 18, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by July 22, 2022 could result in further action.

I. On or about October 14, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by October 21, 2022 could result in further action.

J. On or about October 31, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that he was in non-compliance with this condition.

K. On or about November 8, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by November 14, 2022 could result in further action.

L. On or about December 20, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by December 27, 2022 could result in further action.

M. On or about January 5, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by January 10, 2023 could result in further action.

N. On or about April 17, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by April 21, 2023 could result in further action.

O. On or about May 4, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by May 10, 2023 could result in further action.

P. On or about June 12, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by June 16, 2023 could result in further action.

Q. On or about July 14, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by July 21, 2023 could result in further action.

R. On or about August 29, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, and that it was due on July 10, 2023, but was still outstanding.

S. On or about October 16, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by October 20, 2023 could result in further action.

T. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a timely manner, and that it was due on October 10, 2023, but was still outstanding.

U. On or about January 16, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he failed to submit a quarterly declaration to the Board in a

timely manner, that he was delinquent and that his failure to submit a quarterly declaration by January 22, 2024 could result in further action.

V. Respondent failed to submit Quarter 3 and 4 Quarterly Declarations for 2023, in violation of Condition 8 (Quarterly Declarations) of the Order. This non-compliance has continued to date.

SIXTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Probation Monitoring Costs)

19. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 15 (Probation Monitoring Costs) of the Order stated:

> 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.

20. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 15 of the Order referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

A. The facts and allegations set forth in paragraphs 7 through 8 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

B. On or about April 3, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and that his failure to pay could result in further action.

C. On or about April 14, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and that his failure to pay could result in further action.

D. On or about June 12, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and out of compliance with the Order.

E. On or about June 30, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and out of compliance with the Order.

F. On or about August 29, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and still owed $11,230 in probation monitoring costs and was out of compliance with the Order.

G. On or about October 23, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to make monthly payments towards his probation monitoring costs as required by the Order, and that his failure to remit payment for the outstanding balance of $11,230 by November 20, 2023 could result in further action.

H. On or about October 25, 2023, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter advising him that he was in arrears with his probation monitoring costs and still owed $11,230 in probation monitoring costs.

I. On or about January 4, 2024, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to make monthly payments towards his probation monitoring costs as required by the Order, and that his failure to remit payment for the outstanding balance of $10,230 by January 8, 2024 could result in further action.

J. Respondent failed to pay his probation monitoring costs of $10,230.00 which was due by November 20, 2023. This non-compliance has continued to date.

SEVENTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(General Probation Requirements)

21. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 9 (General Probation Requirement) of the Order stated, in pertinent part:

> Compliance with Probation Unit: Petitioner shall comply with the Board's probation unit.
>
> . . .
>
> License Renewal
>
> Respondent shall maintain a current and renewed California physician's and surgeon's license.
>
> . . .

22. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 9, referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

23. On or about April 30, 2022, Respondent's medical license expired.

24. On or about May 4, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to renew his medical license.

25. On or about June 1, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to renew his medical license.

26. On or about June 17, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a non-compliance letter advising him that he had failed to pay his renewal fees to renew his medical license.

27. On or about June 29, 2022, Respondent renewed his medical license.

28. On or about October 5, 2022, the Board sent Respondent a follow-up letter. Respondent's probation was extended due to his failure to renew his license in a timely manner.

29. The facts and allegations of the First through Sixth Causes to Revoke Probation, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth.

EIGHTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Violation of Probation)

30. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Condition 13 (Violation of Probation) of the Order stated:

> 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, 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.

31. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Condition 13, referenced above. The circumstances are as follows:

32. The facts and allegations of the First through Seventh Causes to Revoke Probation, inclusive, are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth.

///

///

///

///

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 the probation that was granted by the Medical Board of California in Case No. 800-2017-030868 and imposing the disciplinary order that was stayed thereby revoking Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267, issued to Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.;

2. Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267, issued to Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.;

3. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants;

4. Ordering Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. to pay any outstanding balance owed to the Medical Board of California for probation or other costs, including, without limitation, the costs previously awarded in this case;

5. Ordering Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. to pay the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and, if probation is continued or extended, the costs of probation monitoring; and

6. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: MAR 15 2024

REJI VARGHESE
Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

LA2024600647
66638728.docx

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
JUDITH T. ALVARADO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
LATRICE R. HEMPHILL
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 285973
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6198
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
Attorneys for Complainant

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D.** **515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120** **Santa Ana, CA 92701-5016** **Phsyician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267,** Respondent.	Case No. 800-2021-078555 **ACCUSATION**

PARTIES

1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).

2. On or about July 1, 1980, the Medical Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number G 42267 to Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and expired on April 30, 2026.

///

///

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 118 of the Code states:

> (a) The withdrawal of an application for a license after it has been filed with a board in the department shall not, unless the board has consented in writing to such withdrawal, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a proceeding against the applicant for the denial of the license upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order denying the license upon any such ground.
>
> (b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground.
>
> (c) As used in this section, "board" includes an individual who is authorized by any provision of this code to issue, suspend, or revoke a license, and "license" includes "certificate," "registration," and "permit."

5. Section 2004 of the Code states:

> The board shall have the responsibility for the following:
>
> (a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
>
> (b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
>
> (c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.
>
> (d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
>
> (e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board.
>
> (f) Approving undergraduate and graduate medical education programs.
>
> (g) Approving clinical clerkship and special programs and hospitals for the programs in subdivision (f).
>
> (h) Issuing licenses and certificates under the board's jurisdiction.

(i) Administering the board's continuing medical education program.

6. Section 2227 of the Code states:

(a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:

(1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.

(2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the board.

(3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.

(4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the board.

(5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

(b) Any matter heard pursuant to subdivision (a), except for warning letters, medical review or advisory conferences, professional competency examinations, continuing education activities, and cost reimbursement associated therewith that are agreed to with the board and successfully completed by the licensee, or other matters made confidential or privileged by existing law, is deemed public, and shall be made available to the public by the board pursuant to Section 803.1.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

7. 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 no later than 30 calendar days after being notified by the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board.

(h) Any action of the licensee, or another person acting on behalf of the licensee, intended to cause their patient or their patient's authorized representative to rescind consent to release the patient's medical records to the board or the Department of Consumer Affairs, Health Quality Investigation Unit.

(i) Dissuading, intimidating, or tampering with a patient, witness, or any person in an attempt to prevent them from reporting or testifying about a licensee.

8. Section 2242 of the Code states:

(a) Prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, constitutes unprofessional conduct. An appropriate prior examination does not require a synchronous interaction between the patient and the licensee and can be achieved through the use of telehealth, including, but not limited to, a self-screening tool or a questionnaire, provided that the licensee complies with the appropriate standard of care.

