**10A** 

# CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE REGISTRATION APPLICATION

Nevada State Board of Pharmacy 985 Damonte Ranch Pkwy, Suite 206 - Reno, NV 89521

Registration Fee: \$80.00 (non-refundable money order or cashier's check only) (This application cannot be used by PA's or APRN's)

First: Maryanne Middle: D. Last: Phillips Degree: M.D.				
SS#: L Date of Birth:				
Practice Name (if any): Northeastern Nevada Regional Hospital (ance thesis.) Elko.NV				
Nevada Address: 10620 Souther Highlands Parkway # Suite #: 110 - 251				
(This must be a practicing address, we will not issue a license to a home address or to a PO Box only)	′ ′ ′			
City: Las Vegas State: Nevada Zip Code: 89141				
E-mail: MaryannPhillipsMD@outlook.com Contact E-mail: MaryannPhillipsMD@outlook.com				
Work Telephone: (702) 860-8965 Fax: (702) 897-0610				
Practitioner License Number: 7635 Specialty: Anesthesiologist				
Sex: □ M or ☑ F				
You must have a current Nevada license with your respective BOARD before we will process this application. The Nevada license must remain current to keep the controlled substance registration.				
Been diagnosed or treated for any mental illness, including alcohol or substance abuse, or Physical condition that would impair your ability to perform the essential functions of your license?  1. Been charged, arrested or convicted of a felony or misdemeanor in any state?				
Board Administrative State Date: Case #:	_			
Action: Medical Rec. Request that were not in my possession  Nevada 03/01/2016 not known fending?				
Criminal Action: Case #: County Court				
It is a violation of Nevada law to falsify this application and sanctions will be imposed for misrepresentation. I hereby certify that I have read this application. I certify that all statements made are true and correct.  I understand that Nevada law requires a licensed physician who, in their professional or occupational capacity, comes to know or has reasonable gives to believe, a child has been abused/neglected, to report the abuse/neglect to an agency which provides child welfare services or to a local law enforcement agency.  Original Signature, no copies or stamps accepted.  Date  Board Use Only: Date Processed:  Amount:				
	-			

# BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY,	) CASE NO. 13-061-CS-S
Petitioner, v.	) FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS ) OF LAW AND ORDER
MARYANNE PHILLIPS, MD Certificate of Registration No. CS19260	) NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY
Respondent.	MAR - 6 2014

The Nevada State Board of Pharmacy (Board) heard this matter at its regular meeting on Wednesday, March 5, 2014, in Reno, Nevada. Attorney S. Paul Edwards represented the Board in his capacity as its General Counsel. Attorney Puneet K. Garg, of the law firm Gordon Silver, appeared on behalf of respondent MaryAnne Phillips, M.D., Certificate of Registration No. CS19260. Based on the evidence and arguments presented at the hearing, the Board issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

I.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. During the March 5, 2014 hearing in this matter, the Board admitted into evidence copies of certain public records filed by the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, (the "California Board") in California Case No. 19-2010-211768 (OAH No. 2012060101) (the "California Disciplinary Action"). Those documents were marked and admitted as Exhibit A through E. 1 Those public records show that in the California Disciplinary Action, the California Board revoked respondent Maryanne Phillips' California Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A-63753 (CA Certificate) effective August 26, 2013.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Board also admitted as "Exhibit F" an affidavit from S. Paul Edwards, Esq., attesting to the source from which Board Staff obtained Exhibits A through E, which are public documents filed by the California Medical Board relating to its discipline of Dr. Phillips.

- 2. On December 18, 2013, the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy brought a parallel action against Respondent Dr. Phillips pursuant to NRS 639.210(14) based on the findings in the California Disciplinary Action.
- 3. The evidence presented at the hearing supports the allegations in the December 18, 2013 Accusation in this matter, which are summarized as follows:
- 4. The California Board revoked Dr. Phillips' California Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A-63753 ("California Certificate"), effective "at 5:00 p.m. on August 16, 2013." Exhibit B.
- 5. The California Board took that action after adopting the Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judge Roy W. Hewitt (the "ALJ"), of the California Office of Administrative Hearings. Exhibit A.
- 6. The ALJ entered his Proposed Decision on June 26, 2013, after conducting an evidentiary hearing on the matter earlier that month. Id.
- 7. On August 15, 2013, the California Board entered an Order Granting Stay, which stayed the revocation of Dr. Phillips' license until August 26, 2013. Exhibit D.
- 8. The California Board stayed its Decision to allow time for it to review and consider a petition for reconsideration filed by Dr. Phillips. Exhibit E.
- The California Board denied Dr. Phillips' Petition for Reconsideration on August
   23, 2013. Id.
- 10. Dr. Phillips' California license to practice medicine was therefore revoked no later than August 26, 2013.
- 11. The ALJ's findings, which the Board found credible and relied upon pursuant to NRS 639.210(14), are as follows:
- a. Prior to having her California Certificate revoked in August 2013, Dr.

  Phillips had been disciplined, including substantial periods of probation, by the California Board,

the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy and the New Mexico Medical Board. Ex. A, pp. 2-8.

 Those disciplinary actions occurred between August 2006, and entry of the ALJ's June 2013 Proposed Decision.

# Initial 2009 California Discipline

- c. The first of those disciplinary actions is a 2009 case in which the California Board alleged against Dr. Phillips (1) gross negligence, (2) repeated negligent acts, (3) incompetence, (4) violations of drug statutes, (5) excessive prescribing, (6) prescribing to an addict, (7) prescribing without a good faith examination, (8) absence of medical indication and (9) failure to maintain accurate records. (Ex. A (ALJ Rec.) p.2, ¶¶3, 5).
- d. Dr. Phillips stipulated in that action in December 2008, that the CA Board "could establish a prima facie case with respect to the charges" and her license was subject to discipline.
- e. The California Board revoked Dr. Phillips' Certificate in April 2009, then stayed the revocation and placed Dr. Phillips on probation for three years with certain terms and conditions. Ex. A, p.2, ¶5.

# 2009 Nevada Board of Medical Examiners Discipline

- f. In May 2009, Dr. Phillips renewed her license to practice medicine with the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (BME). Id., p.3, ¶6. In response to Question 9 on the BME's renewal application, which asked "[h]ave you had a medical license or license to practice any other healing art revoked, suspended, limited, or restricted in any state, country or U.S. territory?", [Dr. Phillips] falsely answered . . . in the negative." Id.
- g. Based on that false representation, the BME brought an accusation against Dr. Phillips. Id., p.3, ¶7. Dr. Phillips and the BME settled that matter by agreeing that Dr. Phillips would receive a public reprimand, her Nevada medical license would be revoked. Id.,

p.3, ¶¶6-8. The BME stayed the revocation and placed Dr. Phillips on probation until April 6, 2012. Id.

## 2010 Nevada Board of Pharmacy Discipline

- h. In December 2010, the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy filed an accusation against Dr. Phillips alleging, in part, that Dr. Phillips had provided false information on her November 17, 2010 renewal application. Ex. A, p.3, ¶9. Dr. Phillips admitted in a February 2011 Stipulation and Order with this Board to "provid[ing] false information on her renewal application by failing to disclose the administrative actions taken against her and the administrative action that was still pending against her." Id., p.3, ¶10.
- i. As a result of Dr. Phillips' admissions, the Nevada Board of Pharmacy cancelled Dr. Phillips' Nevada Controlled Substance Registration and DEA Registration, effective March 1, 2011. Id. The Board allowed Dr. Phillips to apply for a new controlled substance registration reflecting her disciplinary actions. Id. The Board revoked that new registration, then stayed the revocation and placed Dr. Phillips on probation until February 2013. Id.

# 2011 New Mexico Medical Board Discipline

- j. Based on the April 2009 California discipline, the New Mexico Medical Board (New Mexico Board) entered into an "agreed order" with Dr. Phillips, in which Dr. Phillips agreed to have her New Mexico medical license placed on probation until she completed the terms and conditions ordered by the CA Board and her California license had been fully restored. Ex. A, p.4, ¶11. One of the terms of that "Agreed Order" with the New Mexico Board was that Dr. Phillips would "provide quarterly affidavits to the [New Mexico] Board attesting to her compliance with the terms set forth in [the] Agreed Order." Id.
- k. In August 2011, the New Mexico Board filed an accusation against Dr.

  Phillips, and ultimately disciplined her for failing to provide the agreed upon quarterly affidavits, and for failing to inform the New Mexico Board that she was publicly reprimanded and placed on

probation by the Nevada BME. Id., p.4, ¶12. After Dr. Phillips failed to respond to that accusation, the New Mexico Board issued a Default Decision and Order revoking Dr. Phillips' license to practice medicine in New Mexico. Id., p.5, ¶13.

# 2011 Nevada Board of Medical Examiner's Discipline

l. In January 2011, the BME filed another complaint against Dr. Phillips charging her with:

One count of engaging in conduct intended to deceive ... One count of violating a regulation adopted by the [Nevada] State Board of Pharmacy . . . One count of prescribing a controlled substance except as authorized by law . . . and one count of failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records related to the diagnosis, treatment and care of [a patient]. . . (Exh.29).

Id., p.5, ¶13 (quoting January 28, 2011 BME Complaint).

m. Dr. Phillips settled that matter with the BME in April 2012. Pursuant to the parties' "Settlement, Waiver and Consent Agreement", Dr. Phillips agreed to accept a public letter of reprimand, her Nevada medical license was revoked, the revocation was stayed, and Dr. Phillips was placed on probation for thirty-six (36) months. Ex. A, p.5, ¶15-16.

# 2013 California Medical Board Discipline and Revocation of Dr. Phillips' License

- n. In the ALJ's June 2013 Proposed Decision, the ALJ found that Dr. Phillips had failed to comply with the terms of her California probation. Id., pp.6-7, ¶17-21.
- o. One of the terms of Dr. Phillips' California probation was that she would file quarterly declarations with the California Board declaring, under penalty of perjury, that she had answered the questions in the Quarterly Declaration Form truthfully. Id.
- p. The ALJ found that Dr. Phillips had not answered the questions in the Quarterly Declaration Form truthfully. Id., p.7, ¶20-12. The ALJ found that Dr. Phillips failed to disclose (a) her February 2011 discipline and placement on probation by the Nevada Board of

Pharmacy, and (b) her April 2012 discipline by the Nevada BME, including her public letter of reprimand and probation. Id., p.6, ¶¶17-21.

