1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California CHAR SACHSON Supervising Deputy Attorney General JUDITH J. LOACH Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 162030 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 510-3483 Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 E-mail: Judith.Loach@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant BEFOR VETERINARY MODEPARTMENT OF COMP	EDICAL BOARD ONSUMER AFFAIRS	
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation Against:	Case No. 4602017000814	
12	TEJPAUL S. GHUMMAN Alta View Animal Hospital	THIRD AMENDED ACCUSATION AND	
14	690 Showers Drive Mountain View, CA 94040	AMENDED PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION	
15 16	Veterinarian License No. VET 10812 Premises Registration No. HSP 4645		
17	Respondent.		
18			
19	Complainant alleges:		
20	<u>PARTIES</u>		
21	1. Jessica Sieferman (Complainant) brings this Third Amended Accusation and		
22	Amended Petition to Revoke solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the		
23	Veterinary Medical Board, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
24	Veterinary License		
25	2. On or about June 15, 1990, the Veterinary Medical Board issued Veterinarian License		
26	Number VET 10812 to Tejpaul S. Ghumman (Respondent). The Veterinarian License was in full		
27	force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on September		
28	30, 2020, unless renewed.		
		1	

Premises Registration

On or about April 27, 1993, the Veterinary Medical Board issued Premises
 Registration No. HSP 4645 to Respondent. The Premises Registration will expire on May 31, 2020, unless renewed.

Prior Disciplinary Action

4. In a disciplinary action entitled "In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Tejpaul Ghumman," Case No. AV 2013 29, the Veterinary Medical Board issued a Decision and Order effective April 19, 2014, in which Respondent's Veterinarian License and Premises Registration was revoked. However, the revocation was stayed and Respondent and his Premises Registration was placed on probation for four (4) years with certain terms and conditions. A copy of that Decision and Order is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference.

JURISDICTION

- 5. This Third Amended Accusation and Amended Petition to Revoke Probation is brought before the Veterinary Medical Board (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 6. Section 4875 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board of Veterinary Medicine may revoke or suspend the license of any person to practice veterinary medicine, or any branch thereof, in this state for any causes provided in the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, '4800, et seq.). In addition, the Board has the authority to assess a fine not in excess of \$5,000 against a licensee for any of the causes specified in section 4883 of that code. Such fine may be assessed in lieu of, or in addition to, a suspension or revocation.
- 7. Section 4853.6 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board shall withhold, suspend or revoke registration of veterinary premises when the license of the licensee manager to practice veterinary medicine is revoked or suspended.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

8. Section 143.5 [Provisions in agreement to settle certain causes of action prohibited] of the Code states:

	_
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

3

"(a) No licensee who is regulated by a board, bureau, or program within the Department
of Consumer Affairs, nor an entity or person acting as an authorized agent of a licensee, shall
include or permit to be included a provision in an agreement to settle a civil dispute, whether the
agreement is made before or after the commencement of a civil action, that prohibits the other
party in that dispute from contacting, filing a complaint with, or cooperating with the department
board, bureau, or program within the Department of Consumer Affairs that regulates the licensee
or that requires the other party to withdraw a complaint from the department, board, bureau, or
program within the Department of Consumer Affairs that regulates the licensee. A provision of
that nature is void as against public policy, and any licensee who includes or permits to be
included a provision of that nature in a settlement agreement is subject to disciplinary action by
the board, bureau or program.

. . . ,,

9. Section 4883 [Denial, revocation, or suspension of license or registration;Grounds] of the Code states:

"The board may deny, revoke, or suspend a license or assess a fine as provided in Section 4875 for any of the following:

. . .

"(c) Violation or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, any of the provisions of this chapter.

. . .

- "(f) False or misleading advertising.
- "(g) Unprofessional conduct, that includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- "(3) A violation of any federal statute, rule, or regulation or any of the statutes, rules, or regulations of this state regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances.

. . .

- "(i) Fraud, deception, negligence, or incompetence in the practice of veterinary medicine.
- "(j) Aiding or abetting in any acts that are in violation of any of the provisions of this chapter.

"(o) "Violation, or the assisting or abetting violation, of any regulations adopted by the board pursuant to this chapter."

10. Section 4855 [Written records] of the Code states:

"A veterinarian subject to the provisions of this chapter shall, as required by regulation of the board, keep a written record of all animals receiving veterinary services, and provide a summary of that record to the owner of animals receiving veterinary services, when requested. The minimum amount of information which shall be included in written records and summaries shall be established by the board. The minimum duration of time for which a licensed premise shall retain the written record or complete copy of the written record shall be determined by the board."

11. California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 16, section 2032 [Minimum Standards of Practice] states:

"The delivery of veterinary care shall be provided in a competent and humane manner. All aspects of veterinary medicine shall be performed in a manner consistent with current veterinary medical practice in this state."

2. CCR, title 16, section 2032.05 [Humane Treatment] states:

"When treating a patient, a veterinarian shall use appropriate and humane care to minimize pain and distress before, during and after performing any procedure(s)."