(b) No licensee shall be found to have committed unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this section if, at the time the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished, any of the following applies:

(1) The licensee was a designated physician and surgeon or podiatrist serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and if the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished only as necessary to maintain the patient until the return of the patient's practitioner, but in any case no longer than 72 hours.

(2) The licensee transmitted the order for the drugs to a registered nurse or to a licensed vocational nurse in an inpatient facility, and if both of the following conditions exist:

(A) The practitioner had consulted with the registered nurse or licensed vocational nurse who had reviewed the patient's records.

(B) The practitioner was designated as the practitioner to serve in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be.

(3) The licensee was a designated practitioner serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and was in possession of or had utilized the patient's records and ordered the renewal of a medically indicated prescription for an amount not exceeding the original prescription in strength or amount or for more than one refill.

(4) The licensee was acting in accordance with Section 120582 of the Health and Safety Code.

9. 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

10. Section 125.3 of the Code states:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before any board within the department or before the Osteopathic Medical Board, upon request of the entity bringing the proceeding, the administrative law judge may 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.

(b) In the case of a disciplined licensee that is a corporation or a partnership, the order may be made against the licensed corporate entity or licensed partnership.

(c) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where actual 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.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

11. Respondent is the owner and director of OC Comprehensive Care, an outpatient clinic in Santa Ana, California.

Patient A[1]

12. Patient A is a forty-four-year-old man who was treated by Respondent on numerous occasions from March 2018 through February 2022.[2] According to Respondent's records, Patient A was being treated for opioid dependency, but was being tapered down per Patient A's request.

13. Throughout the treatment period, Patient A was also seen by a primary care doctor and other physicians. Patient A had a chronic prescription for alprazolam, a Schedule IV benzodiazepine used to treat anxiety and panic disorders. Patient A was also routinely prescribed diazepam, a Schedule IV benzodiazepine used to treat anxiety disorders or alcohol withdrawal symptoms, by other physicians.

14. On or about August 23, 2018, Patient A presented to Respondent for an opiate follow-up. Respondent conducted a urine drug test (UDT) during this visit, which was positive for tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), benzodiazepine, and oxycodone. Buprenorphine was not detected in the drug test. The August 23, 2018 UDT was the only documented test performed by Respondent.

---

[1] The patients are identified by letters in this Accusation to address privacy concerns.

[2] Respondent has treated Patient A on dates outside of those listed in this Accusation, but this Accusation is based on the treatment period between 2018 through 2022.

15. Respondent prescribed Patient A Zubsolv[3] on or about February 7, 2022, March 10, 2021, January 13, 2021, June 21, 2019, December 3, 2018, and October 26, 2018.

16. On or about November 28, 2020 and January 12, 2021, Respondent also prescribed Patient A diazepam.

Patient B

17. Patient B is a forty-year-old woman who was treated by Respondent on numerous occasions from November 2018 through April 2022.[4] According to Respondent's records, Patient B was being treated for chronic back and elbow pain.

18. Throughout the treatment period, and beginning September 2018 through April 2022, Respondent prescribed Patient B hydrocodone-acetaminophen,[5] a Schedule II opioid used to treat pain.

19. Throughout the treatment period, and beginning May 2019 through February 2020, Respondent prescribed Patient B carisoprodol, a Schedule IV muscle relaxant.

20. Throughout the treatment period, and beginning November 2019 through December 2021, Respondent prescribed Patient B diazepam.

Patient C

21. Patient C is a thirty-one-year-old man who was treated by Respondent from August 2019 through July 2020.[6] According to Respondent's records, Patient C was initially being treated for a dog bite to the hand. Records also indicate that Patient C suffered from chronic neck and shoulder pain.

///

---

[3] Zubsolv is a Schedule III drug that contains a combination of buprenorphine and naloxone. Buprenorphine is an opioid medication and naloxone blocks the effects of opioid medication. Zubsolv is used to treat opioid addiction.

[4] Respondent may have treated Patient B on dates outside of those listed in this Accusation, but this Accusation is based on the treatment period between 2018 through 2022.

[5] Hydrocodone and acetaminophen is a combination medicine used to relieve moderate to severe pain. Hydrocodone is an opioid pain reliever and cough suppressant, also known as a narcotic analgesic, that works on the central nervous system. Acetaminophen is a non-opioid analgesic used for pain relief and to reduce fever, and increases the effects of hydrocodone. It is a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022 of the Code.

[6] Respondent may have treated Patient C on dates outside of those listed in this Accusation, but this Accusation is based on the treatment period between 2019 through 2020.

22. On or about September 30, 2019, Respondent prescribed Patient C hydrocodone-acetaminophen.

23. On or about December 18, 2019, Patient C presented to Respondent for a follow-up regarding his neck pain. During this visit, Patient C requested a prescription for Subutex (buprenorphine), a Schedule III opiate replacement therapy used to treat opioid addiction. Patient C indicated that he had taken the medication in the past and wanted to try it again for two weeks. Respondent provided the prescription, which was filled on or about February 27, 2020.

24. On or about February 27, 2020, Respondent also prescribed Patient C diazepam for his anxiety.

25. On or about July 17, 2020 and July 21, 2020, Respondent prescribed Patient C oxycodone-hydrochloride, a Schedule II opioid used to treat moderate to severe pain.

26. On or about July 17, 2020, Respondent prescribed Patient C clonazepam, a Schedule IV benzodiazepine used to treat certain seizure and panic disorders.

STANDARD OF CARE WHEN PRESCRIBING CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

27. **Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES).** Physicians should check a patient's CURES report when the patient is new to the physician, when first prescribing a new medication to a patient, and at least every six months thereafter.

28. **Medical Records.** Physicians must maintain adequate and accurate medical records. The contents of a patient's medical records should include the patient's medical history and physical examinations results. Medical records should also include lab tests, patient consent and pain management agreements, risk assessments, and results of CURES reports.

29. **Pain Contract.** Patients on long-term opiates, or those needing opiates longer than three months, should have a pain contract that outlines the responsibilities of the patient and provider.

30. **Prescription for Naloxone.** Physicians should educate patients about the danger signs of respiratory depression. Physicians should also offer patients a prescription for naloxone, and educate patients on how to safely administer naloxone, an opiate antagonist used to quickly reverse an opioid overdose.

31. **Patient Consent.** Physicians should discuss the risks and benefits associated with the use of controlled substances. Physicians should document patient consent.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

32. Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234, subdivision (b), in that Respondent was grossly negligent in his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C. The circumstances are as follows:

33. Complainant hereby re-alleges the facts set forth in paragraphs 11 through 31, above, as though fully set forth.

Patient A

34. Patient A was being treated for opioid dependency, while he was simultaneously prescribed benzodiazepines. However, there was no documentation indicating that Respondent educated Patient A about the danger signs of respiratory depression, and Respondent failed to prescribe Patient A naloxone. These failures constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.

