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

\* \* \* \* \*

In the Matter of Charges and	) Case No. 12-27376-1
Complaint Against	; FILED
ABHINAV SINHA, M.D.,	) NOV - 5 2012
Respondent	NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS  By:

### **COMPLAINT**

The Investigative Committee (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board), composed at the time of filing of Benjamin J. Rodriguez, M.D., Chairman, Beverly A. Neyland, M.D., Member, and Donna A. Ruthe, Member, by and through Erin L. Albright, Esq., Deputy General Counsel and Attorney for the IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that Abhinav Sinha, M.D. (Respondent), violated the provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 (Medical Practice Act), hereby issues its formal Complaint, stating the IC's charges and allegations as follows:

- 1. Respondent is currently licensed in active status (License No. 10745), and has been so licensed by the Board since December 10, 2003, pursuant to the provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
- 2. Patient A was a forty-six (46)-year-old male suffering from chronic back pain and muscle spasms at the time of the incidents in question. His true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect his identity, but his identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.
- 3. On March 4, 2009, Patient A was treated by Respondent. Patient A denied any change in the character or severity of his pain since his last visit and stated that he was functional

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 his medication. Respondent did not conduct a thorough medical examination for diagnostic purposes. He ordered Patient A's dosage of MS Contin, a schedule II medication, doubled and failed to document a basis for the increased dosage.

- 4. On May 1, 2009, Patient A was treated by Respondent. Patient A denied any change in the character or severity of the pain since his last visit and stated that he was functional with his medication. Respondent did not conduct a thorough medical examination for diagnostic purposes. He ordered Patient A's dosage of MS Contin, a schedule II medication, doubled and failed to document a basis for the increased dosage.
- 5. On December 2, 2009, Patient A was treated by Respondent. Patient A denied any change in the character or severity of the pain since his last visit and stated that he was functional Respondent did not conduct a thorough medical examination for diagnostic with his medication. purposes. He ordered Patient A's dosage of MS Contin, a schedule II medication, increased and failed to document a basis for the increased dosage.
- 6. Patient B was a thirty-two (32)-year-old, morbidly obese female suffering from chronic pain at the time of the incidents in question. Her true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect her identity, but her identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.
- 7. On March 13, 2009, Respondent increased Patient B's prescribed dosage of MS Contin, a schedule II medication. Respondent failed to document a basis for the increased dosage.
- 8. Patient C was a forty (40)-year-old, disabled, morbidly obese female suffering from chronic pain at the time of the incidents in question. Her true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect her identity, but her identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.
- 9. On June 24, 2010, Patient C presented to Respondent with complaints of a cough and lower back pain. Respondent prescribed a narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant and monthly refills for two schedule II medications, Hydrocodone and Oxycodone, to Patient C.
- 10. Respondent did not conduct a thorough medical examination to determine the etiology of Patient C's cough.

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

- 11. Respondent failed prescribe Patient  $\mathbf{C}$ to non-narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant prior to prescribing the narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant.
- 12. Respondent failed to document a basis for providing Patient C with more than a thirty (30)-day supply of both Hydrocodone and Oxycodone.
- 13. Every month, Patient C refilled her prescription before the end of her thirty (30) day prescription; thereby, allowing her to receive an extra thirty (30)-day supply of Hydrocodone and Oxycodone within a twelve (12)-month time frame.
- 14. Patient D was a twenty-three (23)-year-old, morbidly obese female suffering from chronic pain at the time of the incidents in question. Her true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect her identity, but her identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.
- 15. On July 14, 2010, Patient D presented to Respondent with complaints of a cough and lower back pain. Respondent prescribed Patient D a narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant and monthly refills for two schedule II medications, Hydrocodone and Oxycodone.
- 16. Respondent did not conduct a thorough medical examination to determine the etiology of Patient D's cough.
- 17. Respondent failed to prescribe Patient non-narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant prior to prescribing the narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant.
- 18. Respondent failed to document a basis for providing Patient D with more than a thirty (30)-day supply of both Hydrocodone and Oxycodone.
- 19. Every month, Patient D would refill her prescription before the end of her thirty (30) day prescription; thereby, allowing her to receive an extra thirty (30)-day supply of Hydrocodone and Oxycodone within a twelve (12)-month time frame.
- 20. Patient E was a thirty-seven (37)-year-old, morbidly obese female suffering from chronic pain at the time of the incident in question. Her true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect her identity, but her identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.

Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners	1105 Terminal Way #301 Reno, Nevada 89502	(775) 688-2559
---	--	----------------

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

21.	On November	r 17, 2010, Pat	tient I	E present	ed to	Res	pond	lent v	vith	com	plaints	0
numbness and	d tingling in h	er right hand.	The	progress	note	for	this	visit	did	not	include	e 6
neurological e	exam.											

- 22. Respondent prescribed Patient E monthly refills for two schedule II medications. Hydrocodone and Oxycodone. Respondent failed to document a basis for providing Patient E with more than a thirty (30)-day supply of both Hydrocodone and Oxycodone.
- Every month, Patient E would refill her prescription before the end of her thirty (30) day prescription; thereby, allowing her to receive an extra thirty (30)-day supply of Hydrocodone and Oxycodone within a twelve (12)-month time frame.
- Patient F was a forty-eight (48)-year-old, morbidly obese male suffering from 24. chronic pain at the time of the incidents in question. His true identity is not disclosed in this Complaint to protect his identity, but his identity is disclosed in the Patient Designation served contemporaneously on Respondent with a copy of this Complaint.
- 25. On March 9, 2010, Patient F presented to Respondent with complaints of lower back pain with radiation down his legs coupled with tingling and numbness. The progress note for this visit did not include a neurological exam.

### **COUNT I**

### (Medical Records Violation -- Nine Counts)

- 26. All of the allegations in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
- 27. NRS 630.3062(1) provides that the failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient is grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.
- 28. Respondent failed to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of Patients A and B when he failed to document the basis for increasing each patient's dosage of MS Contin.

///

///

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

///

- 29. Respondent failed to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of Patients C and D when he failed to document the etiology of each patient's cough.
- 30. Respondent failed to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records for Patients C, D and E when he failed to document the basis for prescribing Patients C, D and E monthly refills of Hydrocodone and Oxycodone.
- 31. Respondent failed to maintain timely, legible, accurate and complete medical records for Patients E and F when he failed to document the performance of a neurological exam on each patient after each patient presented with neurologic conditions.
- 32. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.

### **COUNT II**

### (Malpractice – Five Counts)

- 33. All of the allegations in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein.
- 34. NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a physician is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a licensee.
- 35. Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 630.040 defines malpractice as the failure of a physician, in treating a patient, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances.
- 36. Respondent failed, in treating Patients A and B, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances, when he increased each patient's dose of MS Contin without a documented basis for the increase.
- 37. Respondent failed, in treating Patients C and D, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances, when he failed to conduct a thorough medical examination to determine the etiology of each patient's cough, prescribed each patient a narcotic cough expectorant/suppressant without first prescribing a non-narcotic cough

- 38. Respondent failed, in treating Patient E, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances, when he prescribed the patient more than a thirty (30)-day supply of Hydrocodone and Oxycodone without documenting the basis for the prescription and when he failed to document the performance of a neurologic exam on the patient after the patient presented with a neurological condition.
- 39. Respondent failed, in treating Patient F, to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances, when he failed to document the performance of a neurological exam on the patient after the patient presented with a neurologic condition.
- 40. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.

### WHEREFORE, the Investigative Committee prays:

- 1. That the Board give Respondent notice of the charges herein against him and give him notice that he may file an answer to the Complaint herein as set forth in NRS 630.339(2) within twenty (20) days of service of the Complaint;
- 2. That the Board set a time and place for a formal hearing after holding an Early Case Conference pursuant to NRS 630.339(3);
- 3. That the Board determine the sanctions it will impose if it finds Respondent violated the Medical Practice Act;
- 4. That the Board make, issue and serve on Respondent, in writing, its findings of fact, conclusions of law and order, which shall include the sanctions imposed; and

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 | ///

///

26 | ///

27 | ///

28 | ///

5. That the Board take such other and further action as may be just and proper in these premises.

DATED this 6 day of November, 2012.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By:

Erin L. Albright, Esq Deputy General Counsel Attorney for the Investigative Committee

## OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

### VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEVADA	)
COUNTY OF CLARK	: ss.

Benjamin J. Rodriguez, 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 that based upon information discovered during the course of the investigation into a complaint against Respondent, that he believes the allegations and charges in the foregoing Complaint against Respondent are true, accurate and correct.

Dated this 5th day of November, 2012.

Benjamin J. Rodriguez, M.D.

# OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

### 

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that I am employed by Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and that on 6<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012; I served a filed copy of the Complaint, Patient Designation & Fingerprint Information via USPS e-certified mail return receipt to the following:

Abhinav Sinha, M.D. 2031 McDaniel St., #120 Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dated this 6<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

Angelia L. Donohoe Legal Assistant