- 13. CCR, title 16, section 2032.1 [Veterinarian-Client-Patient Relationship], states:
- "(a) It is unprofessional conduct for a veterinarian to administer, prescribe, dispense or furnish a drug, medicine, appliance, or treatment of whatever nature for the prevention, cure, or relief of a wound, fracture or bodily injury or disease of an animal without having first established a veterinarian-client-patient relationship with the animal patient or patients and the client, except where the patient is a wild animal or the owner is unknown.
 - "(b) A veterinarian-client-patient relationship shall be established by the following:
 - "(1) The client has authorized the veterinarian to assume responsibility for making

(5) Dates (beginning and ending) of custody of the animal, if applicable.

"(7) Daily progress, if relevant, and disposition of the case.

"(c)(1) Radiographs are the property of the veterinary facility that originally ordered them to be prepared. Radiographs shall be released to another veterinarian upon the request of another veterinarian who has the authorization of the client. Radiographs shall be returned to the veterinary facility which originally ordered them to be prepared within a reasonable time upon request. Radiographs originating at an emergency hospital shall become the property of the next attending veterinary facility upon receipt of said radiograph(s). Transfer of radiographs shall be documented in the medical record.

. . .

"(d) Laboratory data is the property of the veterinary facility which originally ordered it to be prepared, and a copy shall be released upon the request of the client.

. . . ''

15. CCR, title 16, section 2032.35 [Altering Medical Records] states:

"Altering or modifying the medical records of any animal, with fraudulent intent, or creating any false medial record, with fraudulent intent, constitutes unprofessional conduct in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 4883(g)."

- 16. CCR, title 16, section 2032.4 [Anesthesia] states:
- "(a) General anesthesia is a condition caused by the administration of a drug or combination of drugs sufficient to produce a state of unconsciousness or dissociation and blocked response to a given pain or alarming stimulus.
- "(b) When administering general anesthesia, a veterinarian shall comply with the following standards:
- "(1) Within twelve (12) hours prior to the administration of a general anesthetic, the animal patient shall be given a physical examination by a licensed veterinarian appropriate for the procedure. The results of the physical examination shall be documented in the animal patient's medical records.

"(2) An animal under general anesthesia shall be observed for a length of time appropriate for its safe recovery.

///

- "(3) Provide respiratory monitoring including, but not limited to, observation of the animal's chest movements, observation of the rebreathing bag or respirometer.
- "(4) Provide cardiac monitoring including, but not limited to, the use of a stethoscope, pulseoximeter or electrocardiographic monitor.
- "(5) When administering general anesthesia in a hospital setting, a veterinarian shall have resuscitation or rebreathing bags of appropriate volumes for the animal patient and an assortment of endotracheal tubes readily available.
- "(6) Records for procedures involving general anesthesia shall include a description of the procedure, the name of the surgeon, the type of sedative and/or anesthetic agents used, their route of administration, and their strength if available in more than one strength.
 - 17. Section 4037 [**Pharmacy**] of the Code states:
- 'Pharmacy' means an area, place, or premises licensed by the board [California State Board of Pharmacy in which the profession of pharmacy is practice and where prescriptions are compounded. "Pharmacy' includes, but is not limited to, any area, place, or premises described in a license issued by the board wherein controlled substances, dangerous drugs, or dangerous devices are stored, possessed, prepared, manufactured, derived, compounded or repackaged, and from which the controlled substances, dangerous drugs, or dangerous devices are furnished, sold or dispensed at retail.

Section 4051 [Unlawful acts; Permitted functions for pharmacists] of the Code 18. states:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, it is unlawful for any person to manufacture, compound, furnish, sell, or dispense a dangerous drug or dangerous device, or to dispense or compound a prescription pursuant to Section 4040 of a prescriber unless he or she is a pharmacist under this chapter.

1	"	
2	19. Section 4110 [License requirements] of the Code states:	
3	"(a) No person shall conduct a pharmacy in the State of California unless he or she has	
4	obtained a license from the board. A license shall be required for each pharmacy owned or	
5	operated by a specific person. A separate license shall be required for each of the premises of an	
6	person operating a pharmacy in more than one location. The license shall be renewed annually.	
7	The board may, by regulation, determine the circumstances under which a license may be	
8	transferred.	
9	"	
10	COST RECOVERY	
11	20. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the	
12	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of	
13	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and	
14	enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being	
15	renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be	
16	included in a stipulated settlement.	
17	STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "LENA"	
18	21. On March 27, 2017, Van V. took her 13-year-old canine "Lena" to Respondent for	
19	complaints of vomiting and diarrhea. Lena had a history of pancreatitis that had previously	
20	responded to intravenous fluids and medications.	
21	22. Two separate records were kept by Respondent for his care of Lena. One was a	
22	handwritten note dated March 27, 2017. This record was incomplete as it:	
23	A. Failed to include the initials or name of the individual who took Lena's history.	
24	B. Failed to document her breed, species, color and whether her weight was in pounds o	
25	kilograms.	
26	C. Failed to document the owner's full name, address and phone number.	
27	D. Failed to document physical examination findings.	

E. Failed to document an assessment and/or diagnosis.

- F. Failed to document a treatment plan and/or intended treatment plan.
- G. Failed to document a disposition of the case.