Patient B

35. Patient B's medical records indicate that her chronic back pain is the result of a protruding lumbar disc, necessitating the prescription for hydrocodone-acetaminophen. However, the records do not include an adequate medical history or imaging tests to support the diagnosis. The records also fail to discuss non-opiate modalities for managing pain. Furthermore, records indicate that Patient B was breastfeeding, but there is no discussion regarding titrating her opiate medication to limit any risks to the infant. Respondent also failed to document patient consent or risk assessments. Additionally, there was no documentation indicating that Respondent educated Patient B about the danger signs of respiratory depression, and Respondent failed to prescribe Patient B naloxone. These failures constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.

///

///

///

Patient C

36. Patient C's medical records do not include imaging, lab or test results, or any documentation supporting the chronic pain diagnosis. Additionally, the records do not include an adequate medical history or an adequate work-up to justify a prescription for opioids. The records also fail to discuss non-opiate modalities for managing pain. Respondent also failed to document patient consent, or a treatment plan and the success or failure of the treatment plan. Respondent's failures constitute an extreme departure from the standard of care.

37. There was no documentation indicating that Respondent educated Patient C about the danger signs of respiratory depression, and Respondent failed to prescribe Patient C naloxone, despite prescribing Patient C a benzodiazepine and opioid. This constitutes an extreme departure from the standard of care.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

38. Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2234, subdivision (c), in that Respondent was repeatedly negligent in his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C. The circumstances are as follows:

39. The facts and allegations set forth in the First Cause for Discipline are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth.

40. Each act of gross negligence set forth in the First Cause for Discipline is also a negligent act.

41. Respondent also committed the following acts of negligence in his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C:

Patient A

42. Throughout the treatment period, Respondent failed to adequately document Patient A's medical history, which is a simple departure from the standard of care.

43. Respondent failed to document a pain contract or Patient A's compliance with a pain contract, despite prescribing Patient A benzodiazepines and opioids. This failure constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

44. Patient A's medical records included several entries that were not legible as written. This constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

45. While records indicate that Respondent periodically checked Patient A's CURES report, Respondent prescribed Patient A a benzodiazepine when he already had an active prescription for a benzodiazepine from another physician. Patient A was also receiving opiate replacement therapy from Respondent, despite having an active prescription for an opioid from another physician. Respondent failed to indicate the results of the CURES checks and failed to justify why he provided Patient A prescriptions for controlled substances in light of his other active prescriptions for controlled substances from other providers. Respondent's actions and inactions constitute a simple departure from the standard of care.

Patient B

46. Respondent failed to document a pain contract or Patient B's compliance with a pain contract. This failure constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

47. Patient B's medical records included several entries that were not legible as written. This constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

48. While records indicate that Respondent periodically checked Patient B's CURES report, Respondent failed to indicate the results of the CURES checks. Respondent's failure to document constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

Patient C

49. Respondent failed to document a pain contract or Patient C's compliance with a pain contract. This failure constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

50. Patient C's medical records included several entries that were not legible as written. This constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

51. Respondent failed to document patient consent. This constitutes a simple departure from the standard of care.

52. While records indicate that Respondent periodically checked Patient C's CURES report, Respondent failed to indicate the results of the CURES checks. Further, Respondent failed to justify why he provided Patient C prescriptions for opioids when Patient C had active

opioid prescriptions from other providers. Respondent's actions and inactions constitute a simple departure from the standard of care.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate Medical Records)

53. By reasons of the facts and allegations set forth in the First and Second Causes for Discipline, Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2266 in that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records of his care and treatment of Patients A, B, and C.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

54. Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 2234, subdivision (a), and 2242 in that Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct when he prescribed dangerous drugs to Patients A, B, and C without appropriate prior examinations or medical indication thereof. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 26, above, as though fully set forth.

55. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in the First, Second, and Third Causes for Discipline, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code section 2234. Therefore, cause for discipline exists.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

56. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D., Complainant alleges that on or about November 13, 2020, in a prior disciplinary action titled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.* before the Medical Board of California, in Case Number 800-2017-030868, Respondent's license was revoked, with the revocation stayed for a period of three (3) years, subject to terms and conditions. This action was taken due to sustained allegations of gross negligence, repeated negligent acts, unprofessional conduct, excessive prescribing, and failure to maintain accurate and adequate medical records. 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 G 42267, issued to Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.;

2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;

3. Ordering Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, 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; and

4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: MAY 31 2024

for

REJI VARGHESE
Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

LA2024602054
66777445.docx

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	
Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.	Case No. 800-2017-030868
Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267	
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 November 13, 2020.

IT IS SO ORDERED: October 14, 2020.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Kristina D. Lawson, J.D., Chair
Panel B

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
JUDITH T. ALVARADO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
REBECCA L. SMITH
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 179733
California Department of Justice
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6475
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
Attorneys for Complainant

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D. 515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120 Santa Ana, California 92701-5016 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267, Respondent.	Case No. 800-2017-030868 OAH No. 2020040153 **STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:

PARTIES

1. William Prasifka ("Complainant") is the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California ("Board"). He brought this action solely in his official capacity and is represented in this matter by Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California, by Rebecca L. Smith, Deputy Attorney General.

2. Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. ("Respondent") is represented in this proceeding by attorney William A. Elliott, whose address is 13522 Newport Avenue, Suite 201, Tustin, California 92780.

3. On or about July 1, 1980, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267 to Respondent. That license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 800-2017-030868, and will expire on April 30, 2022, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 800-2017-030868 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 March 13, 2020. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.

5. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2017-030868 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. 800-2017-030868. 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. 800-2017-030868, 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. 800-2017-030868, 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. G 42267 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.

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. 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. 800-2017-030868 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.

14. 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.

///

///

15. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or opportunity to be heard by Respondent, issue and enter the following Disciplinary Order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267 issued to Respondent MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and Respondent is placed on probation for three (3) years on the following terms and conditions:

1. EDUCATION COURSE. Within sixty (60) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, 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 forty (40) hours per year, for each year of probation. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be aimed at correcting any areas of deficient practice or knowledge and shall be Category I certified. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be at Respondent's expense and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education ("CME") requirements for renewal of licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Board or its designee may administer an examination to test Respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 65 hours of CME of which forty (40) hours were in satisfaction of this condition.

2. PRESCRIBING PRACTICES COURSE. Within sixty (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 fifteen (15) calendar days after successfully completing the course, or not later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the effective date of the Decision, whichever is later.

3. MEDICAL RECORD KEEPING COURSE. Within sixty (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 fifteen (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.

4. PROFESSIONALISM PROGRAM (ETHICS COURSE). Within sixty (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 fifteen (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.

5. MONITORING - PRACTICE. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board or its designee for prior approval as a practice monitor, 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 fifteen (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, the monitor shall submit a revised monitoring plan with the signed statement for approval by the Board or its designee.