- q. The ALJ found that Dr. Phillips falsely represented those disciplines to the CA Board as "reciprocal" discipline, when they were truthfully each supported by independent grounds for discipline. Id., p.7, ¶20-21.
- r. The ALJ found that Dr. Phillips filed false Quarterly Declarations with the CA Board again in July 2011, by again failing to disclose and misrepresenting her discipline in Nevada. Id.
- s. The ALJ described Dr. Phillips' testimony at the June 3, 2013 hearing regarding those false Quarterly Declarations as "merely serv[ing] to highlight the fact that [Dr. Phillips] plays fast and loose with the truth." Ex. A, p.7, ¶23.
- t. The ALJ found that Dr. Phillips "engages in half-truths and slight of tongue to obfuscate the truth. In other words, [Dr. Phillips], by her own statements during the hearing . . . proved to be a consummate liar." Id.
  - u. The ALJ further stated:

Based on [Dr. Phillips'] equivocations and misrepresentations to the court in the present action, and her seeming inability to distinguish truth from fiction, [her] testimony was completely discounted.

Id. at ¶25.

- v. Based on the findings of fact in the Proposed Decision, The ALJ concluded that legal and factual grounds existed under California law for further discipline of Dr. Phillips. Id., pp.8-9. Based on his conclusion that numerous violations of California law had occurred, The ALJ recommended to the CA Board the "outright revocation of [Dr. Phillips'] certificate to practice medicine in the state of California." Id., p.9.
- w. The California Board adopted the ALJ's recommendation and revoked Dr. Phillips' license on or about August 26, 2013. Ex. B.

#### H.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the forgoing findings of fact, the Board concludes on matters of law as follows:

- 12. The Board has jurisdiction over this matter because at the time of the conduct set forth above, respondent held a controlled substance registration issued by this Board.
- 13. All objections made by respondent's counsel regarding the admissibility or evidentiary value of the Exhibits admitted as Exhibits A through F are overruled.
- 14. The Board admitted as evidence an email presented by respondent's counsel during the hearing, which shall be designated as Exhibit G.
- 15. The Board did not admit into evidence a letter from Dr. Daniel Royal, which was presented by respondent's counsel, on the basis that it was not relevant to the issues before the Board.
- 16. Respondent is guilty of the acts alleged in the Accusation on file in this matter, as further described in the findings of the ALJ in Exhibit A.
- 17. Pursuant to NRS 639.210(14), "[t]he Board may suspend or revoke any certificate, license, registration or permit issued pursuant to this chapter, and deny the application of any person for a certificate, license, registration or permit, if the holder or applicant . . . . : 14. [h]as had a certificate, license or permit suspended or revoked in another state on grounds which would cause suspension or revocation of a certificate, license or permit in this State."
- 18. Grounds which would cause suspension or revocation of a certificate, license or permit in this state include:
  - a. Being "not of good moral character";
- b. "[Obtaining] any certificate, certification, license or permit by the filing of an application, or any record, affidavit or other information in support thereof, which is false or fraudulent";

- c. Being "guilty of unprofessional conduct or conduct contrary to the public interest", which pursuant to NAC 639.945 specifically includes "performing or in any way being a party to any fraudulent or deceitful practice of transaction."
- 19. Dr. Phillips' actions, based on the findings above, constitute "grounds which would cause suspension or revocation of a certificate, license or permit in this State."

### THEREFORE, THE BOARD HEREBY ORDERS:

- 20. The Controlled Substance Registration of MaryAnne Phillips, Certificate of Registration No. CS19260, is hereby revoked for at least one year from the effective date of this Order.
- Dr. Phillips may not write any prescription or order for any Controlled Substance
   or possess any Controlled Substance unless and until her Certificate of Registration is reinstated.
- 22. After one year from the effective date of this Order, Dr. Phillips may apply to the Board for reinstatement of her Certificate of Registration.
- 23. If Dr. Phillips applies to the Board for reinstatement of her Certificate of Registration, she shall appear before the Board at regularly scheduled Board Meeting to respond to questions put to her by the Members of the Board and/or Board Staff. The Board is under no obligation to reinstate Dr. Phillips' registration, and may, at its sole discretion, determine whether to reinstate Dr. Phillips' registration according to its authority to do so pursuant to applicable laws and regulations.

Signed this 6 day of March, 2014.

Leo Basch - Acting President/Presiding Board

Member,

Nevada State Board of Pharmacy

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

In the Matter of Charges and

**Complaint Against** 

MARYANNE D. PHILLIPS, M.D.,

Respondent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. 18-10032-1

FILED

JUN 1 0 2019

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

# SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Investigative Committee (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board), by and through Donald K. White, Esq., Deputy General Counsel for the Board and attorney for the IC, and Maryanne D. Phillips, M.D. (Respondent), a licensed Physician in Nevada, assisted by her attorney, Kenneth E. Hogan, Esq., of the law firm of Hogan Hulet PLLC, hereby enter into this Settlement Agreement (Agreement) based on the following:

#### A. Background

- 1. Respondent is a medical doctor currently licensed (License No. 7635) in active status, with conditions, by the Board pursuant to Chapter 630 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and Chapter 630 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), to practice medicine in Nevada since December 21, 1995.
- 2. On February 9, 2018, in Case No. 18-10032-1, the IC filed a formal Complaint (Complaint) charging Respondent with violating the Medical Practice Act. Specifically, the Complaint alleges: Count I, violation of NRS 630.306(1)(b)(1) (Engaging in Conduct Intended to Deceive); Count II, violation of NRS 630.306(1)(p) (Engaging in Unsafe or Unprofessional

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All agreements and admissions made by Respondent are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, Respondent's agreements and admissions are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government regulatory agency proceeding, state or federal civil or criminal proceeding, any state or federal court proceeding, or any credentialing or privileges matter.

- 3. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.
- 4. Respondent was properly served with a copy of this Complaint, has reviewed and understands this Complaint, and has had the opportunity to consult with competent counsel concerning the nature and significance of this Complaint.
- 5. Respondent is hereby advised of her rights regarding this administrative matter, and of her opportunity to defend against the allegations in the Complaint. Specifically, Respondent has certain rights in this administrative matter as set out by the United States Constitution, the Nevada Constitution, the Medical Practice Act, the Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML), which is contained in NRS Chapter 241, and the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act (APA), applicable to certain regulatory bodies, which is contained in NRS Chapters 233B and 622A. These rights include the right to a formal hearing on the allegations in the Complaint, the right to representation by counsel, at her own expense, in the preparation and presentation of her defense, the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses and evidence against her, the right to written findings of fact, conclusions of law and order reflecting the final decision of the Board, and the right to judicial review of the Board's order, if the decision is adverse to her.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Respondent understands that, under the Board's charge to protect the public by regulating the practice of medicine, the Board may take disciplinary action against Respondent's license, including license probation, license suspension, license revocation and imposition of administrative fines, as well as any other reasonable requirement or limitation, if the Board concludes that Respondent violated one or more provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
- 7. Respondent understands and agrees that this Agreement, by and between Respondent and the IC, is not with the Board, and that the IC will present this Agreement to the Board for consideration in open session at a duly noticed and scheduled meeting. Respondent understands that the IC shall advocate for the Board's approval of this Agreement, but that the Board has the right to decide in its own discretion whether or not to approve this Agreement. Respondent further understands and agrees that if the Board approves this Agreement, then the terms and conditions enumerated below shall be binding and enforceable upon her and the Board.

#### **B. Terms & Conditions**

NOW, THEREFORE, in order to resolve the matters addressed herein, i.e., the matters with regard to the Complaint, Respondent and the IC hereby agree to the following terms and conditions:

- 1. Jurisdiction. Respondent is, and at all times relevant to the Complaint has been, a physician licensed to practice medicine in Nevada subject to the jurisdiction of the Board as set forth in the Medical Practice Act.
- 2. Representation by Counsel/Knowing, Willing and Intelligent Agreement. Respondent acknowledges she is represented by counsel, and wishes to resolve the matters addressed herein with said counsel. Respondent agrees that if representation by counsel in this matter materially changes prior to entering into this Agreement and for the duration of this Agreement, that counsel for the IC will be timely notified of the material change. Respondent agrees that she knowingly, willingly and intelligently enters into this Agreement after deciding to have a full consultation with and upon the advice of legal counsel.
- 3. Waiver of Rights. In connection with this Agreement, and the associated terms and conditions, Respondent knowingly, willingly and intelligently waives all rights in connection

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

with this administrative matter. Respondent hereby knowingly, willingly and intelligently waives all rights arising under the United States Constitution, the Nevada Constitution, the Medical Practice Act, the OML, the APA, and any other legal rights that may be available to her or that may apply to her in connection with the administrative proceedings resulting from the Complaint filed in this matter, including defense of the Complaint, adjudication of the allegations set forth in the Complaint, and imposition of any disciplinary actions or sanctions ordered by the Board. Respondent agrees to settle and resolve the allegations of the Complaint as set out by this Agreement, without a hearing or any further proceedings and without the right to judicial review.