///

- 23. Respondent also kept an electronic medical record (EMR) on Lena. On the EMR, he documented that on March 27, 2017, Lena had a tender/painful abdomen and was dehydrated. Her weight was recorded as 13.6 pounds. Respondent recommended keeping Lena overnight. He also recommended blood work, a urinalysis and full body radiographs, which the owner declined.
- 24. Treatment included 10 milligrams of Metacam.² However, the oral dose of Metacam administered by Respondent was 8 to 16 times that recommended based on Lena's weight.
- 25. On March 28, 2017, at approximately 1:30 p.m., Respondent called Van V. as Lena was reported to be in critical condition. Without the owner's consent and/or knowledge, Respondent sent out blood work, a urinalysis, completed x-rays and performed an abdominocentesis on Lena. The owner was billed and paid for the unauthorized testing.
- 26. At 1:30 p.m., Respondent administered 4 milligrams of Dexate.³ He failed to document the brand name and/or concentration of the Dexate administered intravenously, a medication contraindicated as Lena had received Metacam without an adequate "washout period" between administration of these drugs.⁴
- 27. Van V. arrived promptly at Respondent's clinic and requested to take Lena to another facility. Respondent prepared Lena for transfer and gave her an unknown amount/concentration of "Heparinized IV." Respondent documented that Lena's condition started to deteriorate rapidly

(continued...)

¹ The EMR software system Respondent used was Avimark (2010.4). This system has a feature in which data entered into a client record is locked with the time and date that the entry is made. However, this "time-stamped" feature was not used by Respondent. Accordingly, the client records could at a later date be altered without detection.

² Metacam is a non-steroidal medication with a recommended dose of 0.1 to 0.2 milligrams per kilogram. It is to be administered once a day.

³ Dexate is the trade name for dexamethasone, a corticosteroid. It has not been manufactured or been available for purchase for several years.

⁴ "Washout period" refers to an amount of time between administering different drugs to ensure that they do not cross-react and cause untoward side-effects.

with a heartbeat of 60 beats per minute. He took Lena into the surgery room to give oxygen by mask and administered an unknown concentration of Epinephrine.⁵ Respondent did not initiate chest compressions or ventilations. Instead, he administered 10 milligrams of Dopram,⁶ a medication not indicated given Lena's condition. At 3:15 p.m., Respondent documented that Lena had agonal breathing. She expired shortly thereafter.

28. On April 11, 2017, Van V. requested Lena's medical records. On April 18, 2017, the owner received an incomplete set of Lena's records. Included was an altered copy of the invoice for medications/treatments given to Lena on March 27, 2017, which included a copying of Van V.'s signature that was not on the original invoice.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence – Medication Administration)

- 29. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), based on:
 - A. Administration of an excessive dose of Metacam given Lena's weight.
- B. Administration of Dexate intravenously without waiting the requisite "washout period," thereby increasing her Lena's risk for gastrointestinal bleeding.
- C. Administration of Dopram, a medication not indicated given Lena's critical condition. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraphs 24, 26 and 27.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence – Failure to Institute Appropriate Resuscitation)

30. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), in that he failed to initiate chest compressions, provide appropriate ventilation, including intubation, and/or failed to administer additional doses of Epinephrine in response to Lena's deteriorating cardiac status. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 27.

⁵ Epinephrine is used in cardiac resuscitation. It comes in a dose of 1:1000 (1 gram in 1000 milliliters) or 1:10000 (1 gram in 10000 milliliters).

⁶ Dopram is prescribed to stimulate breathing during and/or after anesthesia and/or to initiate breathing in newborns.

1			
2	///		
3	///		
4	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
5	(Unprofessional Conduct -Deception in Animal Records)		
6	31. Respondent is subject to discipline for deception pursuant to Code section 4883,		
7	subdivision (i), and CCR, title 16, section 2032.35, in that the handwritten records for Lena were		
8	significantly different from the EMR that was allegedly concurrently maintained and presented to		
9	the Board and to Van V. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in		
10	paragraphs 22 through 28.		
11	FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
12	(Deception-Performing and Billing Owner for Unauthorized Testing)		
13	32. Respondent is subject to discipline for deception pursuant to Code section 4883,		
14	subdivision (i), in that he performed and billed Lena's owner for various tests without the owner		
15	consent and/or knowledge. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in		
16	paragraphs 23 and 25.		
17	FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
18	(Unprofessional Conduct - Record Keeping Violations)		
19	33. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code		
20	section 4883, subdivision (i), and CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, in that the March 27, 2017		
21	handwritten records on Lena failed to include the following:		
22	A. The initials or names of the person(s) who took Lena's presenting history as required		
23	by CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(1).		
24	B. The name, address and phone number of the owner as required by CCR, title 16,		
25	section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(2).		
26	C. The breed, species, and color of Lena as required by CCR, title 16 section 2032.3,		
27	subdivision (a)(4).		
28			

owner completed a Patient/Client Information Sheet and Animal Medical History form that had the trademark of the American Animal Hospital Association (AAHA), the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an AAHA accredited hospital.