Within sixty (60) calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, and continuing throughout probation, Respondent's practice 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 sixty (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 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 medicine, 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 ten (10) calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

If the monitor resigns or is no longer available, Respondent shall, within five (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 fifteen (15) calendar days. If Respondent fails to obtain approval of a replacement monitor within sixty (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.

6. NOTIFICATION. Within seven (7) days of the effective date of this Decision, 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 fifteen (15) calendar days.

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

7. OBEY ALL LAWS. 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.

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 ten (10) calendar days after the end of the preceding quarter.

9. 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 thirty (30) calendar days prior to the dates of departure and return.

10. INTERVIEW WITH THE BOARD OR ITS DESIGNEE. 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. NON-PRACTICE WHILE ON PROBATION. Respondent shall notify the Board or its designee in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days of any periods of non-practice lasting more than thirty (30) calendar days and within fifteen (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 forty (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 eighteen (18) calendar months, Respondent shall successfully complete the Federation of State Medical Boards's 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.

12. COMPLETION OF PROBATION. Respondent shall comply with all financial obligations (e.g., restitution, probation costs) not later than one-hundred twenty (120) calendar days prior to the completion of probation. Upon successful completion of probation, Respondent's certificate shall be fully restored.

13. VIOLATION OF PROBATION. 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. LICENSE SURRENDER. 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 fifteen (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. 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, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 800-2017-030868 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.

///

///

///

///

///

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, William A. Elliott. 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 voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.

DATED: 7/30/20

MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D.
Respondent

I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I approve its form and content.

DATED: 7/30/2020

WILLIAM A. ELLIOTT
Attorney for Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Medical Board of California.

DATED: 8/3/2020

Respectfully submitted,

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
JUDITH T. ALVARADO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

REBECCA L. SMITH
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

LA2019500849
63452626.docx

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 800-2017-030868

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
JUDITH T. ALVARADO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
REBECCA L. SMITH
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 179733
California Department of Justice
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6475
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
Attorneys for Complainant

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: MARK STEPHEN WAGNER, M.D. 515 Cabrillo Park Drive, Suite 120 Santa Ana, California, 92701-5016 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 42267, Respondent.	Case No. 800-2017-030868 ACCUSATION

PARTIES

1. Christine J. Lally ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs ("Board").

2. On or about July 1, 1980, the Medical Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number G 42267 to Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D. ("Respondent"). That license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2022, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following provisions of the California Business and Professions Code ("Code") unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 2004 of the Code states:

The board shall have the responsibility for the following:

(a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice Act.

(b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.

(c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.

(d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.

(e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board.

(f) Approving undergraduate and graduate medical education programs.

(g) Approving clinical clerkship and special programs and hospitals for the programs in subdivision (f).

(h) Issuing licenses and certificates under the board's jurisdiction.

(i) Administering the board's continuing medical education program.

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.

6. 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 which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.

(f) Any action or conduct which 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.

7. Section 2242 of the Code states:

(a) Prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in Section 4022 without an appropriate prior examination and a medical indication, constitutes

unprofessional conduct. An appropriate prior examination does not require a synchronous interaction between the patient and the licensee and can be achieved through the use of telehealth, including, but not limited to, a self-screening tool or a questionnaire, provided that the licensee complies with the appropriate standard of care.

(b) No licensee shall be found to have committed unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this section if, at the time the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished, any of the following applies:

(1) The licensee was a designated physician and surgeon or podiatrist serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and if the drugs were prescribed, dispensed, or furnished only as necessary to maintain the patient until the return of his or her practitioner, but in any case no longer than 72 hours.

(2) The licensee transmitted the order for the drugs to a registered nurse or to a licensed vocational nurse in an inpatient facility, and if both of the following conditions exist:

(A) The practitioner had consulted with the registered nurse or licensed vocational nurse who had reviewed the patient's records.

(B) The practitioner was designated as the practitioner to serve in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be.

(3) The licensee was a designated practitioner serving in the absence of the patient's physician and surgeon or podiatrist, as the case may be, and was in possession of or had utilized the patient's records and ordered the renewal of a medically indicated prescription for an amount not exceeding the original prescription in strength or amount or for more than one refill.

(4) The licensee was acting in accordance with Section 120582 of the Health and Safety Code.

8. Section 725 of the Code states:

(a) Repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering of drugs or treatment, repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic procedures, or repeated acts of clearly excessive use of diagnostic or treatment facilities as determined by the standard of the community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon, dentist, podiatrist, psychologist, physical therapist, chiropractor, optometrist, speech-language pathologist, or audiologist.

(b) Any person who engages in repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs or treatment is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars ($100) nor more than six hundred

dollars ($600), or by imprisonment for a term of not less than 60 days nor more than 180 days, or by both that fine and imprisonment.

(c) A practitioner who has a medical basis for prescribing, furnishing, dispensing, or administering dangerous drugs or prescription controlled substances shall not be subject to disciplinary action or prosecution under this section.

(d) No physician and surgeon shall be subject to disciplinary action pursuant to this section for treating intractable pain in compliance with Section 2241.5.

9. 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.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES/DANGEROUS DRUGS

10. Code section 4021 states:

"Controlled substance" means any substance listed in Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 11053) of Division 10 of the Health and Safety Code.

11. Code section 4022 provides:

"Dangerous drug" or "dangerous device" means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:

(a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.

(b) Any device that bears the statement: "Caution: federal law restricts this device to sale by or on the order of a _____," "Rx only," or words of similar import, the blank to be filled in with the designation of the practitioner licensed to use or order use of the device.

(c) Any other drug or device that by federal or state law can be lawfully dispensed only on prescription or furnished pursuant to Section 4006.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Respondent is the owner and director of OC Comprehensive Care, an outpatient clinic in Santa Ana. From November 9, 2011 through July 21, 2018, Patient 1[1] received care and treatment from Respondent and his staff at OC Comprehensive Care for post-traumatic stress

///

[1] For privacy purposes, the patient in this Accusation is referred to as Patient 1.

disorder ("PTSD") and panic disorder. Patient 1 developed a dependence upon benzodiazepines during his care and treatment at Respondent's clinic.

13. Patient 1 initially presented to Respondent's clinic on November 11, 2011, at which time he was seen by Dr. T.P. and diagnosed with PTSD and anxiety. Patient 1 received a medical cannabis certificate.[2] Dr. T.P. prescribed 90 tablets of Xanax,[3] 1 mg, with instructions to take one tablet three times a day. Dr. T.P. next saw Patient 1 on December 7, 2011, at which time he prescribed 120 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, with instructions for Patient 1 to take one tablet three times a day.

