BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * *

3

1

2

4

5 In the Matter of Charges and

6 Complaint Against:

SHERMAN WASHINGTON, M.D.,

Respondent.

Case No. 21-41427-1

FILED

AUG 3 0 2021

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS By:

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

7

8

COMPLAINT

The Investigative Committee¹ (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board), by and through Aaron Bart Fricke, J.D., General Counsel and attorney for the IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that Sherman Washington, M.D., (Respondent) violated the provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 630 (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), hereby issues its Complaint, stating the IC's charges and allegations as follows:

1. Respondent was at all times relevant to this Complaint a medical doctor holding an active license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada (License No. 15168). Respondent was originally licensed by the Board on February 7, 2014.

I. STATEMENT OF LAW

- A. "Medical Directors," Medical Assistants, and the Unlicensed Practice of Medicine
- 2. NRS 630.305(1)(e) provides that aiding, assisting, employing or advising, directly or indirectly, any unlicensed person to engage in the practice of medicine, contrary to the provisions of NRS Chapter 630 or the regulations of the Board, is grounds for disciplinary action or denying licensure.

²⁷

¹ The Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, at the time this formal Complaint was authorized for filing, was composed of Board Members Victor M. Muro, M.D., Chair, Weldon Havins, M.D., J.D., and Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel.

Pursuant to NRS 630.020(1)-(4), the "Practice of medicine" means:

3.

delegating practitioner knows that the medical assistant possesses the knowledge, skill and training to perform the task safely and properly; (b) the medical assistant is not required to be certified or licensed to perform that task; and (c) the medical assistant is employed by the delegating practitioner or the medical assistant and the delegating practitioner are employed by the same employer.

- 10. Pursuant to NAC 630.830(4), a delegating practitioner shall not delegate or otherwise allow a medical assistant to administer an anesthetic agent which renders a patient unconscious or semiconscious.
- 11. Pursuant to NAC 630.820, a delegating practitioner may not remotely supervise a medical assistant, except in a specific case of emergency in a rural area.²
- 12. Except as otherwise provided in NAC 630.820, pursuant to NAC 630.810, if a medical assistant is delegated a task which involves an "invasive procedure," ³ the delegating practitioner must be immediately available to exercise oversight in-person while the medical assistant performs the task.
- 13. The term "medical director" is not recognized or defined under the Medical Practice Act, and no law authorizes a licensee of the Board to, by calling himself or herself a "medical director," violate or circumvent the aforementioned statutes and regulations of the Medical Practice Act.
- 14. Accordingly, pursuant to NRS 630.400(1)(d), 630.305(1)(e), and 630.0129, and NAC 630.800-830:
- a. A practitioner who, whether by serving as a so-called "medical director" or by some other relationship or circumstance, aids, assists, employs or advises, directly or indirectly, any unlicensed person to engage in the practice of medicine, may lawfully do so only by delegating tasks

² Remote supervision of a medical assistant is prohibited unless: (a) the patient is located in a rural area; (b) the delegating practitioner is physically located a significant distance from the location where the task is to be performed; (c) the delegating practitioner determines that the exigent needs of the patient require immediate attention; (d) the patient and the delegating practitioner previously established a practitioner-patient relationship; and (e) the delegating practitioner is immediately available by telephone or other means of instant communication during the performance of the task by the medical assistant. As used in NAC 630.820, "rural area" means any area in this State other than Carson City or the City of Elko, Henderson, Reno, Sparks, Las Vegas or North Las Vegas.

³ The Medical Practice Act does not define "invasive procedure," however, NAC 449.9733 pertaining to Medical Facilities defines "invasive procedure" as "a medical procedure involving entry into the human body by puncture or incision or by insertion of an instrument."

to an adequately supervised and properly trained medical assistant, who the delegating practitioner knows possesses the knowledge, skill and training to perform the task safely and properly, and the delegating practitioner is professionally responsible for the safety and performance of each task which is delegated to that medical assistant.