- 4. Acknowledgement of Reasonable Basis to Proceed. Respondent acknowledges that the IC believes it has a reasonable basis to allege that Respondent engaged in conduct that is grounds for discipline pursuant to the Medical Practice Act. The IC acknowledges Respondent is not admitting that the IC's claims/counts as alleged in the Complaint have merit. Respondent is agreeing to resolve this matter to avoid the costs of hearing and potential subsequent litigation. Respondent asserts if this matter were to proceed to hearing, she has evidence, witnesses, expert witness(es) and defenses to the counts/claims alleged in the Complaint, but for the purposes of resolving the matter and for no other purpose, Respondent waives the presentation of evidence, witnesses, expert witnesses, and defenses in order to effectuate this Agreement.
- 5. Consent to Entry of Order. In order to resolve this Complaint pending against Respondent, Respondent hereby agrees that the Board may issue an order finding that Respondent engaged in conduct that is grounds for discipline pursuant to the Medical Practice Act. Accordingly, the following terms and conditions are hereby agreed upon:
- A. Respondent admits to Count IV, violation of NRS 630.3062(2) (Altering Medical Records); Count IX, violation of NRS 630.3062(4) (Failure to Make the Medical Records of a Patient Available for Inspection and Copying as Provided in NRS 629.061); and Count X, violation of NRS 630.3065(2)(a) (Failure to Comply With Order of the Board or Committee Designated by the Board to Investigate a Complaint).
- B. Respondent's license to practice medicine in the state of Nevada shall be revoked for a period of one year, with the revocation to be immediately stayed.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

C. Respondent's license shall be subject to a term of probation for a period of time not to exceed thirty-six (36) months from the date of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement (Probationary Period). Respondent must complete the following terms and conditions within the Probationary Period and demonstrate compliance to the good faith satisfaction of the Board within thirty-six (36) months, including but not limited to, payment in full of the Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00) stated as a condition below in C(2), and at that time she may petition the Board to lift the probationary status of her license,. If Respondent fails to demonstrate compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement within thirty-six (36) months, or otherwise violates the terms of this Agreement or the Medical Practice Act, then the IC shall be authorized to immediately suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in Nevada pending an Order To Show Cause Hearing on immediate revocation of her license, which hearing will be duly noticed. The following terms and conditions shall apply during Respondent's probationary period:

- (1) Respondent shall complete the University of San Diego, Physician Assessment and Competency Evaluation Program (PACE), Competency Assessment, and, if recommended by PACE, the Fitness For Duty (FFD) evaluation, all at Respondent's expense, and pass all of the above to the satisfaction of the Board;
- (2) Respondent will pay the costs and expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of the above-referenced matter within thirty (30) months of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement, the current amount being Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00), not including any costs that may be necessary to finalize this Agreement. An initial payment of \$500.00 will be due within thirty (30) calendar days of the Board's approval of this Agreement. Based on Respondent's current financial circumstances, payment of \$500.00 per month will be due on the first day of the month beginning on July 1, 2019, through December 1, 2021, and, if necessary, the first day of each month thereafter until satisfied in full.
- (3) Respondent shall take twenty two and one half (22.5) hours of continuing medical education (CME) related to the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(UNRMED) Best Practices and Tools for Prescribing Controlled Substances within twelve (12) months from the date of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement. The aforementioned hours of CME shall be in addition to any CME requirements that are regularly imposed upon Respondent as a condition of licensure in the state of Nevada and shall be approved by the Board to meet this requirement prior to their completion and are at Respondent's expense.

- (4) Respondent agrees to perform one hundred (100) hours of community service at a nonprofit entity, having a medical nexus and without compensation, in a manner and capacity mutually and reasonably agreed to by Respondent and the Board, and approved by the Board in advance of its completion, within six months of the acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement.
- (5) During the probationary period, Respondent shall not supervise any Physician Assistant, or collaborate with any Advanced Practice Registered Nurse.
- (6) During the probationary period, Respondent shall submit to random and unannounced medical records audits performed by an investigator with the Board.
- (7) During the probationary period, Respondent shall successfully complete all requirements and comply with all orders and conditions, past or future, of the Board. specifically including but not limited to, the Board's Order issued on December 8, 2017, in its Cases Numbered 12-10032-1 and 14-10032-1.
- D. This Agreement shall be reported to the appropriate entities and parties as required by law, including, but not limited to, the National Practitioner Data Bank.
  - E. Respondent shall receive a Public Letter of Reprimand.
  - F. The remaining counts of the Complaint shall be dismissed with prejudice.
- Release From Liability. In execution of this Agreement, Respondent understands 6. and agrees that the State of Nevada, the Board, and each of its members, staff, counsel, investigators, experts, peer reviewers, committees, panels, hearing officers, consultants and agents are immune from civil liability for any decision or action taken in good faith in response to information acquired by the Board. NRS 630.364(2)(a). Respondent agrees to release the State of

(775) 688-2559

Nevada, the Board, and each of its members, staff, counsel, investigators, experts, peer reviewers, committees, panels, hearing officers, consultants and agents from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that Respondent ever had, now has, may have or claim to have, against any or all of the persons, government agencies or entities named in this paragraph arising out of, or by reason of, this investigation, this Agreement or the administration of the case referenced herein.

7. Procedure for Adoption of Agreement. The IC and counsel for the IC shall recommend approval and adoption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement by the Board in resolution of this Complaint. In the course of seeking Board acceptance, approval and adoption of this Agreement, counsel for the IC may communicate directly with the Board staff and the adjudicating members of the Board.

Respondent acknowledges that such contacts and communications may be made or conducted ex parte, without notice or opportunity to be heard on her part until the public Board meeting where this Agreement is discussed, and that such contacts and communications may include, but may not be limited to, matters concerning this Agreement, the Complaint and any and all information of every nature whatsoever related to this matter. The IC and its counsel agree that Respondent may appear at the Board meeting where this Agreement is discussed and, if requested, respond to any questions that may be addressed to the IC or the IC's counsel.

- 8. Effect of Acceptance of Agreement by Board. In the event the Board accepts, approves and adopts this Agreement, the Board shall issue a final order, making this Agreement an order of the Board, and, pending full compliance with the terms herein, the case shall be closed and the remaining counts of the Complaint shall be dismissed with prejudice.
- 9. Effect of Rejection of Agreement by Board. In the event the Board does not accept, approve and adopt this Agreement, this Agreement shall be null, void and of no force and effect except as to the following agreement regarding adjudications: (1) Respondent agrees that, notwithstanding rejection of this Agreement by the Board, nothing contained in this Agreement and nothing that occurs pursuant to efforts of the IC to seek the Board's acceptance of this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

Agreement shall disqualify any member of the adjudicating panel of the Board from considering this Complaint and from participating in disciplinary proceedings against Respondent, including adjudication of this case; and (2) Respondent further agrees that she shall not seek to disqualify any such member absent evidence of bad faith.

- 10. Binding Effect. If approved by the Board, Respondent understands that this Agreement is a binding and enforceable contract upon Respondent and the Board.
- 11. Forum Selection Clause. The parties agree that in the event either party is required to seek enforcement of this Agreement in district court, the parties consent to such jurisdiction and agree that exclusive jurisdiction shall be in the Second Judicial District Court, State of Nevada, Washoe County.
- 12. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. The parties agree that in the event an action is commenced in district court to enforce any provision of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 13. Failure to Comply with Terms. Should Respondent fail to comply with any term or condition of this Agreement once the Agreement has been accepted, approved and adopted by the Board, the IC shall be authorized to immediately suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in Nevada pending an Order To Show Cause Hearing, which will be duly noticed. Failure to comply with the terms of this Agreement, including failure to pay any fines, costs, expenses or fees owed to the Board, is a failure to comply with an order of the Board, which may result in additional disciplinary action being taken against Respondent. NRS 630.3065(2)(a).

111

22 111

23 ///

24 ///

25 111

26 111

111 27

111 28

# OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners 9600 Gareway Drive Reno, Nevada 89521 (775) 688-2559

1	///	
2	///	
3	///	
4	Further, Respondent's failure to remit payment to the Board for monies agreed to be paid as	
5	condition of this Agreement may subject Respondent to civil collection efforts.	
6		
7	Dated this day of, 2019.	
8	es es	
9	INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS	
10		
11	Pour A	
12	By:	
13	Attorney for the Investigative Committee	
14	Detail this day of	
15	Dated this day of, 2019.	
16	Hogen Hulet DLL C	
17	Hogan Hulet PLLC	
18	By: Sens Pret 1	
19	By: Kenneth E. Hogan, Esq.,	
20	Attorney for Respondent	
21		
22	Dated this day of, 2019.	
23	1. 1	
24		
25	Maryanne D. Phillips, M.D., Respondent	
26		
27		
28		

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the foregoing Settlement Agreement is approved and accepted by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners on the 7th day of June, 2019, with the final total amount of costs due of \$15,000.00.

Dhally fachalistan

Rachakonda D. Prabhu, M.D., President
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

3

4 5

In the Matter of Charges and

Maryanne D. Phillips, M.D.,

**Complaint Against** 

Respondent.

7

8

6

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

Case No. 18-10032-1

FILED

FEB - 9 2018

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF** MEDICAL EXAMINERS

# **COMPLAINT**

The Investigative Committee<sup>1</sup> (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board) hereby issues this formal Complaint (Complaint) against Maryanne D. Phillips, M.D. (Respondent), a licensed physician in Nevada. After investigating this matter, the IC has a reasonable basis to believe that Respondent has violated provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) chapter 630 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) chapter 630 (collectively Medical Practice Act). The IC alleges the following facts:

- Respondent is currently licensed in Nevada in active status with conditions 1. (License No. 7635). She has been licensed by the Board since December 21, 1995.
- 2. Respondent's license is currently in active status with certain conditions placed on the license pursuant to an order dated December 8, 2017, which removed the probationary status on her license to practice medicine, restored the license to active status, and placed all remaining conditions and restrictions associated with a Settlement Agreement dated September 9, 2016, on her license. Previously, Respondent's license was active-probationary status pursuant to the September 9, 2016 Settlement Agreement between the Respondent and the Board. At the regularly scheduled December 1, 2017 Board Meeting, at which Respondent appeared and requested that ///

<sup>1</sup> The Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners at the time the filing of this Complaint was approved, was composed of Board members Wayne Hardwick, M.D., Chairman, Theodore B. Berndt, M.D., member, and Mr. M. Neil Duxbury, public member.

her probation be lifted, the Board agreed to lift the probation but place the same conditions of her probation on her license.

- Respondent does not have a license to prescribe controlled substances issued by the
   Nevada State Board of Pharmacy.
- 4. Respondent is not registered with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) to prescribe controlled substances.
- 5. On or about April 29, 2016, an investigator for the Board sent an allegation letter to Respondent, based on information received by the Board, regarding allegations that Respondent unduly pressures her employees and/or independent contractors to prescribe controlled substances to her patients for financial gain. It was further alleged that Respondent was operating her medical practice under the name of Marianne Elias, rather than Maryanne Phillips. It was further alleged that Respondent was the medical director of Research and Wellness Center or Hormones Center of Nevada located at 2649 Wigwam Parkway, Suite 101, in Henderson, Nevada 89074. It was further alleged that Respondent was facilitating her office manager and husband, Donald Kinsman, to distribute and/or sell controlled substances to patients.
- 6. Respondent provided a response on or about June 1, 2016, in which she denied:
  (a) ever having used the name of Marianne Elias; (b) ever having been the medical director of Research and Wellness Center or Hormones Center of Nevada; (c) actively seeing patients since May or June of 2014; (d) having an office manager, as she denied having a regular office; (e) facilitating her husband or anyone to distribute and/or sell controlled substances to patients; and (f) extorting office staff to prescribe controlled substances that are unwarranted and not medically necessary, resulting in patient harm, as she denied having office staff.
- 7. A Nevada limited liability company named Research and Wellness Center LLC is registered with the Nevada Secretary of State. Marianne Elias is listed as the manager of the company. The company has been in default since October 31, 2016. The address of the manager is listed as 10920 Southern Highlands Parkway, #2105, Las Vegas, Nevada 89141.
- 8. On or about October 30, 2015, the Research and Wellness Center LLC entered into a Lease Agreement with Marlin A, LLC, to lease real property located at 2649 Wigwam Parkway,

Suite 101, Henderson, Nevada 89074.