14. Respondent first saw Patient 1 on January 5, 2012, at which time Respondent noted that Patient 1's chief complaints were anxiety, PTSD and panic disorder. Respondent documented that Patient 1 reported having less frequent and less severe panic attacks with the attacks occurring about two times a day rather than three times a day. On a "Physical Finding/s" template, Respondent checked off that the patient's examination was within normal limits in all respects. No other assessment was noted. Respondent's impression was PTSD and panic disorder. Respondent prescribed 150 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, with instructions for Patient 1 to take five tablets daily, twice a day and one additional tablet as needed for breakthrough panic. Respondent instructed the patient to return in one month.

15. Patient 1 returned to Respondent's clinic on February 4, 2012, at which time Respondent noted that Patient 1's chief complaint was anxiety. Respondent documented that Patient 1 reported that he experienced a couple panic attacks daily which would last about 15 minutes, that the medication was helpful and that he preferred taking two tablets three times a day. Respondent prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, with instructions for Patient 1 to take two tablets three times a day.

///

---

[2] Patient 1 received medical cannabis certificates for the following time periods during his care and treatment at Respondent's clinic: November 9, 2011 through November 8, 2012; January 11, 2014 through January 10, 2015; February 10, 2015 through February 9, 2016; and September 16, 2016 through September 16, 2017.

[3] Xanax, the brand name for alprazolam, is a Schedule IV Controlled Substance and a dangerous drug.

16. For the next 10 months, Patient 1 was seen monthly at Respondent's clinic by Respondent or his staff. At each monthly visit, Patient 1 was prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, with instructions to take two tablets three times a day. After the March 2, 2012 visit, PTSD was dropped as a diagnosis, without explanation. Thereafter, the health care providers, including Respondent noted an impression of "anxiety" and occasionally, the additional impression of "panic disorder". Other than checking off boxes on a "Physical Findings/s" templates, no other physical assessments or evaluations for that 10-month time period were charted. Patient history taking was likewise limited to checking off boxes. Other than one notation by Respondent on April 2, 2012, that he "re-advised patient regarding tolerance, dependence, and withdrawal symptoms," there was no documentation of obtaining informed consent regarding the risks of taking Xanax.[4]

17. On January 23, 2013, Patient 1 was seen at Respondent's clinic by staff physician, Dr. A.P. At that time, Dr. A.P. noted that the patient's chief complaint was anxiety, that the anxiety was stable as expected and that the patient had no side effects or new complaints. Dr. A.P. noted that the patient had no panic attacks and that his anxiety was well controlled. Dr. A.P.'s impression was anxiety. He prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, with instructions for Patient 1 to take two tablets three times a day. In addition, he prescribed 30 tablets of Lexapro,[5] 10 mg, with instructions for Patient 1 to take once a day. There was no documentation setting forth the reason for prescribing Lexapro and no documentation of any discussion of the risks and benefits associated with taking Lexapro. Patient 1 was also instructed to return to the clinic in one month.

18. On February 22, 2013, Patient 1 was seen by Respondent at which time the patient reported that the Lexapro was not effective and that Xanax works better. Respondent's impression was anxiety/panic disorder. He prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, two tablets to

///

[4] Only on July 27, 2012 and August 29, 2012, Patient 1 executed a document entitled Controlled Substance Informed Consent Form. These two forms do not document the risks associated with taking controlled substances.

[5] Lexapro is a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI). It is used as a treatment for major depressive disorder.

be taken three times a day and 30 tablets of Lexapro, 10 mg, to be taken once a day. The patient was instructed to return in a month.

19. For the remainder of 2013 through April 4, 2014, Patient 1 was seen monthly at Respondent's clinic by Respondent or his staff for a chief complaint of anxiety. At each monthly visit, Patient 1 was prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, two tablets to be taken three times a day and 30 tablets of Lexapro, 10 mg, to be taken once a day. For each visit, the physical examination documentation consisted of checking off boxes on "Physical Finding/s" templates and the health care provider's impression was always "anxiety" with the occasional additional impression of panic disorder. There was no documentation of any discussions with Patient 1 regarding the risks of taking Xanax and Lexapro.

20. On May 2, 2014, Patient 1 was seen at Respondent's clinic by Dr. A.P. The patient's chief complaint was anxiety follow-up. Dr. A.P. noted that the patient felt that his anxiety was better controlled when he took 20 mg of Lexapro. On a "Physical Finding/s" template, Dr. A.P. checked off that the examination was within normal limits in all respects. No other assessment was noted. Dr. A.P.'s impression was anxiety. Dr. A.P. increased the patient's Lexapro to 30 tablets at 20 mg. Other than the patient's indication that his anxiety was better controlled when he took 20 mg of Lexapro, no further reason or explanation for the increase in dose was noted. Likewise, there was no documentation of any discussions with Patient 1 regarding the risks of increasing the dosage. Dr. A.P. also prescribed 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, to be taken three times a day. The patient was instructed to return in 1 month.

21. Patient 1 returned to Respondent's clinic on May 31, 2014, and was again seen by Dr. A.P. The patient's chief complaint was anxiety follow-up. Dr. A.P. noted that the 20 mg of Lexapro was working well, the patient's anxiety was managed and he had no panic attacks. Dr. A.P. checked off that the patient's physical examination was within normal limits in all respects. No other assessment was noted other than a urine drug test positive for benzodiazepines. Dr. A.P.'s impression was anxiety. He prescribed 30 tablets of Lexapro, 20 mg, and 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, to be taken three times a day. The patient was instructed to return in 1 month.

///

22. On June 27, 2014, Patient 1 was seen by Respondent who noted the patient's chief complaint was anxiety follow-up. He further noted that the patient was taking Lexapro 20 mg and it was "working better." Respondent noted that the patient was not undergoing therapy, counseling or group sessions. Respondent checked off that the patient's physical examination was within normal limits. Respondent's impression was anxiety/panic disorder. He prescribed 30 tablets of Lexapro, 20 mg, with two refills, as well as 180 tablets of Xanax, 1 mg, to be taken three times a day. In addition, Respondent noted that he recommended therapy. The patient was instructed to return in 1 month.

23. For the remainder of 2014, Patient 1 continued to present on a monthly basis to Respondent's clinic for medications for his "anxiety/panic disorder." On July 25, 2014, Respondent added an additional diagnosis of depression. Other than when Patient 1 reported that he lost his medications, his panic attacks were documented to be under control.[6] During this timeframe, Patient 1's medical records from the clinic reflected normal examinations, with occasional urine drug testing reflecting that the patient was positive for benzodiazepines. On September 15, 2014, Respondent noted that Patient 1's CURES report reflected that in addition to the Xanax prescribed at Respondent's clinic, Patient 1 was receiving Valium.[7] Respondent further documented that the patient reported that Valium had "no effect." In addition to the monthly prescriptions for Lexapro and Xanax, Respondent added a prescription for 30 tablets of Valium 10 mg, one tablet to be taken at bedtime. The dose and dosage of these medications were adjusted at various visits without documented explanation.