- b. A practitioner who, whether by serving as a so-called "medical director" or by some other relationship or circumstance, aids, assists, employs or advises, directly or indirectly, any unlicensed person to engage in the practice of medicine, but who has not done so by delegating specific tasks to an adequately supervised and properly trained medical assistant, has violated NRS 630.305(1)(e), and is subject to discipline for aiding and abetting the unlicensed practice of medicine. In addition, the unlicensed person engaged in the practice of medicine has violated NRS 630.400(1)(d), by practicing medicine without a license.
- c. A practitioner who delegates a medical task to a medical assistant, whether by serving as a so-called "medical director" or by some other relationship or circumstance, remains professionally responsible for, among other requirements, ensuring the following:
 - i. The safety and performance of each task delegated;
- ii. The proper employment relationships between themselves and the medical assistant or their common employer;
- iii. The medical assistant is sufficiently knowledgeable, trained and skilled to perform the tasks delegated to them;
- iv. The medical assistant is adequately supervised, and the practitioner must be nearby to supervise the specific medical tasks delegated, and, if it is an invasive medical task, then the delegating practitioner must be immediately available to exercise oversight in-person while the medical assistant performs the task; and
- v. The medical assistant does not administer an anesthetic agent which renders a patient unconscious or semiconscious.
- d. A practitioner who delegates a medical task to a medical assistant, whether by serving as a so-called "medical director" or by some other relationship or circumstance, and who violates the aforementioned provisions of the NRS or NAC pertaining to medical assistants, and

who fails to adequately supervise that medical assistant as required under the circumstances, has violated NRS 630.306(1)(r), and is subject to discipline for failing to adequately supervise a medical assistant.

B. Cosmetologists, "Medical Spas" and "Medical Aestheticians," and the Unlicensed Practice of Medicine

- 15. Pursuant to NRS 644A.030 a licensed "cosmetologist" is not authorized by such license to practice medicine in any way. Rather, a licensed cosmetologist is authorized to perform only non-medical, cosmetology services, such as cleansing, stimulating or massaging the scalp or cleansing or beautifying the hair by the use of cosmetic preparations, antiseptics, tonics, lotions or creams, cutting, trimming or shaping the hair, removing hair by the use of depilatories, waxing, tweezing or sugaring, except for the permanent removal of hair with needles, manicuring nails, massaging the skin, giving facials, and other miscellaneous non-medical, cosmetological services.
- 16. Pursuant to NAC 644A.790 a cosmetologist is further explicitly prohibited from performing "invasive procedures," which mean, for the purposes of professional licensing of cosmetologists, "an act that affects the structure or function of the skin other than the uppermost layers of the skin," and which, for the sake of regulating the practice of cosmetologists, includes, without limitation, (a) the application of electricity for the sole purpose of contracting a muscle, (b) the application of a topical lotion, cream or other substance which affects anything other than the uppermost layers of the skin, (c) the penetration of the skin by needles, and (d) the abrasion of the skin below the uppermost layers of the skin.
- 17. Further, there is no such license as "medical aesthetician" or "medical cosmetologist" authorized by any Nevada law or issued by any Nevada sanctioned professional licensing body. On the contrary, NAC 644A.870 specifically prohibits cosmetologists and aestheticians from using the terms "expert," "advanced" or "medical" in connection with any description of their practice in any branch of cosmetology or otherwise holding the licensee out to the public as an expert, advanced or medical practitioner of any branch of cosmetology.
- 18. Accordingly, a Nevada licensed cosmetologist or aesthetician may not refer to himself or herself as a "medical cosmetologist" or "medical aesthetician" in connection with any

///

description of their practice, and may not, in fact, practice medicine in any way or perform invasive medical procedures or medical services of any kind, unless they do so as a "medical assistant" to a Nevada licensed medical professional, i.e., either as medical assistant to a Nevada licensed physician or physician assistant pursuant to NRS 630.0129, et. seq., and NAC 630.800-830, as described above, or similarly as another type of professional "assistant," "hygienist," "technician," or other such designation, who is delegated tasks by and under the direct supervision of a medical professional who is duly licensed pursuant to chapters 631 to 637, inclusive, 639 or 640 of NRS, and who remains professionally responsible for their conduct.

19. If a cosmetologist or aesthetician practices medicine in any way, unless he or she acts as a medical assistant and is delegated tasks and is properly supervised by a professional medical practitioner, then he or she is violating NRS 630.400(1)(d) by practicing medicine without a license.