- 9. The Lease Agreement was signed by Donald Kinsman on behalf of the Research and Wellness Center LLC.
  - 10. Upon information and belief, Donald Kinsman is the spouse of Maryanne Phillips.
- Contact names for Research and Wellness Center LLC were listed on the Lease
   Agreement as Mari Elias and Blas Elias.
  - 12. The Lease Agreement was personally guaranteed by MaryAnne Elias.
- 13. The signature of MaryAnne Elias, aka Maryanne Phillips, on the Guaranty was notarized, and she provided a copy of her driver's license. The name on the Nevada driver's license is Maryanne Phillips Elias.
- 14. A cashier's check was provided with the Lease Agreement. On the Remitter (Purchased by) line, the cashier's check states "Mary Anne Phillips Elias Wellness Ctr."
- 15. On or about January 11, 2016, the Lease Agreement between Research and Wellness Center LLC and Marlin A, LLC, was amended. The amendment changed the guarantors from Donald Kinsman and Mary Anne Elias to Donald Kinsman, Mary Anne Elias, and David Memmoli.
- 16. Maryanne Phillips previously practiced medicine at 2649 Wigwam Parkway, Suite101, Henderson, Nevada 89074.
- 17. Maryanne Phillips-Elias, MD is listed on the WebMD website as having a practice with Daniel F. Royal, D.O. at 9065 S. Pecos Road, Suite 250, Henderson, Nevada 89074.
- 18. Dr. Maryanne Phillips was listed on letterhead for Comprehensive Pain Management and Wellness, located at 9065 S. Pecos Road, Suite 250, Henderson, Nevada 89074, from November 2013 through September 2015.
  - 19. Respondent treated patients as late as December of 2014.
- 20. From on or around November 2015 through May 2016, one or more members of Respondent's staff and/or independent contractors witnessed Respondent review patients' charts.
- 21. From on or around November 2015 through May 2016, one or more members of Respondent's staff and/or independent contractors witnessed Respondent remove progress notes

 and/or other information from patients' charts.

22. From on or around November 2015 through May 2016, one or more members of Respondent's staff and/or independent contractors witnessed Respondent replace information in patients' charts.

### Patient A

- 23. Patient A's true identity is not disclosed to protect his privacy, but his identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served on Respondent, along with a copy of this Complaint.
- 24. In December 2015 or January 2016, Patient A came to Respondent's practice for treatment of pain. He was seen by an advanced practice registered nurse contracting with Respondent and/or Research and Wellness Center LLC.
- 25. The advanced practice registered nurse, after having a discussion with Patient A, prescribed Patient A a different pain management regimen than was requested by Patient A.
- 26. Upon receiving an alternate pain management regimen, Patient A chose to discontinue care with Respondent's practice.
- 27. Respondent and her husband, Donald Kinsman, subsequently admonished the advanced practice registered nurse and claimed that because the advanced practice registered nurse had failed to prescribe Oxycodone to Patient A, they had lost both Patient A and the additional patients he would have brought into the practice.
- 28. Upon information and belief, Patient A was subsequently told by Respondent and/or Donald Kinsman that he would be prescribed Oxycodone, and returned to Respondent's practice. Prior to the office visit, Donald Kinsman informed the advanced practice registered nurse that Patient A had been using his parents' Oxycodone for his pain management.
  - 29. On or about February 15, 2016, Patient A again presented to Respondent's practice.
- 30. The advanced practice registered nurse told Patient A that using his parents' medication was wrong, to which Patient A replied that he knew.
- 31. After discussion with Patient A, during which time Patient A returned the other prescriptions, admitted to not filling them, said that only the Oxycodone worked, and repeatedly asked whether he would get a prescription for Oxycodone, the advanced practice registered nurse

determined that Patient A was exhibiting drug-seeking behaviors and refused to prescribe Oxycodone.

- 32. Patient A stated that he had wasted his time and left Respondent's practice.
- 33. On or about February 15, 2016, Donald Kinsman confronted the advanced practice registered nurse about why he had not prescribed Oxycodone to Patient A. The advanced practice registered nurse responded that Patient A had gone without a prescription for two weeks, which demonstrated he did not really need pain medication. He indicated that in his experience, patients in pain will typically try any pain management regimen in hopes of obtaining pain relief, rather than go without any pain medication at all because it is not Oxycodone.
- 34. On or about March 1, 2016, a member of Respondent's staff witnessed Respondent remove the advanced practice registered nurse's note from the examination of Patient A that took place on or about February 15, 2016, and replace that day's note with a note Respondent then wrote herself.
- 35. Upon information and belief, Respondent has signed off the chart notes entered by the advanced practice registered nurse for Patient A.
- 36. On or about May 9, 2017, the IC issued an Order to Produce Medical Records regarding Patient A to Respondent. The Order required Respondent to produce the records within 10 days of service.
- 37. Respondent previously provided health care records for patients of Research and Wellness Center LLC; however, Respondent has not complied with the May 9, 2017 Order to Produce Medical Records.
- 38. On or about May 17, 2017, Respondent sent a message by electronic mail to the IC's investigative staff that she vaguely remembered a patient by the name of the patient requested, but was in California most of the time and had not treated a pain patient since 2014.
- 39. In response to a question from investigative staff as to who currently was the custodian of records for Research and Wellness Center LLC, on or about May 20, 2017, Respondent sent a message by electronic mail to investigative staff that she was no longer the custodian of records and that Research and Wellness Center LLC was no longer in existence.

1 2 3

4 5

6

7 8 9

11

12

10

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

2526

2728

40. In response to additional correspondence from investigative staff requesting the identity of the current custodian of records, on or about May 24, 2017, Respondent sent a message by electronic mail, stating the following, verbatim:

This is not a patient I have seen in five years and the Research and Wellness was not a pain clinic and it was only established for a year in later part of 2015 for a research project for a topical cream and only in existence for a year Davison has now taken over that research They no longer need an MD to work on the project. I'm training for a cancer research project but I don't need Research and Wellness LLC to do it the larger pharmaceutical companies are in charge of any further research. And just so you have the correct information I was not the manager of Research and Wellness Center because it is not a Center it is Research and Wellness LLC and it is Not the same as Wellness Center which was primary care including weight loss B12 shots nutritional pain treatment as needed counseling infusion therapy and I believe even history and physicals only for marijuana patients (started by Memmoli whose no longer there ) my DEA license was Retired in may 2014 by me because I did not need it for the research and you might be confusing me with Kim Phillips who worked a the same location in 2014 that I previously was at, most of the records in 2016 were put into EMR and I obviously did not need paper records to do anesthesia at a hospital. Unfortunately some of the providers actually took some of the paper record that were there like Dr Foote in 2012. The original practice was Dr Nagy's and I worked for him on a salary basis and all persons working there were his employees or independent contractors and there were issues with several of them so I left and came back for a while in 2013-14 until Dr Emmerling took over patient care. Most of the charts were with him that were paper and transcribed into EMR. It is physically impossible to know where every

patient I ever saw for Dr Nagy is. I would suggest you check the PNP and see who saw them three years ago and contact them?

If you need a copy of my previous contract with Dr Nagy or the state information on Research and Wellness LLC I will provide it. I did neuroanesthesia for Dr Nagy and he decided he wanted a private pain clinic to refer his surgical patients to but it didn't work out. I apologize for any problems his former employees might have given you but like I said I had no control over him or them I just saw patients!

41. To date, Respondent has not provided the information requested in the Order to Produce Medical Records.

#### Count I:

## NRS 630.306(1)(b)(1): Engaging in Conduct Intended to Deceive

- 42. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 43. NRS 630.306(1)(b)(1) provides that engaging in any conduct which is intended to deceive is grounds for initiating disciplinary action.
- 44. Respondent denied to the IC ever having used the name of Marianne Elias, though she has used various forms of the name Maryanne Phillips, MaryAnne Phillips, MaryAnne Phillips, Maryanne Phillips-Elias, Mary Anne Phillips Elias, Marianne Elias, Mari Tiffany Phillips-Elias, Mari Elias and Maryanne Elias on her driver's license, lease agreement, guaranty of lease agreement, list of officers for Research and Wellness Center LLC, emails, and on websites advertising her services.
- 45. Respondent denied to the IC ever having been the medical director of Research and Wellness Center LLC or Hormones Center of Nevada, though a Marianne Elias is listed as the manager of Research and Wellness Center LLC and that entity signed a lease agreement, which MaryAnne Elias personally guaranteed.

| ///

| |||

- 46. Respondent denied actively seeing patients since May or June of 2014, though she continued to refer at least one patient to physical therapy on or about November 12, 2014, and to medical imaging on or about December 10, 2014.
- 47. Respondent denied having an office manager, as she denied having a regular office; however, the Lease Agreement demonstrates that she guaranteed the lease for 2649 Wigwam Parkway, Suite 101, in Henderson, Nevada, which Lease Agreement was executed by her husband, Donald Kinsman, on behalf of Research and Wellness Center LLC. Medical records of multiple patients indicate that patients were seen there from November 2015 through at least May 2016.
- 48. Upon information and belief, Respondent was present in the office at 2649 Wigwam Parkway, Suite 101, in Henderson, Nevada, nearly every day that the office was open for the time period in question in this Complaint.
- 49. Respondent denied facilitating her husband or anyone to distribute and/or sell controlled substances to patients, and denied extorting office staff to prescribe controlled substances that were unwarranted and not medically necessary, as she denied having office staff. However, one advanced practice registered nurse working at 2649 Wigwam Parkway, Suite 101, in Henderson, Nevada, was pressured by both Respondent and Donald Kinsman to prescribe Oxycodone to Patient A, in spite of the fact that the advanced practice registered nurse believed, in his medical judgment, that Patient A exhibited drug-seeking behaviors and that such prescription was inappropriate.
- 50. Accordingly, Respondent's response to the Board's investigative staff was less than truthful and was intended to deceive investigative staff.
- 51. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in NRS 630.352.

## Count II:

# NRS 630.306(1)(p): Engaging in Unsafe or Unprofessional Conduct

52. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.

///

64. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in NRS 630.352.