- 37. BooBoo presented with lethargy, vomiting, a swollen abdomen, increased urination and incontinence. The records failed to document the owners address or phone number, BooBoo's age, sex, breed, species and/color. Respondent documented that BooBoo's liver was enlarged, a finding confirmed by an x-ray. Blood work showed elevated liver enzymes and an abnormally high Spec cPL, which can be associated with pancreatitis or other diseases.
- 38. On April 23, 2016, BooBoo was seen for blood in his urine. Respondent administered an "injection" of an unknown medication (noted in the billing invoice), but not documented in his record. He sent a urine culture and started BooBoo on an antibiotic.
- 39. On May 6, 2016, BooBoo presented without improvement. Respondent ordered an ACTH stimulation test to rule-out Cushing's disease.⁷ A urine culture showed a small amount of Pseudomonas bacteria.
- 40. On May 10, 2016, BooBoo was seen by Respondent. The ACTH stimulation test result was "equivocal." Respondent nonetheless prescribed Vetoryl.⁸ Respondent did not counsel the owner as to the risks of starting BooBoo on this medication in the absence of a confirmed diagnosis of Cushing's disease. Respondent treated Booboo's urine infection with Ciprofloxacin, when Marbofloxacin, a medication specifically prescribed for canine urinary infections should have been prescribed.⁹ Respondent documented that he consulted with another

 $^{7}\,\mathrm{Cushing}$'s disease is a disease of the adrenal glands that causes overactive steroid production.

⁸ Vetoryl is an adrenocortical suppressant prescribed to treat the symptoms of Cushing's disease. It is indicated when there <u>is a confirmed, not presumptive diagnosis</u>, of Cushing's disease, as it can have life-threatening side effects if prescribed inappropriately.

⁹ Marbofloxacin is the appropriate medication for treatment of canine urinary tract infections. Ciprofloxacin has an extra-label use in dogs and has a known poor and widely variable rate of absorption especially when given orally.

veterinarian Dr. Sterns and a veterinarian who specialized in internal medicine. However, BooBoo's medical records did not contain notes from these consultants.

- 41. On June 11, 2016, Respondent repeated blood testing and an ACTH stimulation test. According to his notes, another veterinarian Dr. Gurushav examined BooBoo. However, BooBoo's records did not contain any notes from this consultant. The ACTH stimulation test result was normal. Blood work indicated an infection, with elevated liver enzymes and abnormal electrolytes.
- 42. On or about June 13, 2016, Irina B. requested that a complete copy of BooBoo's records be sent to Dr. B., her consulting veterinarian. Respondent's clinic instead forwarded only laboratory test results, omitting Respondent's notes. Dr. B. recommended that BooBoo be taken to a 24-hour clinic for immediate evaluation. A veterinarian at a 24-hour clinic examined BooBoo on June 14, 2016, and immediately ordered an abdominal ultrasound. The test revealed a large liver mass. After consultation, the owner elected humane euthanasia for BooBoo.
- 43. BooBoo's owner requested complete records on multiple occasions. On June 13, 2016, Irina B. called Respondent's clinic requesting all of BooBoo's records, and was sent only his laboratory test results. On July 2, 2016, Irina B. sent another request for records by certified mail. On July 16, 2016, an incomplete set of altered/amended records were received. The records received by the Board did not include any consultant notes regarding BooBoo's diagnosis and/or treatment plans.
- 44. On or about August 8, 2016, BooBoo's owners met with Dr. Sterns, who was Respondent's supervising veterinarian while he was on probation. The owners were dissatisfied with the care given to BooBoo. Dr. Sterns presented the owners with a settlement agreement entitled FULL RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS. Under this heading was the warning:

"Read this Document Carefully
When you Sign It, You Give
Up Certain Rights."

The agreement, which was not executed by BooBoo's owners, provided that:

For in consideration of the payment to (owners of BooBoo) of the sum Seven hundred

and forty nine dollars (\$749.00), and other good and valuable consideration, (owners) . . . release, acquit and forever discharge Alta View Animal Hospital, Paul Ghumman, Suji Gurushav, Michael Sterns . . . from any and all past, present and future actions, . . including claims or suits to any licensing body, for contribution and/or indemnity, of whatever nature, and all consequential damage on account of, or in any way growing out of any and all claims resulting from the medical treatment of BooBoo at Alta View Animal Hospital. (Emphasis added.)

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence - Failure to Counsel Owner Regarding Medication)

45. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), in that he failed to counsel Booboo's owner of the risks associated with prescribing and administering Vetoryl without a confirmed diagnosis of Cushing's disease. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 40.

NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence - Failure to Treat Urinary Infection with Appropriate Medication)

46. Respondent is subject to discipline for incompetence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), in that he treated BooBoo's urinary infection with Ciprofloxacin instead of Marbolfloxacin, an antibiotic with known absorption properties and safety margin for treatment of canine urinary infections. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 40.

TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Record-Keeping Violations)

- 47. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (i), and CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, in that the records failed to include:
- A. The name, address and phone number of the client as required by CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(2).
- B. The sex, breed species or color of BooBoo as required by CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(4).

FOURTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Seeking Prohibited Settlement)

51. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (c) and 143.5, in that he permitted his name to be used and/or authorized another veterinarian in his practice to enter into a prohibited settlement with BooBoo's owners, reducing veterinary costs owed in exchange for not filing a complaint with the Board. This facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 44.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "GRACE"

- 52. On July 14, 2016, Margarita G., took her 9-year-old Irish Setter "Grace" to Respondent's clinic for bilateral ear surgery. The surgery was performed by Dr. Suji Gurushav. During surgery, Grace's oxygen saturation and blood pressures dropped quickly. She went into cardiac arrest and was unable to be resuscitated.
- 53. Margarita G. spoke to a veterinarian after the surgery, who admitted that Grace's death was due to his negligence. Margarita G. was told by the male veterinarian that he would "take care of the death expenses."
- 54. A few days after Grace's death, Margarita G. called Respondent's clinic to inquire about a refund. She was told that she needed to come to the clinic and sign a document in order to get a refund for Grace's surgery. Margarita G. recalled signing a document similar to that given to BooBoo's owners. In exchange for a refund she recalled that she "promised not to talk badly about them (Respondent's clinic)."
- 55. The Full Release of All Claims document referenced above in paragraph 44 has Margarita G.'s name in the fourth paragraph and provides in relevant part:

"Should Margarita G. fail to adhere to this agreement, *Alta View Animal Hospital* would be entitled to reasonable damages arising therefrom and a complete refund of the settlement amount stated in paragraph one. Further, it is understood and agreed that this non-disparagement provision if a material term of this Agreement." (Emphasis in original.)

FIFTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Seeking Prohibited Settlement)

56. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (c) and 143.5, in that he permitted his name to be used and/or authorized another veterinarian in his practice to enter into a prohibited settlement with Grace's owner, reducing and/or rebating veterinary costs owed in exchange for her not filing a complaint with the Board.

///

///

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "SABRINA"

- 57. On September 26, 2012, Beata S. took her 6-year-old feline "Sabrina" to Respondent for complaints of straining on urination, drinking excessively and weight loss. The owner completed a Patient/Client Information Sheet and Animal Medical History form that had the trademark of the AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.
- 58. Two separate sets of records were kept by Respondent. One consisted of handwritten notes for visits on September 26, 2012 and October 10, 2012. These records were incomplete as they:
 - A. Failed to include the initials or name of the person who recorded Sabrina's history.
 - B. Failed to document any physical examination(s).
 - C. Failed to include a treatment plan or intended treatment plan.
 - D. Failed to include any tentative diagnosis.
- 59. Respondent also kept an EMR on Sabrina that was subsequently turned over to the Board. For the visit on September 26, 2012, Respondent documented a presumptive diagnosis of urinary tract infection and ordered a urinalysis and blood work. Testing did not include a urine culture and/or recommendation that a urine culture be done to confirm the diagnosis. Respondent treated Sabrina with 20 milligrams of a subcutaneous injection of Baytril. Based on Sabrina's weight of 6.06 pounds she should have received no more than 13.7 milligrams of Baytril.

¹⁰ Baytril is an antibiotic indicated only for a confirmed urinary tract infection in felines. The recommended dose is 5 milligrams per kilogram. A dose greater than 5 milligrams per kilogram can cause blindness.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "KATY"

- 67. On September 26, 2012, Beata S. completed a Patient/Client Information Sheet and Animal Medical History form as the owner of "Katy" a 4 to 5-year old feline. These forms had the trademark of the AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.
- 68. On April 5, 2013, Katy presented to Respondent with complaints of loss of appetite, decreased activity and hair loss. Two separate sets of records were kept by Respondent. One consisted of a handwritten note for the visit on April 5, 2013. The record was incomplete as it:
 - A. Failed to include the initials or name of the individual who took the history.
 - B. Erroneously referred to Katy as being a male and as being 2 years of age.
 - C. Failed to document a physical examination.
 - D. Failed to include a treatment plan or intended treatment plan.
 - E. Failed to include any diagnosis.
- 69. Respondent also kept an EMR on Katy that was subsequently turned over to the Board. For the visit on April 5, 2013, Respondent documented a limited physical examination and noted her weight as 9 pounds. He diagnosed her with miliary dermatitis. Respondent treated Katy with 30 mg of Baytril, an antibiotic not indicated for dermatitis. The recommended dose of Baytril in felines is no more than 5 milligrams per kilogram, with Respondent's dose equivalent to 7.33 milligrams per kilogram. The following day, Respondent again administered 30 milligrams of Baytril to Katy.

TWENTY-SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence – Medication Administration)

70. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence and/or incompetence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), based on prescribing excessive doses of Baytril to Katy and given that this medication was not indicated for a diagnosis of miliary dermatitis. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 69.

¹¹ Miliary dermatitis is a term used to describe a skin condition in felines that commonly results from an allergic reaction.

subdivision (i), in that he represented that he was a member of the AAHA and that his facility was an AAHA accredited hospital, when such representations were false and misleading. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 67.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "MABEL"

