1	ROB BONTA		
2	Attorney General of California EDWARD KIM Supervising Deputy Attorney General CHRISTINE FRIAR WALTON Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 228421		
3			
4			
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013		
6	Telephone: (213) 269-6472 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE		
9	PODIATRIC MEDICAL BOARD DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 500-2018-000703	
12	ROBERT JOHN JOSEPH II, D.P.M.		
13	150 North Robertson Blvd., Suite 300 Beverly Hills, CA 90211	ACCUSATION	
14	Doctor of Podiatric Medicine License		
15	No. E 4013,		
16	Respondent.		
17	PARTIES  1. Brian Naslund ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity		
18			
19	as the Executive Officer of the Podiatric Medical Board, Department of Consumer Affairs		
20	("Board").		
21	2. On or about July 8, 1996, the Podiatric Medical Board issued Podiatrist License		
22	Number E 4013 to Robert John Joseph II, D.P.M. ("Respondent"). The Podiatrist License was in		
23	full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30,		
24	2024, unless renewed.		
25		CTION	
26	JURISDICTION  This A consistion is brought before the Padietic Medical Parent ("Parent") and to the		
27	3. This Accusation is brought before the Podiatric Medical Board ("Board"), under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code		
28	dustority of the following laws. All section felence	Prices are to the Dasiness and Linfessions Code	
		1	

#### 

# 

# 

### 

### 

#### 

### 

## 

### 

### 

#### 

### 

### 

# 

# 

# 

## 

### 

### 

### 

# 

### 

### 

# 

### 

#### 4. Section 2222 of the Code states:

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

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

#### 5. Section 2497 of the Code states:

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

#### 6. Section 2228 of the Code states:

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

- (a) Requiring the licensee to obtain additional professional training and to pass an examination upon the completion of the training. The examination may be written or oral, or both, and may be a practical or clinical examination, or both, at the option of the board or the administrative law judge.
- (b) Requiring the licensee to submit to a complete diagnostic examination by one or more physicians and surgeons appointed by the board. If an examination is ordered, the board shall receive and consider any other report of a complete diagnostic examination given by one or more physicians and surgeons of the licensee's choice.

- (c) Restricting or limiting the extent, scope, or type of practice of the licensee. including requiring notice to applicable patients that the licensee is unable to perform
- (d) Providing the option of alternative community service in cases other than
- (a) On and after July 1, 2019, except as otherwise provided in subdivision (c), the board shall require a licensee to provide a separate disclosure that includes the licensee's probation status, the length of the probation, the probation end date, all practice restrictions placed on the licensee by the board, the board's telephone number, and an explanation of how the patient can find further information on the licensee's probation on the licensee's profile page on the board's online license information Internet Web site, to a patient or the patient's guardian or health care surrogate before the patient's first visit following the probationary order while the licensee is on probation pursuant to a probationary order made on and after July 1.
  - (1) A final adjudication by the board following an administrative hearing or admitted findings or prima facie showing in a stipulated settlement establishing any
  - (A) The commission of any act of sexual abuse, misconduct, or relations
  - (B) Drug or alcohol abuse directly resulting in harm to patients or the extent that such use impairs the ability of the licensee to practice safely.
    - (C) Criminal conviction directly involving harm to patient health.
  - (D) Inappropriate prescribing resulting in harm to patients and a
  - (2) An accusation or statement of issues alleged that the licensee committed any of the acts described in subparagraphs (A) to (D), inclusive, of paragraph (1), and a stipulated settlement based upon a nolo contendre or other similar compromise that does not include any prima facie showing or admission of guilt or fact but does include an express acknowledgment that the disclosure requirements
- (b) A licensee required to provide a disclosure pursuant to subdivision (a) shall obtain from the patient, or the patient's guardian or health care surrogate, a separate,
- (c) A licensee shall not be required to provide a disclosure pursuant to
  - (1) The patient is unconscious or otherwise unable to comprehend the disclosure and sign the copy of the disclosure pursuant to subdivision (b) and a guardian or health care surrogate is unavailable to comprehend the disclosure and
  - (2) The visit occurs in an emergency room or an urgent care facility or the visit is unscheduled, including consultations in inpatient facilities.

evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred.

- (b) The district attorney, city attorney, or other prosecuting agency shall notify the Division of Medical Quality of the pendency of an action against a licensee charging a felony or misdemeanor immediately upon obtaining information that the defendant is a licensee. The notice shall identify the licensee and describe the crimes charged and the facts alleged. The prosecuting agency shall also notify the clerk of the court in which the action is pending that the defendant is a licensee, and the clerk shall record prominently in the file that the defendant holds a license as a physician and surgeon.
- (c) The clerk of the court in which a licensee is convicted of a crime shall, within 48 hours after the conviction, transmit a certified copy of the record of conviction to the board. The division may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- (d) A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction after a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this section and Section 2236.1. The record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred.