#### Count V:

# NRS 630.301(6): Disruptive Behavior That Interferes With Patient Care or Has an Adverse Impact on the Quality of Patient Care

- 65. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 66. NRS 630.301(6) provides that disruptive behavior with physicians, hospital personnel, patients, members of the families of patients or any other persons if the behavior interferes with patient care or has an adverse impact on the quality of care rendered to a patient is grounds for disciplinary action.
- 67. Respondent exerted pressure, coercion and/or intimidation on the advanced practice registered nurse in her employ or who was an independent contractor in her office, to prescribe opioids to Patient A, when it was not in the patient's best interest in the opinion of the advanced practice registered nurse.
- 68. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in NRS 630.352.

# Count VI:

# NRS 630.301(9): Engaging in Conduct That Brings the Medical Profession Into Disrepute

- 69. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 70. NRS 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical profession into disrepute, including, without limitation, conduct that violates any provision of a code of ethics adopted by the Board by regulation based on a national code of ethics is grounds for disciplinary action.
- 71. Respondent's insistence that an advanced practice registered nurse in her employ, or working as an independent contractor in her office, prescribe medically unwarranted opioids to Patient A in violation of the Model Policy on the Use of Opioid Analgesics in the Treatment of

2

3

4

5

6

7

89.

Produce Medical Records.

27

28

Respondent knowingly and willingly failed to comply with the IC's Order to

#### VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEVADA ) : ss.
COUNTY OF WASHOE )

Wayne Hardwick, M.D., hereby deposes and states under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Nevada that he is the Chairman of the Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners that authorized the foregoing Complaint against the Respondent herein; that he has read the foregoing Complaint; and based upon information discovered during the course of the investigation into a complaint against Respondent, he believes the allegations and charges in the foregoing Complaint against Respondent are true, accurate and correct.

DATED this 9th day of February, 2018.

Wayne Hardwick, M.D.

Chairman, Investigative Committee Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

Marge Hardwick

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

In the Matter of the License of Case Nos.: 12-10032-1 and 14-10032-1

MARYANNE PHILLIPS, M.D., FILED

Licensee. DEC 0 8 2017

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: ORDER MODIFYING PREVIOUSLY APPROVED

# ORDER MODIFYING PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Maryanne Phillips, M.D. (Dr. Phillips), License No. 7635, personally appeared in Las Vegas, Nevada before the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board) at its regularly scheduled meeting on December 1, 2017, requesting termination of the probationary terms on her license to practice medicine in the state of Nevada as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, which was approved by the Board on September 9, 2016. After considering the request and speaking with Dr. Phillips, the Board enters the following order:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the probationary status attached to Dr. Phillips' license to practice medicine in the state of Nevada is hereby removed, and her license is restored to active status with all remaining conditions and restrictions associated with the September 9, 2016 Settlement Agreement still in full force and effect. The terms of Paragraph 5(A) of the September 9, 2016 Settlement Agreement are incorporated herein by reference as conditions upon her license for 36 months from September 9, 2016. The Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of December 2017.

Dhally Schallston

Rachakonda D. Prabhu, M.D., President Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

# EXHIBIT A

**EXHIBIT A** 

LV194756

# ORIGINAL

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

3

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

1 1

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

2425

26 27

28

Case Nos.: 12-10032-1 & 14-10032-1

**FILED** 

SEP 0 9 2016

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS BY:

# SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Investigative Committee (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board) and Maryanne D. Phillips, M.D. (Respondent), a licensed physician in Nevada, represented by John A. Hunt, Esq. of the law firm Morris Polich & Purdy, LLP, hereby enter into this Settlement Agreement (Agreement) based on the following:

## A. Background

In the Matter of Charges and

MARYANNE D. PHILLIPS, M.D.,

Complaint Against

Respondent.

- 1. Respondent is a physician licensed by the Board, pursuant to Chapter 630 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and Chapter 630 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), to practice medicine in Nevada since 1995 (License No. 7635).
- 2. On November 5, 2012, in Case No. 12-10032-1, the IC filed a formal Complaint (Complaint No. 12-10032-1) charging Respondent with violations of the Medical Practice Act. Specifically, Complaint No. 12-10032-1 alleges three counts. Count 1 alleges a violation of

All agreements and admissions made by Respondent are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, Respondent's agreements and admissions are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government regulatory agency proceeding, state or federal civil or criminal proceeding, any state or federal court proceeding, or any credentialing or privileges matter.

3 4

5

1

6 7

9 10

8

12 13

11

14 15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

NRS 630.301(3), disciplinary action taken by another state. Count II alleges a violation of NRS 630.306(11), failure to report in writing, within 30 days, any disciplinary action taken against the licensee by another state. Count III alleges a violation of NRS 630.306(2)(a), engaging in any conduct that is intended to deceive.

- 3. For purposes of this Agreement, Respondent and the IC further stipulate and agree that that the IC represented it was intending to amend Complaint - No. 12-10032-1to include additional counts regarding allegations that Respondent failed to report to the Board that the Medical Board of California had taken disciplinary action against Respondent and failed to report to the Board that the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy (BOP) had taken disciplinary action against Respondent. The IC also represented that it was going to amend Complaint - No. 12-10032-1to include additional counts regarding the disciplinary action taken by The Medical Board of California against Respondent and the disciplinary action taken by the BOP against Respondent. Accordingly, this Agreement addresses, resolves, and takes into consideration any and all claims/counts the Board or IC may have brought against Respondent relative to said matters, including but not necessarily limited to, any count alleging a violation of NRS 630.301(3), disciplinary action taken by another state, any count alleging a violation of NRS 630.306(11), failure to report in writing, within 30 days, any disciplinary action taken against the licensee by another state, or any count alleging a violation of NRS 630.306(2)(a), engaging in any conduct that is intended to deceive. Accordingly, Respondent and the IC agree that any and all allegations or claims regarding Respondent allegedly failing to report to the Board that the Medical Board of California and the BOP had taken disciplinary action against Respondent are hereby waived and/or released by the IC and/or the Board. Again, for ease of reference, reference to "Complaint – No. 12-10032-1" shall also include the matters addressed in this paragraph.
- 4. On April 22, 2014, in Case No. - 14-10032-1, the IC filed a formal Complaint (Complaint - No. 14-10032-1) charging Respondent with violations of the Medical Practice Act. Complaint - No. 14-10032-1alleges three counts. Count I alleges one violation of NRS 630.3062(1), failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient. Count II alleges one violation of NRS 630.301(4), malpractice as defined by NAC 630.040. Count III alleges one violation of NRS 630.306(2)(b), engaging in any

conduct that the Board has determined is a violation of the standards of practice established by regulation of the Board.

- 5. Respondent was properly served with a copy of Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and with a copy of Complaint No. 14-10032-1, and has reviewed both Complaints, understands both Complaints, and has had the opportunity to consult with competent counsel concerning the nature and significance of the Complaints.
- 6. Respondent is hereby advised of her rights regarding this administrative matter, and of her opportunity to defend against the allegations in Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and in Complaint No. 14-10032-1. Specifically, Respondent has certain rights in this administrative matter as set out by the United States Constitution, the Nevada Constitution, the Medical Practice Act, and the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which is contained in NRS Chapter 233B. These rights include the right to a formal hearing on the allegations in Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and in Complaint No. 14-10032-1, the right to representation by counsel, at her own expense, in the preparation and presentation of her defense, the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses and evidence against her, the right to written findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order reflecting the final decision of the Board, and the right to judicial review of the Board's order, if the decision is adverse to her.
- 7. Respondent understands that, under the Board's charge to protect the public by regulating the practice of medicine, the Board may take disciplinary action against Respondent's license, including license probation, license suspension, license revocation, and imposition of administrative fines, as well as any other reasonable requirement or limitation, if the Board concludes that Respondent violated one or more provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
- Respondent understands and agrees that this Agreement, by and between Respondent and the IC, is not with the Board, and that the IC will present this Agreement to the Board for consideration in open session at a duly noticed and scheduled meeting. Respondent understands that the IC shall advocate for the Board's approval of this Agreement, but that the Board has the right to decide in its own discretion whether or not to approve this Agreement. Respondent further understands and agrees that if the Board approves this Agreement, then the terms and conditions enumerated below shall be binding and enforceable upon her and the Board.

# B. Terms & Conditions

22.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** in order to resolve the matters addressed herein (i.e., the matters with regards to Complaint - No. 12-10032-1 and Complaint - No. 14-10032-1), Respondent and the IC hereby agree to the following terms and conditions:

- 1. <u>Jurisdiction</u>. Respondent is, and at all times relevant to Complaint No. 12-10032-1and Complaint No. 14-10032-1has been, a physician licensed to practice medicine in Nevada subject to the jurisdiction of the Board as set forth in the Medical Practice Act.
- Respondent understands that she may retain and consult counsel prior to entering into this Agreement at her own expense. Respondent acknowledges she is represented by counsel, John A. Hunt, Esq. of the law firm Morris Polich & Purdy, LLP, and wishes to resolve the matters addressed herein with counsel. Respondent agrees that if representation by counsel in this matter materially changes prior to entering into this Agreement and for the duration of this Agreement, that counsel for the IC will be timely notified of the material change. Respondent agrees that she knowingly, willingly, and intelligently enters into this Agreement after full consultation with and upon the advice of her counsel.
- 3. Waiver of Rights. In connection with this Agreement, and the associated terms and conditions, Respondent knowingly, willingly, and intelligently waives all rights in connection with this administrative matter. Respondent hereby knowingly, willingly, and intelligently waives all rights arising under the United States Constitution, the Nevada Constitution, the Medical Practice Act, the APA, and any other legal rights that may be available to her or that may apply to her in connection with the administrative proceedings resulting from Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and Complaint No. 14-10032-1 filed in this matter, including defense of the Complaints, adjudication of the allegations set forth in the Complaints (in addition, as more fully addressed above, this also includes any anticipated amendments to Complaint 12-10032-1), and imposition of any disciplinary actions or sanctions ordered by the Board. Respondent agrees to settle and resolve the allegations of Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and Complaint No. 14-10032-1 as set out by this Agreement without a hearing or any further proceedings, and without the right to judicial

review.