- 74. On July 10, 2017, owner Courtney B. took her 11-week-old canine Mabel to Respondent's clinic to be spayed. The owner briefly met with Respondent and left Mabel at the clinic for the spay procedure. At no time did Respondent inform Courtney B. that another veterinarian Dr. Sterns would be performing the spay procedure.
- 75. Two separate sets of records were provided for review. EMR records were received from the owner (Copy A) and separate (different) EMR records for Mabel were received from the Respondent (Copy B). ¹² Copy A of the EMR documented that Mabel's initial visit was on July 10, 2017. The EMR failed to include:
 - A. Documentation of any pertinent information or history documented.
 - B. Documentation of a physical examination.
- C. Referenced an "injection" without information regarding what medication was given, its dose or route of administration.
- D. Referenced giving vaccinations to Mabel without documentation of the route and location of administration.
- E. Referenced dispensing of Heartguard (sic) without information regarding the strength, dosage, route of administration, and/or frequency of use of this medication.
- F. Referenced "Prescriptions" without information of what medications were given, amount, dosage, route of administration, frequency of administration.
 - G. Results from a fecal test and pre-surgical blood test.
- 76. There was no reference in Copy A of the EMR that Mabel was picked up on July 11, 2017. An invoice for July 11, 2017, had in the upper right corner the logo of the AAHA, the

¹² Copy A, the EMR from the owner was printed on July 22, 2017. Copy B, the EMR presented to the Board, was printed on September 6, 2017.

accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.

77. An entry dated July 13, 2017, on Copy A noted that the owner was contacted with no information as to what was discussed. On July 21, 2017, Mabel returned to Respondent's clinic for a post-operative visit. A "DHP-PV (2nd)" vaccination was given. There was no documentation of a history/pertinent information, physical examination, treatment plan or assessment of Mabel on this date.

///

- 78. Copy B of the EMR records, submitted to the Board were significantly different than the EMR records provided to the owner.
- 79. On July 11, 2017, Respondent treated Mabel for coccidia. ¹³ He prescribed "Albon Liquid plus Metronidazole (30 mg/ml) 15 ml" with instructions to the owner to give "ONE ml daily by mouth." ¹⁴ This mixture is a compounded drug that is not commercially available. There was no documentation of the amount and/or concentration of the Albon and/or of the amount or concentration of the Metronidazole in this compounded mixture. There was no documentation to support administration of Metronidazole as Mabel's fecal test result indicated coccidia, not giardia.

TWENTY-SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence - Medication Error)

- 80. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence and/or incompetence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), based on the following:
- A. On or about July 11, 2017, Respondent prescribed an unknown dose of Metronidazole without indication and prescribed this unknown dose to be given once a day, when standard dosing regimens for this medication is that it be given every 8 to 12 hours.

¹³ Coccidia is a common intestinal parasite in young canines.

¹⁴ Albon is an antibiotic used to treat coccidia and is given every 24 hours. Metronidazole is an antibiotic used to treat giardia, a parasite. It is to be administered every 8-12 hours. There was no documentation that Mabel had giardia.

B. On or about July 11, 2017, Respondent prescribed an unknown dose of Albon. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 79.

TWENTY-SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Compounding and Dispensing a Medication without a Pharmacist License)

81. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (g) and 4051, in that on or about July 11, 2017, he compounded and dispensed a liquid solution of Albon and Metronidazole to Mabel's owner without being a licensed pharmacist. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 79.

TWENTY-EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Acting as a Pharmacy)

82. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (g) and 4110 in that on or about July 11, 2017, he acted as a pharmacy by compounding/dispensing a solution of Albon and Metronidazole, without licensure as a pharmacy. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 79.

TWENTY-NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Deception- Animal Records)

83. Respondent is subject to discipline for deception pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i) and CCR, title 16, section 2032.35, in that there were significant discrepancies in the records provided to the owner (Copy A) and the records submitted to the Board (Copy B). The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraphs 76 through 78.

THIRTIETH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct - Record-Keeping Violations)

84. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (i), 4855, and CCR, title 16, section 2032.3 in that Copy A of Mabel's records failed to include the following:

are the Statement of Facts regarding violations in the standard of care and deficiencies found in these records.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "JOONEY"

87. On September 25, 2014, Previn B. took her 6-month old canine Jooney to Respondent's clinic to be spayed and completed a Patient/Client Information Sheet and Animal Medical History form. These forms had the trademark of the AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.

///

- 88. On April 6, 2015, Jooney presented for examination of her back paws. The hand written record has a history, but no initials/name of the person responsible for the entry. The EMR reference is unclear as it noted that her "pelvic digits are mild inflamed (sic) at nail bed." Jooney was sent home on oral antibiotics and the owner was instructed to apply Neosporin, without any specific instructions as to its application.
- 89. On May 12, 2015, Jooney was given a Bordetella vaccine. Respondent failed to document a history, physical examination, intended treatment plan or assessment on either the handwritten record or the EMR.
- 90. On April 19, 2016, Jooney presented for vaccinations. There is a limited physical examination documented on the handwritten medical record, but no history, intended treatment plan or assessment documented.
- 91. On October 25, 2016, Jooney presented for vaccinations. Respondent failed to document a history, physical examination, intended treatment plan or assessment on either the handwritten record or the EMR. The handwritten record references "deworming done" with no initials/name of the person making this notation. There also is no reference to the drug, dose or route of administration of the de-worming medication.

THIRTY-SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Record-Keeping Violations)

92. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code

failed to document a history, physical examination, or assessment of Buddy. The EMR documentation recorded a limited physical examination. Laboratory testing was done and revealed that Buddy had a high level of protein in his urine.

