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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D. Physician's & Surgeon's Certificate No A 99698 Respondent	Case No. 800-2019-053599

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 12, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED October 14, 2021.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Laurie Rose Lubiano, J.D., Chair
Panel A

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
CHRISTINA SEIN GOOT
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 229094
California Department of Justice
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6481
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: STEVE RICHARD CIANCIO, M.D. 1310 Esplanade, Suite 217 Redondo Beach, CA 90277 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 99698, Respondent.	Case No. 800-2019-053599 OAH No. 2021020503 **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 Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California, by Christina Sein Goot, Deputy Attorney General.

2. Respondent Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D. (Respondent) is represented in this proceeding by attorney Gregory D. Werre, whose address is: 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 450

Manhattan Beach, CA 90266.

3. On or about April 13, 2007, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 99698 to Respondent. The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 800-2019-053599, and will expire on January 31, 2023, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 800-2019-053599 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 October 22, 2020. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation.

5. A copy of Accusation No. 800-2019-053599 is attached as exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

6. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 800-2019-053599. 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 admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 800-2019-053599.

10. 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

11. 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.

12. 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.

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

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

A. PUBLIC REPRIMAND

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 99698 issued to Respondent Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D., shall be and is hereby publicly reprimanded pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 2227, subdivision (a)(4). This Public Reprimand, which is issued in connection with Accusation No. 800-2019-053599, is as follows:

"You failed to adequately manage Patient 1's hypotension during surgery of a renal mass

and assigned Patient 1 the incorrect American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status rating, as more fully described in Accusation No. 800-2019-053599."

B. EDUCATION COURSE

Within 60 calendar days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board or its designee for its prior approval, educational program(s) or course(s) which shall not be less than 20 hours. The educational program(s) or course(s) shall be aimed at correcting any areas of deficient practice or knowledge in the area of anesthesiology 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.

C. FAILURE TO COMPLY

Failure to comply with any of the terms of this Disciplinary Order shall constitute general unprofessional conduct and may serve as grounds for further disciplinary action.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Gregory D. Werre. 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: 6-28-21

STEVE RICHARD CIANCIO, M.D.
Respondent

I have read and fully discussed with Respondent Steve Richard Ciancio, 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: 6/29/21

GREGORY D. WERRE, ESQ.
Attorney for Respondent

ENDORSEMENT

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

DATED: 06/29/2021

Respectfully submitted,

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

CHRISTINA SEIN GOOT
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

LA2020601162
64328576.docx

Exhibit A

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
CHRISTINA SEIN GOOT
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 229094
California Department of Justice
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6481
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: STEVE RICHARD CIANCIO, M.D. 1310 Esplanade, Suite 217 Redondo Beach, California 90277 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate A 99698, Respondent.	Case No. 800-2019-053599 **A C C U S A T I O N**

PARTIES

1. William Prasifka (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California (Board).

2. On April 13, 2007, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 99698 to Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D. (Respondent). That license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on January 31, 2021, unless renewed.

//

//

//

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 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.

5. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

> The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
>
> (a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
>
> (b) Gross negligence.
>
> (c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
>
> (1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
>
> (2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.
>
> (d) Incompetence.
>
> (e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
>
> (f) Any action or conduct that would have warranted the denial of a certificate.
>
> (g) The failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview by the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board.

//

CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

6. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code in that he committed repeated negligent acts in his care and treatment of Patient 1.[1] The circumstances are as follows:

7. At the time of their initial encounter, Patient 1 was a 47-year-old male with history of an angioplasty and placement of a bare metal stent in December 2014. On February 13, 2015, Patient 1 presented for a scheduled surgery of a renal mass. Respondent, the anesthesiologist, performed a pre-operative evaluation and deemed Patient 1 suitable for surgery.

8. Anesthetic induction was performed in a typical fashion with typical agents, however, Patient 1 manifested substantial hypotension between induction and the start of surgery. Additional intravenous fluid was administered and anesthetic agents were turned down (but not off); however, no vasopressors were given. Patient 1's mean blood pressure remained in the vicinity of 50 mm Hg for 25 minutes from 7:25 a.m. to 7:50 a.m.

9. Surgery commenced shortly thereafter, with a rise in Patient 1's blood pressure to more acceptable levels. Shortly after 9:30 a.m., Patient 1 sustained a brief run of non-sustained ventricular tachycardia (VT) that terminated spontaneously. A few minutes later, a second brief run of VT was noted, followed by sustained VT that devolved into ventricular fibrillation. Despite concluding the surgery and instituting resuscitative measures, the physicians caring for Patient 1 were unable to restore spontaneous circulation.

10. The standard of care for an anesthesiologist is to respond promptly to hypotension manifested by the patient, recognizing that such response may not be effective in all circumstances.

11. Respondent erred in allowing hypotension of this degree to persist for so long in Patient 1. Respondent's failure to be more aggressive in correcting Patient 1's post-inductive hypotension was a simple departure from the standard of care.

//

[1] The patient is referred to by number to protect his privacy.

12. The standard of care for an anesthesiologist is to assign preoperatively the correct American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status.

13. Respondent assigned Patient 1 an ASA of II, which corresponds to an underlying health condition of a moderate nature (e.g., controlled hypertension). Patient 1's coronary artery disease was of sufficient severity that it required percutaneous intervention less than two months prior to the renal surgery, at which time he suffered a sustained non-ST segment elevation myocardial infarction. An ASA rating of III (or even IV, in light of the recent myocardial infarction) would have been appropriate. Respondent's erroneous ASA rating was a simple departure from the standard of care.

14. The standard of care for an anesthesiologist is that an arterial line should be placed for continuous blood pressure monitoring in patients who, because of underlying cardiac disease or the nature of the proposed procedure, may be reasonably expected to be at significant risk of intraoperative hemodynamic instability.

15. Respondent's failure to place an arterial line in Patient 1 for intraoperative continuous blood pressure monitoring was a simple departure from the standard of care.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 99698, issued to Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D.;

2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;

3. If placed on probation, ordering Steve Richard Ciancio, M.D. to pay the Board the costs of probation monitoring; and

//

//

//

//

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

DATED: OCT 2 2 2020

WILLIAM PRASIFKA
Executive Director
Medical Board of California
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California

Complainant

LA2020601162
63657262.docx