3 4 5

- 4. Acknowledgement of Reasonable Basis to Proceed. Respondent acknowledges that the IC believes it has a reasonable basis to allege that Respondent engaged in conduct that is grounds for discipline pursuant to the Medical Practice Act. The Board acknowledges Respondent is not admitting that the Board's claims/counts as alleged in the Complaints have merit and Respondent is agreeing to resolve this matter to avoid the costs of hearing and potential subsequent litigation. Respondent asserts if this matter were to proceed to hearing, she has evidence, witnesses, expert witness(es), and defenses to the counts/claims alleged in Complaint No. 12-10032-1and Complaint No. 14-10032-1, but for the purposes of resolving the matter and for no other purpose, Respondent waives the presentation of evidence, witnesses, expert witnesses, and defenses in order to effectuate this Agreement.
- Complaint No. 14-10032-1 pending against Respondent without incurring any further costs or the expense associated with a hearing, Respondent hereby agrees that the Board may issue an order finding that Respondent engaged in conduct that is grounds for discipline pursuant to the Medical Practice Act, to wit: one count of disciplinary action taken by another state, a violation of NRS 630.301(3), as outlined in Count I of Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and one count of malpractice, a violation of NRS 630.301(4), as outlined in Count II of Complaint No. 14-10032-1. Accordingly, the following terms and conditions are hereby agreed upon:
  - A. Respondent agrees to allow her license to practice medicine in the state of Nevada to be placed on probation for a period of 36 months from the date of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement (probationary period). The following terms and conditions shall apply during Respondent's probationary period:
    - 1. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not prescribe any Class II
       IV medications. If Respondent obtains a medical license coupled with the authority to prescribe Class II IV medications in another jurisdiction, the Board will not object to Respondent prescribing Class II IV medications in the jurisdiction in which Respondent obtained a medical license coupled with the

authority to prescribe Class II - IV medications. However, if Respondent prescribes any Class II - IV medications in another jurisdiction to any patient from Nevada, the IC shall be authorized to immediately summarily suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in Nevada.

- 2. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not administer drugs to patients except those that are necessary to perform her duties as an anesthesiologist. Accordingly, Respondent shall be able to administer drugs to patients to perform her duties as an anesthesiologist. The only drugs Respondent shall be able to administer to patients to perform her duties as an anesthesiologist are outlined in Exhibit "1." The IC shall monitor Respondent's administration of said drugs through reasonable random audits of her profile with the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy's Prescription Monitoring Program and/or random audits of her patient medical charts. If Respondent administers any drugs outlined in Exhibit "1" to patients, Respondent shall be able to provide documentary proof upon request from a Board investigator that said drugs were administered solely to perform her duties as an anesthesiologist.
- 3. During the probationary period, Respondent agrees the Board shall have unfettered access to Respondent's medical records and agrees they may be inspected randomly and without prior notice by investigators of the Board during the probationary period, to ensure that Respondent's subsequent practice and record-keeping protocols are consistent with Nevada statutes and regulations.
- 4. During the probationary period, Respondent will be responsible for the costs involved in the ongoing administrative oversight relative to the probationary period and shall reimburse the Board within 30 days of a written request for reimbursement of the same.
- 5. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not engage, in any manner, in the practice of pain management.

///

- 6. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not be employed in any manner with a pain management clinic/practice.
- 7. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not have any business interest/ownership in any pain management clinic/practice.
- 8. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not work at any location where pain management is practiced.
- 9. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not supervise any physician assistants.
- 10. During the probationary period, Respondent shall provide the Board with the physical address of each location of employment. If an address of employment changes, Respondent shall notify the Board in writing of the new physical address within five business days of the change.
- 11. During the probationary period, Respondent shall comply with all laws related to the practice of allopathic medicine, whether state or federal, whether statutory or regulatory, and whether contained in NRS and NAC chapters 629, 630, 453, 454, 585 and 639.
- 12. Respondent shall allow Board investigators to enter each location where Respondent is practicing medicine at any time during each practice location's normal operating hours, including any room or area therein, to inspect the practice and review any or all of her patient and practice records.
- B. Respondent may petition the Board before the probationary period has expired to request that the terms of this Agreement be modified or that the probationary period be terminated before the 36-month probationary period referenced above expires.
- C. With regards to Complaint No. 12-10032-1, Respondent shall pay a fine of five hundred and xx/100 dollars (\$500.00) for Count I within 30 days of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement.

- D. With regards to Complaint No. 14-10032-1, Respondent shall pay a fine of five hundred and xx/100 dollars (\$500.00) for Count II within 30 days of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement.
- E. With regards to Counts II and III of Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and Counts I and III of Complaint No. 14-0032-1, the same shall be dismissed.
- F. Respondent will pay the costs and expenses incurred in the investigation and prosecution of the above-referenced matters within 30 days of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement (i.e., Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and Complaint No. 14-10032-1), the current amounts being \$4,567.42 for Complaint No. 12-10032-1 and \$4,360.36 for Complaint No. 14-10032-1, not including any costs that may be necessary to finalize this Agreement.
- G. Respondent shall be issued a public letter of reprimand.
- H. Respondent shall take six hours of continuing medical education (CME) related to anesthesiology within 12 months from the date of the Board's acceptance, adoption and approval of this Agreement. The aforementioned hours of CME shall be in addition to any CME requirements that are regularly imposed upon Respondent as a condition of licensure in the state of Nevada and shall be approved by the Board prior to their completion.
- I. This Agreement shall be reported to the appropriate entities and parties as required by law, including, but not limited to, the National Practitioner Data Bank.
- Release From Liability. In execution of this Agreement, Respondent understands and agrees that the state of Nevada, the Board, and each of its members, staff, counsel, investigators, experts, peer reviewers, committees, panels, hearing officers, consultants, and agents are immune from civil liability for any decision or action taken in good faith in response to information acquired by the Board. NRS 630.364(2). Respondent agrees to release the state of Nevada, the Board, and each of its members, staff, counsel, investigators, experts, peer reviewers, committees, panels, hearing officers, consultants, and agents from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that Respondent ever had, now has, may have or claim to have, against

any or all of the persons, government agencies, or entities named in this paragraph arising out of, or by reason of, this investigation, this Agreement, or the administration of the cases referenced herein.

7. Procedure for Adoption of Agreement. The IC and counsel for the IC shall recommend approval and adoption of the terms and conditions of this Agreement by the Board in resolution of Complaint - No. 12-10032-1 and Complaint - No. 14-10032-1. In the course of seeking Board acceptance, approval, and adoption of this Agreement, counsel for the IC may communicate directly with the Board staff and the adjudicating members of the Board.

Respondent acknowledges that such contacts and communication may be made or conducted ex parte, without notice or opportunity to be heard on her part until the public Board meeting where this Agreement is discussed, and that such contacts and communications may include, but not be limited to, matters concerning this Agreement, the Complaint, and any and all information of every nature whatsoever related to this matter. The IC and its counsel agree that Respondent may appear at the Board meeting where this Agreement is discussed and, if requested, respond to any questions that may be addressed to the IC or the IC's counsel.

- 8. <u>Effect of Acceptance of Agreement by Board</u>. In the event the Board accepts, approves, and adopts this Agreement, the Board shall issue a final order, making this Agreement an order of the Board.
- 9. Effect of Rejection of Agreement by Board. In the event the Board does not accept, approve, and adopt this Agreement, this Agreement shall be null, void, and of no force and effect except as to the following agreement regarding adjudications: (1) Respondent agrees that, notwithstanding rejection of this Agreement by the Board, nothing contained in this Agreement and nothing that occurs pursuant to efforts of the IC to seek the Board's acceptance of this Agreement shall disqualify any member of the adjudicating panel of the Board from considering Complaint No. 12-10032-1and Complaint No. 14-10032-1and from participating in disciplinary proceedings against Respondent, including adjudication of the cases; and (2) Respondent further agrees that she shall not seek to disqualify any such member absent evidence of bad faith.
  - 10. Binding Effect. If approved by the Board, Respondent understands that this

Agreement is a binding and enforceable contract upon Respondent and the Board.

- 11. <u>Forum Selection Clause</u>. The parties agrees that in the event either party is required to seek enforcement of this Agreement in district court, the parties consent to such jurisdiction and agree that exclusive jurisdiction shall be either the Second Judicial District Court, state of Nevada, Washoe County.
- 12. <u>Attorneys' Fees and Costs</u>. The parties agree that in the event an action is commenced in district court to enforce any provision of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 13. Failure to Comply with Terms. Should Respondent fail to comply with any term or condition of this Agreement once the Agreement has been accepted, approved, and adopted by the Board, the IC shall be authorized to immediately suspend Respondent's license to practice medicine in Nevada pending an Order To Show Cause Hearing, which will be duly noticed. Failure to comply with the terms of this Agreement, including failure to pay any fines, costs, expenses, or fees owed to the Board, is a failure to comply with an order of the Board, which may result in additional disciplinary action being taken against Respondent. NRS 630.3065(2)(a). Further, Respondent's failure to remit payment to the Board for monies agreed to be paid as a condition of this Agreement may subject Respondent to civil collection efforts.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the foregoing Settlement Agreement is approved and accepted by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners on the 9th day of September 2016, with the final total amount of costs due of \$8,927.78. NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS 

# EXHIBIT 1

acetaminophen	heparin	nitroprusside 50 mg injection
ademosine	heparin sodium	norepinephrine
Adenosine 3 mg/ml 2 ml vial	hetastach 6% 500 ml drip	ocular lubricant
albuterol	hydralazine	ondansetron
albuterol hfa	hydralazine hcl	opthalmic lubricant
alfentanil	hydrocortisone 100mg/2mL	peinephrine PFS
alfentanyl	hydrocortisone 250mg/2mL	phenylephrine 100mcg/1mL
aminocaproic acid	hydrocortisone pf	phenylephrine 10mcg/1mL
amiodarone	hydromorphone	phenylephrine hcl
atracurium	iopamidol	physostigmine
atropine	ketamine	promethazine hcl
atropine sulfate	ketorolac	propofol 10mg/1mL
benzocaine/tetracaine topical	ketorolac tromethamine	propofol 200mg/20mL
bivalirudin	labetalol 5 mg/ml 4ml syringe	propofol/benzyl
bupivacaine 0.25% epi 1:200K	lidocaine 1% epi 1:100,000	propranolol
buplvacaine	lidocaine 1% MPF	protamine 10mg/1mL
calcium chloride	lidocaine 1% pf	protamine 50mg/5mL
calcium chloride 10%	lidocaine 2%	protamine sulfate
cefazolin	lidocaine 2% 100mg/5mL	rocuronium
cefazolin sodium	lidocaine 2% 20 mg/ml 5ml sdv	sodium bicarbonate
cefoxitin	lidocaine 2% 5 ml jelly	sodium chloride
dexamethasone 10mg/1mL	lidocaine 2% MPF	sodium chloride 10%
dexamethasone 4mg/1mL	lidocaine 2% topical	sterile water
dexamethasone na phosphate	lidocaine 5% topical	succinylcholine
dextrose	lidocaine hcl 2%	succinylcholine chloride
dextrose 50% 50 ml syringe	lta kit 4% 4 ml top soln	sufentanil
digoxin	meperidine	sufentanil citrate
diltiazem	methpredinsolone sodium succ	triamcinolone
diphenhydramine	methyiprednisole sod succ	vasopressin
diphenhydramine hcl	methylprednisolone NA succ	vecuronium
dobutamine	metoclopramide	verapamil
doxapram	metoprolol	water for injection, fliptop
edrophonium/atropine	midazolam	
ephedrine 50mg/1mL	midazolam 2 mg/2mL	
ephedrine 5mg/1mL	midazolam 5mg/5mL	1
ephedrine sulfate	milrinone 20mg/100mL	1
epinephrine	milrinone 20mg/20mL	1
epinephrine 10 ml bristojet	milrinone lactate iv	1
esmolol	morphine	-
esmolol hcl	morphine 10mg/1mL	•
etomidate	morphine PF 10mg/10mL	
famotidine	naloxone	1
fentanyl	naloxone 0.4 mg/1 ml inj.	1
flumazenil	neostigmine	1
furosemide	neostigmine 10 mg/10 ml vial	-
gentamycin sulfate	nitroglycerin	-
glycopyrrolate	nitroglycerin 2% ud	1
Rivenhaire	Immogrycerm 270 ud	1