- 96. On July 2, 2015, Buddy was seen for an examination. He was still drinking and urinating more than usual and his owner complained that he had decreased energy. A urine protein test was done. However, a complete urinalysis was not done and/or recommended and no blood work was done. Respondent prescribed Rimadyl, an anti-inflammatory medication that can impact kidney and liver functions. There was no documentation that Respondent provided the owner with information regarding the adverse effects of this medication.
- 97. On July 25, 2015, Buddy presented for a follow-up appointment. There was no reference to recommended laboratory testing given Buddy's prior symptoms and/or extended use of the Rimadyl which he re-filled for another month.
- 98. On April 23, 2016, Buddy presented for a right eye infection and cyst on his left forearm. A limited physical examination was documented. Blood testing showed that he had an abnormally high PrecisionPSL that correlates with a diagnosis of pancreatitis in canines. In the EMR records, Respondent documented that the owner was contacted on April 24, 2016, but there are no details of the reason for this contact.
- 99. On May 5, 2016, Buddy presented for removal of the cyst and a dental cleaning. He was given the anti-inflammatory Metacam after the procedure and placed on a course of antibiotic therapy. Four days later, Buddy presented with excessive vomiting. A physical examination was documented on the handwritten record with no initials/name of the examiner. For the first time there was reference to a potential diagnosis of pancreatitis, with the examiner recommending that previously prescribed antibiotics be discontinued.

THIRTY-FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence)

100. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), based on the following:

an AAHA accredited hospital, when such representations were false and misleading. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 99.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "OSCAR"

- 103. On March 17, 2015, Amay S. took her 9-week old canine Oscar to Respondent. She completed a Patient/Client Information Sheet and Animal Medical History form as the owner of Oscar. These forms had the trademark of the AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.
- 104. Two separate sets of records were kept by Respondent. On March 20, 2015, Oscar presented with complaints of constipation, not drinking and not eating. Respondent performed a limited physical examination. Oscar stayed overnight at Respondent's facility. The next day, March 21, 2015, Respondent failed to document a physical examination. Reference was made to administering fluids and medications at an unknown time.
- 105. On May 19, 2015, Oscar presented with a history of coughing for 2 days. A limited examination was documented. Respondent diagnosed "mild tracheobronchitis" for which he administered 2 milligrams of Vetalog, a long acting steroid not indicated for young animals and/or not prescribed for a mild cough.
- 106. On May 21, 2015, there is a notation in the EMR that Oscar's "cough is getting worse." There was no reference to a follow-up examination and/or additional testing.
- 107. On August 15, 2015, Oscar presented for "stool problems." The handwritten record has two different handwritten notes, without reference to the initials and/or names of the person making the entries. There is a limited physical examination and no assessment of Oscar's condition.
- 108. On October 14, 2015, Oscar presented with chronic diarrhea. There is no documentation of an abdominal and/or rectal examination. The handwritten record fails to identify the persons making entries on the record.
 - 109. On August 2, 2016, Respondent prescribed 200 milligrams of the antibiotic

¹⁵ Cefpodoxime is an antibiotic that is to be given only once a day.

and the EMR. There were no initials and/or name of the person(s) making the entries on the handwritten notes and many of the entries are crossed out multiple times, instead of a single strike through line. The handwritten notes make reference to Maggie having an "ear infection" without any supporting documentation for this diagnosis. On the handwritten medical record, Maggie was prescribed "#40 ml Clavamox liquid" without any indication of the concentration of the medication. ¹⁶

117. The following day, February 16, 2016, Respondent prescribed "Amoxi-Clavulanate¹⁷ plus Metacam 40 ml." This is a compounded medication not commercially available. There was no description of the concentration of the Metacam added to this mixture. Respondent was not a licensed pharmacist and his clinic was not a licensed pharmacy. Respondent wrote that 2 milliliters were to be given twice a day. However, Metacam is a medication that should be administered only once a day. Respondent also prescribed Temaril-P¹⁸, which is outside of routine veterinary practice due to an increased risk of gastrointestinal ulceration given the concomitant administration of Metacam.

118. On April 15, 2016, Maggie presented for an ear infection. Respondent flushed her ears with an unknown solution.

119. On July 30, 2016, Respondent dispensed a prescription for Temaril-P 5 milligrams without having documented a physical examination.

FORTY-FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence – Medication Administration)

120. Respondent is subject to discipline for negligence pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (i), based on the following:

A. On or about February 16, 2016, Respondent incorrectly prescribed the dosing frequency for Metacam.

¹⁶ Clavamox is a broad-spectrum antibiotic.

¹⁷ "Amoxi" is in reference to Amoxicillin, a broad-spectrum antibiotic.

¹⁸ Temaril is a combination of an antihistamine and corticosteroid prescribed for the treatment of itching and/or kennel cough.

FORTY-FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Acting as a Pharmacy)

123. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (g) and 4110 in that on February 16, 2015, in that he compounded and dispensed Amoxi-Clavulanate plus Metacam, without his clinic being a licensed pharmacy. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 117.