#### 11. Section 490 of the Code states:

- (a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- (b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- (c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.
- (d) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that the application of this section has been made unclear by the holding in *Petropoulos* v. *Department of Real Estate* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 554, and that the holding in that case has placed a significant number of statutes and regulations in question, resulting in potential harm to the consumers of California from licensees who have been convicted of crimes. Therefore, the Legislature finds and declares that this section establishes an independent basis for a board to impose discipline upon a licensee, and that the amendments to this section made by Chapter 33 of the Statutes of 2008 do not constitute a change to, but rather are declaratory of, existing law.

- dispensing in exchange for kickback payments ("Kickback Tainted Prescriptions").
- B. "Compounding" is a practice in which a licensed professional (e.g., pharmacist or physician) combines, mixes or alters ingredients of a drug or multiple drugs to create drugs tailored to the needs of an individual patient. Compounded drugs are not FDA-approved. Compounded drugs can be prescribed when no FDA-approved drug meets the health needs of a particular patient. For example, if a patient is allergic to a specific ingredient in an FDA-approved medication, such as a dye, a compound drug can be prescribed and prepared that excludes the ingredient. As another example, compounded drugs are also used when a patient cannot consume a medication by traditional means (e.g. needs liquid in place of a pill).
- C. The co-conspirator pharmacies to whom Respondent routed his patients' compound prescriptions would then send, by mail, the compounded drugs and other pharmaceuticals prescribed by Respondent to patient-beneficiaries, and submit claims for reimbursement to various government health care programs. Those government programs included: 1) the Defense Health Agency's program of health care coverage ("TRICARE") for Department of Defense beneficiaries worldwide, including active duty service members, National Guard and Reserve members, retirees, their families, and survivors; 2) the Federal Employees' Compensation Act ("FECA") program, which provides benefits (including reimbursement for prescription medication) to civilian employees of the United States for wage-loss disability due to traumatic injury or occupational disease while working as a federal employee; and 3) the California Workers' Compensation System, which provides insurance coverage for treatment of injury or illness suffered by individuals during the course of their employment (collectively, "Affected Health Care Plans").

///

- D. Respondent's co-conspirators used reimbursements received from the Affected Health Care Plans for the Kickback Tainted Prescriptions to pay Respondent's kickbacks.
- E. In addition to kickbacks and bribes, Respondent received other inducements from his co-conspirators in exchange for authorizing pre-printed prescriptions for compound drugs: (a) with no prior physician/patient relationship with the beneficiaries; (b) without the knowledge or consent of the purported beneficiaries; and/or (c) without meaningfully considering a far less expensive FDA-approved (i.e., non-compounded) prescription drug for the patient.
- F. Respondent concealed material information from his patients and the Affected Health Care Plans, including that the compound prescriptions were part of a kickback scheme.
- G. In furtherance of the conspiracy, Respondent's co-conspirators submitted claims for reimbursement on Kickback Tainted Prescriptions seeking in excess of \$250 million from the Affected Health Care Plans.
- H. From in or around April 2014 through in or around July 2016, Respondent was paid approximately \$332,500, in exchange for authorizing Kickback Tainted Prescriptions, which were dispensed by his co-conspirator pharmacies and for which the Affected Health Care Plans reimbursed Respondent's co-conspirators approximately \$1.3 million.
- 17. On or about July 25, 2022, Respondent was convicted, by way of a plea of guilty, of Count 1 as charged in the Indictment.
- 18. On or about July 25, 2022, the United States District Court sentenced Respondent to (2) years of probation with terms and conditions, including 600 hours of community service, and ordered him to pay fees and a fine of \$10,000. The Court also entered a money judgment of forfeiture against Respondent in the amount of \$332,500. Further, and pursuant to the terms of his probation, Respondent "shall not be employed in any position that requires licensing and/or certification by any local, state, or federal agency without the prior written approval of the

		,
. 1	5. Taking such other and	further action as deemed necessary and proper.
2		
3	DATED: <u>12/08/2023</u>	13/168/
4		BRIAN NASLUND Executive Officer
5	·	Executive Officer Podiatric Medical Board Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant
6		Complainant
7		
8	LA2023601647	
9	66370411.doox	
10		
11		
12	·	
13		
14		
15		
16 17		·
18		
19		•
20		
21		
22 <b>.</b>		
23		•
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	,	