**10B** 

# CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE REGISTRATION APPLICATION

Nevada State Board of Pharmacy 985 Damonte Ranch Pkwy, Suite 206 - Reno, NV 89521

Registration Fee: \$80.00 (non-refundable money order or cashier's check only)
(This application cannot be used by PA's or APRN's)

	^			•	
First:	Rober-	<u> </u>	dle:	Last: Toledo Degree: DO	
SS#:		· ·	Date o	f Birth:	
Practice	Practice Name (if any): Henderson Wellness DB/BYN				
Nevada A	Address: _	1552 W	Warm Sorings	2/ Suita # 1	
	Nevada Address: 1552 w warm Springs Rd Suite #: 100  (This must be a practicing address, we will not issue a license to a home address or to a PO Box only)				
City:	Hender	rson	State	e: <u>NV</u> Zip Code: <u>89014</u>	
E-mail:	drrob	toledo@gmai	\.com Contact F	-mail: holly@deserttreatment.com	n
Work Te	lephone: _	762-933-	5544 Fax	:_ 402-933-5545	
Practition	ner License	e Number:	1057	Specialty: OBIGYN	
Sex: ☑	M or □ F				
You mus	st have a c	urrent Nevada l	license with your re	pective BOARD before we will process thi	5
applicati	on. The N	Nevada license n	nust remain current	to keep the controlled substance registrati	on.
Been di	agnosed or	treated for any mer	ntal illness, including ald	ohol or substance abuse, or	No
Physica	a condition i	that would impair v	our ability to nerform		অ^
2. Been the	subject of a	board citation or a	relony or misdemeanor is	any state?	<u>प</u>
3. Had you	r license sub	jected to any discipl	ine for violation of pharr	nacy or drug laws in <u>any</u> state?	
				clude the following information & provide an expla	_
	ontation.		questions (1-3) above, ii	colude the following information & provide an expla	nation
Board Adm Action:	ninistrative	State	Date:	Case #:	
		NV	07/25/2018	16-013-PD-S See Attack County Court	011
Criminal Action:	State	Date:	Case #:	County Court	1611
		***************************************			
It is a viole	tion of Nove	do lam 4- 6-1-16 - 41			
It is a violation of Nevada law to falsify this application and sanctions will be imposed for misrepresentation. I hereby certify that I have read this application. I certify that all statements made are true and correct.					
certify that	I have read	this application. I	certify that all statemen	ons win be imposed for misrepresentation. Thereb	
corting that	I nave reau	tins application. I	certify that all statemen	its made are true and correct.	у
I understan know or ha	d that Neva	da law requires a le cause to believe.	icensed physician who,	n their professional or occupational capacity, come	<b>y</b>
I understan know or ha	d that Neva	da law requires a le cause to believe.	icensed physician who	n their professional or occupational capacity, come	<b>y</b>
I understan know or ha	d that Neva	da law requires a le cause to believe.	icensed physician who, child has been abused/ l law enforcement agen	nt their professional or occupational capacity, come neglected, to report the abuse/neglect to an agency cy.	<b>y</b>
I understan know or ha provides ch	nd that Neva s reasonable ild welfare s	da law requires a le cause to believe, a services or to a loca	icensed physician who, child has been abused/	nt their professional or occupational capacity, come neglected, to report the abuse/neglect to an agency sty.	<b>y</b>
I understan know or ha provides ch Original S	id that Neva s reasonable ild welfare s ignature, n	da law requires a le cause to believe, a services or to a loca	icensed physician who, child has been abused/	nt their professional or occupational capacity, come neglected, to report the abuse/neglect to an agency cy.	<b>y</b>



# BEFORE THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY

<b>NEVADA STATE BOARD</b>
OF PHARMACY

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY,	) CASE NO. 16-013-PD-S
Petitioner,	)
v.	)
ROBERT TOLEDO, D.O.,	) FINDINGS OF FACT,
Certificate of Registration Nos. CS11019,	) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
CS17832,	) AND ORDER
CS19754,	)
CS23073,	)
PD00063, and	)
PD11019,	)
	)
Responden	t/

This matter came before the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy (Board) at its regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, in Las Vegas, Nevada. Brett Kandt, Esq., appeared and prosecuted the case before the Board. Respondent Robert Anthony Toledo, D.O. (Toledo), Certificate of Registration Nos. CS11019, CS17832, CS19754, CS23073, PD00063 and PD11019, appeared with counsel, John Cotton, Esq. The Board heard the case and, based on the evidence presented, the Board makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

# FINDINGS OF FACT

The allegations against Toledo, as stated in the Accusation on file herein, and upon which Toledo admits and the Board makes findings of fact, are as follows:

- Toledo held active Controlled Substance Registrations, Certificate Nos. CS11019,
   CS17832, CS19754, and CS23073, and Practitioner Dispensing Registrations, Certificate Nos.
   PD00063 and PD11019, issued by the Board at the time of the events set forth herein.
- 2. Toledo also held an active license issued by the Nevada State Board of Osteopathic Medicine to practice osteopathic medicine in Nevada (License No. 1057), and owned and operated Henderson Wellness Medical Spa & Colonics (HWMS), located at 9895 Maryland Parkway, #C, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 3. On March 30, 2016, investigators from the Board and the Nevada State Board of Osteopathic Medicine conducted a joint investigation of HWMS.

- 4. When the investigators arrived at HWMS, there was no one present there who was licensed to possess, access, order, prescribe or dispense dangerous drugs or controlled substances.
- 5. Toledo arrived at HWMS approximately thirty (30) minutes after the investigators arrived and initiated their investigation.
- 6. Prior to Toledo's arrival on March 30, 2016, Toledo's staff wrote and dispensed prescriptions for two (2) walk in patients without Toledo present at HWMS.
- 7. Toledo's HWMS staff assisted each of the two (2) patients to complete a Medical Weight Loss Program Progress Note, and, in Toledo's absence, signed the Medical Weight Loss Program Progress Notes with a stamp of Toledo's signature.
- 8. Without Toledo present, his HWMS staff created a prescription for each patient, prescription numbers 11211 for patient W.H., and 11212 for patient L.V., by stamping Phentermine 37.5 MG and instructions for use on a copied prescription blank bearing Toledo's pre-signed signature.
- 9. Toledo's staff accessed HWMS's inventory of controlled substances and dangerous drugs and dispensed Phentermine 37.5 MG tablets to each patient without Toledo present and without Toledo or any licensed practitioner examining the patient to establish a bona fide therapeutic relationship between Toledo and the patient.
  - 10. Phentermine is a schedule IV-controlled substance.
- 11. Toledo established a system at HWMS wherein he directed his staff to routinely possess, prescribe and dispense controlled substances and dangerous drugs to patients on his behalf and in his absence without a bona fide relationship between Toledo and the patient, at significant risk of harm to the public.
- 12. HWMS had five (5) manila folders onsite that each contained copies of pre-signed prescription blanks which were pre-written for a dangerous drug and each bearing Toledo's copied signature. When a patient visited HWMS for a prescription, an unlicensed staff member wrote in the patient's name and information.

- 13. The copies of pre-signed prescriptions in the five manila folders at HWMS included:
  - Latisse 14 pre-signed copied prescription blanks.
  - Obagi CRS 11 pre-signed copied prescription blanks.
  - Obagi Nuderm 21 pre-signed copied prescription blanks.
  - Obagi Clenziderm 13 pre-signed copied prescription blanks.
  - Rx Sheets 17 pre-signed copied prescription blanks for use when staff wrote for Phentermine and other prescription medications other than the Latisse and Obagi products.
- 14. Toledo maintained a stock of controlled substances and dangerous drugs that were readily accessible to HWMS staff in Toledo's absence.
- 15. The acts performed by Toledo's HWMS staff constituted the practice of medicine since they involved assessment, diagnosis, and treatment of HWMS's patients.
- 16. None of Toledo's HWMS staff were licensed to practice medicine as a physician, physician's assistant, or advanced practice registered nurse.
- 17. Toledo did not examine any of the patients of HWMS in any capacity and did not maintain medical charts on any patients of HWMS.
- 18. Toledo's HWMS staff possessed the controlled substances and dangerous drugs they dispensed with Toledo's knowledge and consent and through the exercise of Toledo's authority to obtain and/or prescribe controlled substances and dangerous drugs.
- 19. On August 16, 2016, the Nevada State Board of Osteopathic Medicine approved and entered a Settlement Agreement and Order *In the Matter of Robert Toledo, D.O.*, Case No. AD1606001.
- 20. Toledo entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration in May of 2017 after an audit revealed that from January 1, 2014 through November 28, 2016, Toledo dispensed 32,245 more Phentermine tablets than he was able to validate through invoice purchases.