24. Patient 1 continued to present to Respondent's clinic on a monthly basis in 2015 for treatment of his "anxiety/panic disorder." Every month, Patient 1 was noted to have had a normal examination. Lexapro was discontinued in August 2015, at which time Respondent noted that the patient was "not taking or acquiring Lexapro as prescribed." Every month, Patient 1 continued to

[6] In September and October 2014, Patient 1 reported that he lost his medications and on both occasions, Respondent gave him new prescriptions.

[7] Valium, the brand name for diazepam, is a Schedule IV Controlled Substance, a benzodiazepine, and a dangerous drug.

be prescribed Xanax and Valium, with varying doses and dosages.[8] Respondent recommended grief counseling in August 2015. Respondent noted in October 2015 that grief counseling was to be arranged and in November 2015, that the patient had not yet seen a therapist. Also of significance, at the time of Patient 1's September 21, 2015 visit, Respondent noted that it would be the patient's last visit of receiving 120 tablets each of Xanax and Valium and that the patient must have a psychological support evaluation. Respondent further documented "[p]atient very demanding and I suspect diversion."

25. Patient 1 continued to present to Respondent's clinic on a monthly basis in 2016 for treatment of his "anxiety/panic disorder." In September and October 2016, Patient 1's visits were by video conference and in December 2016, Patient 1's visit was by audio conference. The examinations of Patient 1 were essentially documented to be "normal" with the exception of July 2016 at which time Respondent documented tenderness of the left 5th, 6th and 7th costochondral junctions following an accident the patient had in his garage 2 weeks prior. Three urine drug screens performed in 2016 reflected that the patient was positive for benzodiazepines and opioids. The only visit that the positive opioid was discussed was on November 12, 2016, at which time the patient reported that he had "left-over" Tylenol with Codeine[9] from when he broke his sternum and had taken it because he had an upper respiratory infection with cough that had since resolved. In 2016, Patient 1 was prescribed 120 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 120 tablets of Valium, 10 mg. At the time of Patient 1's October 15, 2016 video conference, Respondent documented that the patient claimed to have no problems at the pharmacy despite the high dose of benzodiazepines. With respect to therapy, the patient reported that he was considering therapy in February 2016. In March 2016, the patient reported that his girlfriend was better than a therapist and in May 2016, the patient reported that he was seeing a church therapist. In June and August 2016, the patient reported that he benefited little from psychological therapy. In June 2016,

[8] In August 2015, Patient 1 reported that he lost his medications and in response, Respondent gave him a new prescription.

[9] Tylenol with Codeine, the brand name for acetaminophen and codeine, is a Schedule IV Controlled Substance and a dangerous drug.

Patient 1 reported that he tried cannabis but that it was not helpful. Notwithstanding, his medical cannabis certification was renewed for anxiety, panic disorder, headaches and low back pain.

26. On January 7, 2017, Patient 1 was seen by Respondent for anxiety follow-up.[10] At that time, Respondent noted that the patient's anxiety was well controlled with medication and very difficult to wean. There was no indication when, if at all, an attempt to wean occurred. He also noted that the patient reported that therapy was not effective in the past. Respondent documented a normal examination. Respondent's impression was chronic and acute anxiety. Respondent prescribed 120 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 120 tablets of Vallum, 10 mg. With respect to his plan, Respondent noted that the patient has been on this therapy for "years" and in the patient's own words, he was "functioning normal" and "productive."

27. Patient 1 was next seen by Respondent on February 4, 2017, with a chief complaint of anxiety follow-up. Respondent noted that the patient claimed that he required "high dose" therapy for persistent anxiety/panic. He further noted that the patient "pleads for meds at all visits." Respondent documented a normal examination and noted that the patient's urine drug test was positive for benzodiazepines, morphine[11] and THC.[12] Respondent's assessment was chronic anxiety/panic disorder and benzodiazepine dependence. He instructed the patient to follow-up with a psychiatrist or psychologist for evaluation. Respondent noted that he will gradually decrease the patient's prescriptions starting with Xanax. Respondent further noted that the patient returned about an hour after his visit with a bottle of Tylenol with Codeine prescribed by Kaiser physician, Dr. B.N. on July 11, 2016, for a sternal fracture.

28. On February 7, 2017, Respondent noted in Patient 1's chart that he spoke with Kaiser psychiatrist, Dr. B.B. who reported that Patient 1 presented to the Kaiser Baldwin Park emergency room with thoughts of overdosing on Xanax/Vallium. Dr. B.B. reported that Patient 1 was admitted voluntarily for detoxification and counseling.

///

[10] This visit appears to be incorrectly dated in Patient 1's medical records as January 7, 2016.

[11] Morphine is a Schedule II Controlled Substance and a dangerous drug.

[12] THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) is a Schedule I Controlled Substance and is a dangerous drug.

29. On February 7, 2017, Patient 1 was admitted to Kaiser's psychiatric in-patient unit for three days for depression and suicidal ideation. Thereafter, Patient 1 was referred to a Kaiser multidisciplinary intensive outpatient substance abuse and detoxification program overseen by Kaiser physician, Dr. M.K. A benzodiazepine dependence treatment plan was established for Patient 1. He underwent a detoxification and agreed that he would remain benzodiazepine free indefinitely and any emergence of anxiety would be treated with non-benzodiazepines.[13] Over a two-month period from February 7, 2017 to April 10, 2017, Patient 1 successfully completed Valium and Xanax detoxification.

30. Patient 1 returned to Respondent's clinic on May 30, 2017, at which time he was seen by Nurse Practitioner I.B. for anxiety follow-up. He was noted to have had a normal examination. Nurse Practitioner's impression was anxiety. She prescribed 120 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 120 tablets of Valium, 10 mg and noted that the patient stated that he has been taking this medication for two years and denied medication side effects. Patient 1 was instructed to return in 1 month. There was no reference to the patient's recent detoxification.

31. On June 24, 2017, Respondent documented that he had a videoconference with Patient 1 at which time the patient reported that everything was okay. There was a further note that the patient had "paid $408.00 and charged twice for anxiety as per medical director." Again, there was no reference to the patient's recent detoxification.

32. On July 22, 2017, Respondent documented that he had a videoconference with Patient 1 at which time the patient reported that he was stable as expected with medications and worsened without medications. Respondent noted that the patient had chronic anxiety and panic and that the patient admitted abuse and overuse of Valium and Xanax. Respondent documented that the patient was "pleading" and reported that things were good as long as he was medicated. Respondent advised Patient 1 to see a therapist or psychiatrist. He prescribed the patient 60

///

[13] It was anticipated by Dr. M.K. that Patient 1 would likely experience reemergence of anxiety in the process of being tapered off benzodiazepines (using long-acting clonazepam to taper Patient 1 off the Valium and Xanax) and that if he experienced anxiety at a level requiring pharmacologic intervention, non-benzodiazepines would be used.

tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 60 tablets of Valium, 10 mg. He noted that with the medication reduction, the patient may need to follow-up in 2 weeks.