FORTY-FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(False and Misleading Advertising and/or Deception)

124. Respondent is subject to discipline for false and misleading advertising pursuant to Code section 4883, subdivision (f), and/or for deception pursuant to section 4883, subdivision (i), in that he represented that he was a member of the AAHA and that his facility was an AAHA accredited hospital, when such representations were false and misleading. The facts in support of this cause for discipline are set forth above in paragraph 115.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING "CHATO"

- 125. In November 2009, Nancy R. completed a Patient/Client Information sheet for her 4-year old canine "Chato." The form had the logo "AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals in the United States. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.
- 126. On February 21, 2010, Chato presented for "check jaw +/- teeth." The record of this visit is very limited and illegible. It appears that Respondent sedated Chato with pre-induction anesthesia, but there is no reference to the actual drugs administered and/or reasons for the anesthesia. Chato was sent home on an illegible dose of the antibiotic Cephalexin. There are no initials or name of the person(s) making entries in the record.
- 127. On April 16, 2016, Chato was seen for a checkup and vaccinations. There is a very limited history and other than the notation BAR, not physical examination, assessment and/or treatment plan was documented. There are no initials or name of the person(s) making entries in the record. Several of the vaccination boxes are crossed out in a manner that makes it difficult to discern if a vaccination was given or omitted. No follow up care was documented.

14-week-old canine "Grover." The form had the logo AAHA, the accrediting body for companion animal hospitals in the United States. Respondent was not then a member of the AAHA and his facility was not then an accredited AAHA hospital.

- 131. On January 28, 2016, Grover presented for a check of his right eye. A very limited examination was recorded with the diagnosis of conjunctivitis. The billing invoice for this visit referenced that Grover had "scleral hematoma," a different diagnosis. There were no initials or names of the person(s) who made entries into the record.
- 132. On February 6, 2016, Grover presented for vaccinations. The box "deworm" was checked without reference to the deworming drug type or dosage that was prescribed. There are no initials or names of the person(s) who made entries into the record.
- 133. On March 5, 2016, Grover presented for another vaccination. No physical examination was documented. There was a prescription written for "OFA Vitamin" without further clarification. There are no initials or names of the person(s) who made entries into the record.
- 134. On April 29, 2016, Grover presented for "red eyes" and diagnosed as having conjunctivitis. The record is illegible regarding what medication(s) were prescribed.
- 135. On May 18, 2016, Grover presented with a history of coughing and sneezing. There is a very limited physical examination. Grover was diagnosed with an upper respiratory infection and bronchitis. He was administered the steroid Vetalog and the antibiotic Baytril, which were not indicated for treatment of bronchitis in young canines. On May 31, 2016, Grover presented for a re-check of his cough. No physical examination was documented and there were no initials or names of the person(s) who made entries into the record.
- 136. On September 10, 2016, Grover presented for a right eye check. This was the third time that he was diagnosed with conjunctivitis. He was again prescribed the steroid Vetalog. There was no referral to a board-certified veterinary ophthalmologist and/or further testing to evaluate his recurrence of conjunctivitis.
- 137. On October 22, 2016, Grover presented for being "sick and throwing up this am." The owner reported finding a "piece of rope on the carpet." It was documented that Grover's

abdomen was tender. He was diagnosed with enteritis, although there was no indication he had an infection. Respondent treated Grover with the antibiotic Baytril, which are not recommended for young canines. The owner was charged for an x-ray however, there were no records to demonstrated that an abdominal x-ray had been performed to rule out a foreign body in the abdomen.

138. On December 19, 2016, Grover presented for an evaluation of a wart on the left side of his mouth. He was placed under anesthesia for removal of the growth diagnosed as a papilloma. No physical examination was documented prior to Grover undergoing anesthesia. The anesthetic drugs were not recorded in milliliters or milligrams, there was no documentation regarding how the procedure was performed and/or the name of the surgeon who performed the procedure. Two different antibiotics were given for the surgery, PPG and Baytril. Pain medications were not administered. The surgical record ends with the notation "Rx?" The pathology report confirmed that lesion was a viral papilloma, with no reference as to whether the owner was notified with the results.

139. On January 13, 2017, Grover presented for "recheck, mouth, breath." The owner reported that his breath was starting to smell again and that the antibiotics previously prescribed had helped the smell to go away. No physical examination was documented and there were no initials or names of the person(s) who made entries into the record. There was no documentation that Grover had been previously prescribed antibiotics for his breath.

FORTY-EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct – Record-Keeping Violations)

- 140. Respondent is subject to discipline for unprofessional conduct pursuant to Code sections 4883, subdivision (i), and CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, in that the records for Grover failed to include the following:
- A. The initials or name of the individual who made the entries in the handwritten record for Grover, as required by CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(1).
- B. Documentation of a complete physical examination/assessment on January 28, 2016, March 5, 2016, May 18, 2016, as required by CCR, title 16, section 2032.3, subdivision (a)(7).

	l l
1	Premises Registration No. HSP 4645, issued to Alta View Animal Hospital and Tejpaul S.
2	Ghumman;
3	3. Assessing a fine against Tejpaul S. Ghumman, not in excess of \$5,000 for any of the
4	causes specified in Business and Professions Code section 4883;
5	4. Ordering Tejpaul S. Ghumman to pay the Veterinary Medical Board the reasonable
6	costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions
7	Code section 125.3; and
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.
13	DATED: October 23, 2019 Jessica Sieferman
14	Executive Officer Veterinary Medical Board
15	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
16	Complainant
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
2627	
28	
۷۵	47

Exhibit A

Decision and Order

Veterinary Medical Board Case No. AV 2013 29