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based on the forgoing findings of fact, the Board concludes as a matter of law:

- 1. The Board has jurisdiction over this matter and this respondent because at the time of the events herein, Toledo held active registrations issued by the Board to prescribe and dispense controlled substances and dangerous drugs.
  - 2. The applicable law in this matter is as follows:
- a. No person may possess a controlled substance or dangerous drug in Nevada except as authorized by law. NRS 453.336; NRS 453.338; NRS 453.373; NRS 454.213; NRS 454.316; NRS 454.321.
- b. No person may prescribe and dispense controlled substances in Nevada except as authorized by law. NRS 453.226; NRS 453.375(1); NRS 453.377; NRS 639.235(1); NAC 639.742(1), (3) and (4); 21 CFR § 1301.11; 21 CFR § 1306.03.
- c. A physician may prescribe and dispense controlled substances only for a legitimate medical purpose and in the usual course of his professional practice. NRS 453.381(1); 21 CFR § 1306.04.
- d. Each written prescription for a controlled substance must contain the handwritten signature of the prescribing practitioner. NRS 639.013(1)(a); NRS 639.2353(2); NAC 453.440(1)(c); 21 CFR § 1306.05.
- e. No person may prescribe and dispense dangerous drugs in Nevada except as authorized by law. NRS 454.213; NRS 454.215; NRS 639.235(1); NAC 639.742(1), (3) and (4).
- f. Each written prescription for a dangerous drug must contain the handwritten signature of the prescribing practitioner. NRS 639.013(1)(a); NRS 639.2353(2); NRS 454.223; NAC 454.060(1).
- g. A dispensing practitioner must secure all controlled substances and dangerous drugs in his inventory in a locked storage area to which the dispensing practitioner has the only key or lock combination. NRS 453.375; NAC 453.400; NAC 453.410(1(d); NAC 639.742(3)(c) and (4)(a); NAC 639.745(1)(c).

- h. A dispensing practitioner shall ensure that no prescription for a controlled substance or dangerous drug is dispensed to a patient unless the dispensing practitioner is on-site at the facility. NAC 639.742(3)(e).
- i. "Performing or in any way being a party to any fraudulent or deceitful practice or transaction" constitutes "unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest."
   NAC 639.945(1)(h).
- j. A licensee "[p]erforming any of his or her duties as the holder of a license, certificate or registration issued by the Board . . . in an incompetent, unskillful or negligent manner" constitutes "unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest." NAC 639.945(1)(i).
- k. "Aiding or abetting a person not licensed to practice pharmacy in the State of Nevada" constitutes "unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest." NAC 639.945(1)(j).
- l. "Prescribing a drug as a prescribing practitioner to a patient with whom the prescribing practitioner does not have a bona fide therapeutic relationship" constitutes "unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest." NAC 639.945(1)(o).
- m. The Board may suspend or revoke a registration issued pursuant to NRS 453.231 to prescribe or otherwise dispense a controlled substance upon a finding that the registrant has committed an act that would render registration inconsistent with the public interest. NRS 453.236(1)(d) and NRS 453.241(1).
- n. Engaging in conduct that constitutes unprofessional conduct or that is contrary to the public interest is grounds for suspension or revocation of any license issued by the Board.

  NRS 639.210(4).
- o. Violating any provision of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act or any other federal law or regulation relating to prescription drugs is grounds for suspension or revocation of any license issued by the Board. NRS 639.210(11).
- p. Violating, attempting to violate, assisting or abetting in the violation of or conspiring to violate any law or regulation relating to drugs, the manufacture or distribution of drugs

or the practice of pharmacy is grounds for suspension or revocation of any license issued by the Board. NRS 639.210(12).

- 3. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to possess controlled substances, to use his authority to access and possess an inventory of controlled substances, Toledo aided and abetted his HWMS staff in the unlicensed practice of pharmacy in violation of NRS 453.338(1) and engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NAC 639.945(g), (h), (i), (j) and (k) and NRS 633.131(d). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (12) and (16), and NRS 639.255.
- 4. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to possess dangerous drugs, to use his authority to obtain and possess an inventory of dangerous drugs, Toledo aided and abetted his HWMS staff in the unlicensed practice of pharmacy in violation of NRS 454.213; NRS 454.311 and NRS 454.316 and engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NAC 639.945(g), (h), (i), (j) and (k) and NRS 633.131(d). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (12) and (16), and NRS 639.255.
- 5. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe controlled substances, to issue prescriptions for controlled substances using pre-signed and copied prescription blanks or a stamp of Toledo's signature to patients with whom Toledo had no bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo violated and/or aided and abetted his HWMS staff in violating 21 CFR § 1306.03; 21 CFR § 1306.04; 21 CFR § 1306.05; NRS 453.321(1)(a); NRS 453.331(1)(b), (c), (d), (f) and (h), NRS 453.381(1); NRS 639.2813(1) and NAC 453.440(1)(c). Toledo has therefore engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NAC 639.945(g), (h), (i), (k), (n) and (o) and NRS 633.131(d). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (11), (12) and (16), and NRS 639.255.
- 6. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, to issue prescriptions for dangerous drugs using pre-signed and copied prescription

blanks or a stamp of Toledo's signature to patients with whom Toledo had no bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo violated and/or aided and abetted HWMS's staff in violating NRS 454.221(1), NRS 454.223, NRS 454.311(1) and (2), NRS 454.316; NRS 639.2813(1); NAC 454.060(1) and NRS 639.235(1). Toledo has therefore engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NAC 639.945(g), (h), (i), (k), (n) and (o) and NRS 633.131(1)(d). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (12) and (16), and NRS 639.255.

- 7. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, to dispense controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs using pre-signed and copied prescription blanks or a stamped signature to patients with whom Toledo had no bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo violated and/or aided and abetted his HWMS staff in violating 21 CFR § 1306.03; 21 CFR § 1306.04; 21 CFR § 1306.05; NRS 639.235(1); NRS 639.284(2) and NRS 639.285. Toledo has therefore engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NRS 639.945(g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (n) and (o). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (11), (12) and (16), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.
- 8. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe controlled substances, to possess and dispense controlled substances to patients with whom he had no bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo aided and abetted HWMS's staff in violating 21 CFR § 1301.11; NRS 639.100(1); NRS 453.316(1); and NRS 453.331(1)(b), (c), (d), (f) and (h). Toledo has therefore engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NRS 639.945(g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (n) and (o). For that conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (11), (12) and (16), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.744
- 9. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, to possess and dispense dangerous drugs to patients with whom he had no bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo aided and abetted HWMS's staff in violating NRS 639.100(1); NRS 454.215 and NRS 454.321. Toledo has therefore engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest as defined in NRS 639.945(g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (n) and (o). For that

conduct, Toledo is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (12) and (16), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.

- 10. By allowing his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to possess, prescribe and dispense controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to possess, prescribe and dispense controlled substances and dangerous drugs under his authority, Toledo performed and/or was a party to fraudulent and deceitful practices and transactions and engaged in unprofessional conduct and conduct contrary to the public interest pursuant to NAC 639.945(1)(h), and is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(4) and NRS 639.255.
- 11. By dispensing, and/or by allowing his unlicensed HWMS staff to dispense, controlled substances to patients without Toledo's valid handwritten signature on each written prescription, Toledo acted in violation of 21 CFR § 1306.05; NRS 639.2353(2); NAC 453.440(1)(c); and NAC 453.410(1)(b)(8), and is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (11), (12) and (16), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.
- 12. By dispensing, and/or by allowing his unlicensed HWMS staff to dispense, dangerous drugs to patients without Toledo's valid handwritten signature on each written prescription, Toledo acted in violation of NRS 454.223(2)(a); NRS 639.2353(2); and NAC 454.060(1), and is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(1), (4), (12) and (16), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.
- 13. By allowing his unlicensed HWMS staff access to his inventory of controlled substances and dangerous drugs when he was not on site at his facility, Toledo violated NRS 453.375; NAC 453.400; NAC 453.410(1(d); NAC 639.742(3)(c) and (4)(a), and NAC 639.745(1)(c), and is subject to discipline under NRS 639.210(11) and (12), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.
- 14. By allowing his unlicensed HWMS staff to dispense controlled substances and dangerous drugs to patients when he was not on-site at his facility, Toledo violated and/or aided and abetted his HWMS staff in violating 21 CFR § 1301.11 and NAC 639.742(3)(e), and is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(11) and (12), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.
- 15. By allowing his unlicensed HWMS staff to dispense prescriptions for controlled substances and dangerous drugs without Toledo first personally checking the medications and

initialing them before they were dispensed, Toledo violated 21 CFR § 1306.05 and NAC 639.743(2)(a) and/or (b). Toledo is therefore subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 639.210(11) and (12), NRS 639.255 and NAC 639.7445.

16. By providing pre-signed prescription blanks and/or a stamp of his signature to his HWMS staff, none of whom were practitioners licensed to prescribe controlled substances, and by facilitating the issuance of prescriptions for controlled substances to patients with whom Toledo does not have a bona fide therapeutic relationship, Toledo committed an act that would render his Nevada Controlled Substance Registration inconsistent with the public interest pursuant to NRS 453.231 and is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 453.236(1)(d) and NRS 453.241(1).

# <u>ORDER</u>

# THEREFORE, THE BOARD HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Respondent Robert Anthony Toledo's Controlled Substance Registrations, Certificate Nos. CS11019, CS17832, CS19754, and CS23073, and Practitioner Dispensing Registrations, Certificate Nos. PD00063 and PD11019, are each revoked effective as of the date of the hearing, July 18, 2018.
- 2. Unless and until Toledo applies for reinstatement of one or more of his controlled substance registrations and/or his dispensing practitioner registrations, and the Board reinstates his registration(s), Toledo:
- a. May not possess any controlled substance other than a controlled substance that was lawfully prescribed to him by a licensed practitioner and lawfully dispensed to him for his own personal use to treat a documented medical necessity.
- b. May not possess any controlled substance for office use or for patient use and must immediately and lawfully dispose of any and all controlled substances in his possession and/or control, other than a controlled substance lawfully prescribed and dispensed to him for his own personal use.
  - c. May not prescribe any controlled substance.
  - d. May not dispense any controlled substance or dangerous drug.

- 3. Toledo may not apply for reinstatement of his controlled substance or dispensing practitioner registrations until after "a period of not less than 1 year has lapsed since the date of revocation," as required by NRS 639.257(1).
- 4. In the event Toledo applies for reinstatement, or for any other registration or certificate with the Board, he shall appear before the Board to answer questions and give testimony regarding his application, his compliance with this Order, and the facts and circumstances underlying this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Entered this 35 day of July, 2018.

Leo Basch, President

Nevada State Board of Pharmacy