33. On August 19, 2017, Respondent documented that he had a videoconference with Patient 1. The patient reported that he saw a therapist in July and would see a therapist in Respondent's office on Tuesdays. The patient requested an increase to 90 tablets of Xanax and Valium. Respondent prescribed 60 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 60 tablets of Valium, 10 mg.

34. On September 16, 2017, Respondent documented that he had a videoconference with Patient 1. The patient was noted to be stable as expected and improved. The patient reported that he attended a therapy session. He requested a change in his medication with an increase in Xanax tablets and reduction of Valium. Respondent agreed and prescribed 90 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 30 tablets of Valium, 10 mg. Respondent noted that the patient would be seen in person for the following visit.

35. Patient 1 was seen by Respondent on October 14, 2017 at which time Respondent noted that the patient was doing well and was less anxious with therapy sessions. Respondent documented a normal examination and noted an impression of anxiety/panic disorder. Respondent prescribed 90 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 30 tablets of Valium, 10 mg. Patient 1 was instructed to return in one month.

36. Patient 1 continued to present to Respondent's clinic on a monthly basis for treatment of his "anxiety/panic disorder" and was prescribed 90 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 30 tablets of Valium, 10 mg from November 2017 through May 2018. It was noted that Patient 1 participated in therapy at Respondent's clinic. Urine drug screen performed on November 11, 2017 and March 3, 2018 were positive for benzodiazepines and opioids. Patient 1 reported taking left over Tylenol with Codeine on both occasions. On March 21, 2018, Respondent noted that he "discussed issues of patient safety with patient."

37. On June 28, 2018, Patient 1 was seen by Respondent in follow-up for anxiety. Patient 1 reported that his chest felt like it was collapsing and his anxiety felt awful when he wakes up but that it would be better within 10 minutes of taking Xanax 2 mg. The patient reported that he also took Xanax at around 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and around 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and took

Valium at bedtime. Respondent documented that Patient 1 stated that he was not supplementing with other drugs and he denied selling drugs in the past. Respondent also documented that Patient 1 admitted to taking left over Tylenol with Codeine. Patient 1 reported that he stopped attending group meetings because he moved. Respondent's impression was anxiety and panic disorder. Respondent documented that Patient 1 inquired as to clonazepam/Klonopin[14] after a review on YouTube. Respondent prescribed 90 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg, and 30 tablets of clonazepam 1 mg. Patient 1 was instructed to follow-up in 1-2 weeks for a response to clonazepam. Patient 1 was also instructed to participate in group therapy and was advised to avoid narcotics, muscle relaxers and other sedating drugs.

38. A telephonic follow-up with Patient 1 took place on July 5, 2018, at which time the patient stated that the clonazepam was more effective than Xanax. That same day, Patient 1 was seen by Respondent for his anxiety/panic disorder. Respondent documented that the patient stated that clonazepam 1 mg did not give the same effect as Valium 10 mg when substituted while continuing Xanax 2 mg three times a day. He tried clonazepam 2 mg three times a day without Valium and did well. He also reported that he was not in therapy but had seen a psychiatrist in Norwalk two times in the past. Respondent encouraged the patient to participate in group therapy and see the psychiatrist in Norwalk or find a new one if the psychiatrist in Norwalk is no longer available. Respondent noted that he planned to contact the patient's prior psychiatrist to discuss Patient 1's case. Respondent prescribed 90 tablets of clonazepam, 1 mg, and instructed the patient to take one to two tablets, maximum, three times a day but to try to take only one tablet three times a day.

39. Patient 1 was last seen by Respondent for anxiety follow-up on July 21, 2018. At that time, Respondent documented that the patient reported taking two tablets of Xanax, 2 mg and 4 tablets of clonazepam, 1 mg, daily. The patient stated that he had no chest pain, palpitations, shortness of breath, lightheadedness, syncope, psychosis, suicidal thoughts, headaches, nausea, or vomiting and was not drinking alcohol. Respondent noted a normal examination and his

[14] Klonopin, the brand name for clonazepam, is a Schedule IV Controlled Substance, a benzodiazepine, and a dangerous drug.

impression was anxiety and panic disorder. Respondent prescribed 60 tablets of Xanax, 2 mg. and 120 tablets of clonazepam, 1 mg. He instructed the patient to return in a month and to bring his medication bottles in for a pill count.

STANDARD OF CARE

40. When prescribing benzodiazepines, the standard of care requires that the physician take a complete patient history, including the nature and extent of symptoms over time and document the history in the patient's medical records.

41. When prescribing benzodiazepines, the standard of care requires that the physician perform a mental status examination and document the findings of the mental status examination in the patient's medical records. A mental status examination includes a description of the patient's affect; speech pattern; thought organization; the presence or absence of symptoms of depression; the presence or absence of psychotic symptoms; the presence or absence of cognitive deficits; and the presence or absence of suicidal or homicidal ideation.

42. When a physician diagnoses a patient with a psychiatric diagnosis, such as PTSD or panic disorder, the standard of care requires that there be a sufficient history to justify a diagnosis. When a chronic psychiatric disorder is no longer a working diagnosis, the physician must document the reasoning as to why the diagnosis has been dropped, especially when the same pharmacologic treatment is continued. When amending a diagnosis and making a diagnosis of depression, the standard of care requires that the physician take a detailed history to support the diagnosis and document the findings in the patient's medical records.

43. When a physician provides care and treatment for diagnoses of PTSD, anxiety disorder and panic disorder, the standard of care requires the physician perform a physical examination and order of routine laboratory studies, including a complete blood count, chemical pain and thyroid function tests.

44. When a physician prescribes medications to a patient, the standard of care requires that the physician obtain informed consent and document the assessment of the indications, benefits, risks alternatives (and offer of alternatives), adverse effects, effectiveness, and/or precautions regarding safe prescribing of medications.

45. When prescribing benzodiazepines, the standard of care requires that the physician obtain informed consent and document that informed consent was obtained. Informed consent for benzodiazepines includes but is not limited to (1) the risk of dependence and tolerance; (2) the risk of withdrawal, including the potential for worsening anxiety, panic attacks, life-threatening seizures and delirium; (3) risk of sedation, including an increased risk for motor vehicle accidents; (4) risk of cognitive impairment; (5) increased risk for falls; and (5) risk of respiratory depression if combined with alcohol or opioids.

46. When prescribing benzodiazepines, the standard of care requires that the physician attempt to stabilize the patient on a single benzodiazepine and document the rationale should the physician prescribe two benzodiazepines to be used concurrently.

47. When the dose or dosage of benzodiazepines is changed, the standard of care requires that the physician clearly document the rationale for the change in the patient's medical records.

48. When treating PTSD and/or panic disorder, the standard of care is to prescribe a trial of an SSRI and try to keep treatment with benzodiazepines to a minimum. When the patient has a positive response to an SSRI, the standard of care requires that the physician attempt to decrease the dose of benzodiazepine to determine if the patient can be managed on a lower benzodiazepine dose with the ultimate goal to taper the patient off benzodiazepines all together. When the trial of an SSRI is complete, the standard of care requires that the physician document the reasoning for continuing or discontinuing it.

49. When a physician suspects that a patient is abusing, is dependent on, and/or is diverting drugs with a high abuse potential, the standard of care requires that the prescribing physician refer the patient to a psychiatrist or substance abuse-treatment program for an evaluation and treatment.

50. When a patient is in need of a psychiatric evaluation refuses to obtain one, the standard of care requires that the physician treating the patient require that the psychiatric evaluation be a condition of treatment rather than merely recommending one and accepting the patient's refusal to undergo one.

///

51. When a physician prescribes benzodiazepines to a patient for treatment of a psychiatric disorder such as PTSD or panic disorder, the standard of care requires that the physician request the patient's past medical and psychiatric records. Further, when a patient is admitted to a hospital and receives treatment for a chemical dependence, the standard of care requires that the patient's physician obtain a copy of those records.

52. When a physician resumes the prescribing of benzodiazepines to a patient following the patient's detoxification and treatment for substance abuse, the standard of care requires that the prescribing physician confer with the patient's treating substance abuse physician.

53. The standard of care requires that a physician maintain accurate and adequate medical records that clearly reflect the patient's history, physical examination, assessment and treatment plan. When medications are prescribed, the method of filling the prescriptions (i.e., dispensed at the clinic versus filled at a pharmacy) should be clearly denoted.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

54. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Section 2234, subdivision (b), in that he engaged in gross negligence in his care and treatment of Patient 1. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 53, above, as though fully set forth herein. The circumstances are as follows:

55. Respondent failed to take a complete patient history of Patient 1 prior to and during the 6 ½ year period of Respondent prescribing benzodiazepines to Patient 1 and document the same.

56. Respondent failed to perform and document a mental status examination of Patient 1 prior to and during the 6 ½ year period of Respondent prescribing benzodiazepines to Patient 1, other than a limited checklist review of systems.

57. Respondent failed to obtain a sufficient history to justify a diagnosis of PTSD in Patient 1 with no documentation in his initial patient encounters as to the causes of Patient 1's purported PTSD. Without explanation, after March 2, 2012, PTSD was no longer referenced in Patient 1's medical records at Respondent's clinic, despite Patient 1's continued monthly

medication regimen. On July 25, 2014, Respondent, without explanation, noted an additional diagnosis of depression; however, there was no change in the patient's medication regime and no additional treatment recommendations made.

58. Respondent failed to perform complete and thorough physical examinations and failed to order routine laboratory studies during Patient 1's care and treatment at Respondent's clinic.

59. Respondent failed to obtain informed consent before prescribing Xanax, Valium and Klonopin to Patient 1. Respondent's notation on April 2, 2012 that he "re-advised patient regarding tolerance, dependence, and withdrawal symptoms" was insufficient to fully inform Patient 1 of the risks associated with taking Xanax.

60. Respondent failed to attempt to stabilize Patient 1 on a single benzodiazepine and inappropriately began prescribing two benzodiazepines concurrently without documenting the rationale for prescribing two benzodiazepines concurrently.

61. Respondent inappropriately changed the doses and dosages of Patient 1's Xanax and Valium during the course of Patient 1's care and treatment at Respondent's clinic without documenting the rational for the changes in Patient 1's medical records.

62. Respondent failed to obtain and document informed consent for the SSRI trial of Lexapro prescribed to Patient 1 from January 23, 2013 through August 2015.

63. Respondent attempted an SSRI trial of Lexapro with Patient 1 from January 23, 2013 through August 2015 without any attempt to decrease and taper Patient 1's Xanax use. Other than noting that Patient 1 was "not taking or acquiring Lexapro as prescribed," Respondent failed to document the rationale for discontinuing Lexapro and prescribing two benzodiazepines, Xanax and Valium. Further, there was no documentation as to why the trial of SSRI was not initiated sooner than January 23, 2013.

64. Respondent failed to refer the patient to a psychiatrist or substance abuse treatment program when he suspected that Patient 1 was diverting medications and when he suspected that Patient 1 was dependent on the medications that Respondent was prescribing

///

65. Respondent failed to require that a psychiatric evaluation be a condition of Patient 1's treatment despite "recommending" that the patient see a psychiatrist or therapist.

66. Respondent failed to request Patient 1's past medical and psychiatric records during his care and treatment of Patient 1. Despite being aware that Patient 1 underwent care and treatment for his dependence on the benzodiazepines that Respondent prescribed, he failed to obtain the hospital records relating to the treatment of Patient 1's dependence on benzodiazepines.

67. Respondent resumed prescribing benzodiazepines to Patient 1 following Patient 1's detoxification and treatment for dependence on benzodiazepines without conferring with Patient 1's treating substance abuse physician.

68. Respondent failed to maintain accurate and medical records clearly reflecting Patient 1's history, physical examination, assessment and treatment plan. Respondent further failed to document the occasions he dispensed medications to Patient 1 at his clinic versus prescribing medications to Patient 1 to be filled a pharmacy.

69. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 68, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute gross negligence pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

70. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he engaged in repeated acts of negligence in the care and treatment of Patient 1. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 69, above, as though fully set forth herein.

71. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 70, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute repeated acts of negligence pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

///

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Furnishing Dangerous Drugs Without Examination)

72. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 2242, subdivision (a), in that he committed unprofessional conduct when he prescribed dangerous drugs to Patient 1 without an appropriate prior examination or medical indication therefor. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 69, above, as though fully set forth herein.

73. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 69, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 2242, subdivision (a), of the Code. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Excessive Prescribing)

74. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 725, in that he excessively prescribed dangerous drugs to Patient 1. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 69, above, as though fully set forth herein.

75. Respondent's acts and/or omissions as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 69, above, whether proven individually, jointly, or in any combination thereof, constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to section 725. Therefore cause for discipline exists.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Accurate and Adequate Medical Records)

76. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2266 of the Code for failing to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to his care and treatment of Patient 1. Complainant refers to and, by this reference, incorporates herein, paragraphs 12 through 42, 44 through 48, 53, 55 through 57, 59 through 63, and 68, above, as though 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 G 42267, issued to Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.;

2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;

3. Ordering Mark Stephen Wagner, M.D., if placed on probation, to pay the Board the costs of probation monitoring; and

4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: MAR 13 2020

CHRISTINE J. LALLY
Interim Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

LA2019500849
54158766.docx