C. Nevada Pharmacy Laws Regarding Controlled Substances, Dangerous Drugs and Hypodermic Devices

- 20. NRS 630.306(1)(b)(3) provides that engaging in conduct that violates a regulation adopted by the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy (Pharmacy Board) is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a licensee.
- 21. Pursuant to NRS 630.3062(1)(h), fraudulent, illegal, unauthorized or otherwise inappropriate prescribing, administering or dispensing of a controlled substance listed in schedule II, III or IV is grounds for initiating disciplinary action or denying licensure.
- 22. Pursuant to 21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1306.04(a)-(b) and NRS 453.381, a physician or physician assistant may prescribe or administer controlled substances only for a legitimate medical purpose and in the usual course of his or her professional practice. The responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, and a prescription may not be issued in order for an individual practitioner to obtain controlled substances for supplying the individual practitioner for the purpose of general dispensing to patients. See 21 CFR §1306.04(a)-(b).

- 23. Pursuant to NRS 454.201, a "dangerous drug" is any drug, other than a controlled substance, unsafe for self-medication or unsupervised use, and includes, among other things, (1) any drug which has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for general distribution and bears the legend: "Caution: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription," and (2) any drug which, pursuant to the Board's regulations, may be sold only by prescription because the Board has found those drugs to be dangerous to public health or safety.
- 24. Pursuant to NRS 454.316 and NRS 454.321, it is unlawful to possess, dispense or furnish a dangerous drug except when furnished to the person by a pharmacist pursuant to a legal prescription from a practitioner.
- 25. Pursuant to NRS 454.009, a "hypodermic" device is any syringe, needle, instrument, device or implement intended or capable of being adapted for the purpose of administering drugs by subcutaneous, intramuscular or intravenous injection.
- 26. Pursuant to NRS 454.510, it is unlawful for any person to have in his or her possession or under his or her control any hypodermic device that is restricted by federal law to sale by or on the order of a physician, unless the person has acquired possession of such device in accordance with the provisions of NRS 454.480 to 454.530, inclusive, that is, by sale from a licensed pharmacist, on the prescription of a physician or other practitioner, which prescription is filled as required by NRS 639.236, and may be refilled as authorized by the prescriber.
- 27. Accordingly, pursuant to NRS 454.009, 454.201, 454.316, 454.321 and 454.510, any person who is not a practitioner as defined in NRS 639.0125 is not permitted by Nevada law to possess, control, access, prescribe, administer, and/or dispense dangerous drugs or hypodermic devices, except as a medical assistant under the direct supervision of a Nevada licensed physician, physician assistant, or other licensed medical professional, and then, only if otherwise permitted and in compliance with laws of regulating pharmacies and pharmaceuticals.
- 28. NAC 639.742(1) provides that a practitioner who wishes to dispense controlled substances or dangerous drugs must apply to the Pharmacy Board for a certificate of registration to dispense controlled substances or dangerous drugs. A practitioner must submit a separate application for each site of practice, including, without limitation, any remote site or satellite

1		C
2		d
3		
4		d
5		p
6		В
7		
8		aj
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		dr
15		ui
16		ino pa
17		pu
8		ρu
9		
20		
21	11	ano
22		ec
23	r	es
	11	

25

26

27

28

consultation site, from which the practitioner wishes to dispense controlled substances or dangerous drugs.

- 29. NAC 639.742(2) provides that if a facility from which the practitioner intends to dispense dangerous drugs or controlled substances is not wholly owned and operated by the practitioner, the owner or owners of the facility must also submit an application to the Pharmacy Board for a license to do so.
- 30. NAC 639.742(3) provides in pertinent part that a dispensing practitioner and, if applicable, the owner or owners of the facility, shall ensure that:
 - . . . (b) All drugs are received and accounted for by the dispensing practitioner;
 - (c) All drugs are stored in a secure, locked room or cabinet to which the dispensing practitioner has the only key or lock combination;
 - (d) All drugs are dispensed in accordance with NAC 639.745⁴;

- 1. Each practitioner who is registered with the Board to dispense controlled substances and dangerous drugs, including, without limitation, a dispensing practitioner, and who dispenses such products for use by the practitioner's patients outside his or her presence shall:
- (a) Keep complete, accurate and readily retrievable records of each controlled substance and dangerous drug purchased and dispensed. The record for each such product dispensed to a patient must include:
 - (1) The name of the patient and, if not readily available from the practitioner's records, the patient's address;
 - (2) The name, strength and quantity of the prescribed controlled substance or dangerous drug;
 - (3) The directions for use;
 - (4) The date the prescription was issued; and
 - (5) A unique identifying number.
- (b) Maintain a separate file for the records concerning the purchase of each controlled substance listed in schedule II and a separate file for the records concerning the dispensing of each controlled substance listed in schedule II. Each prescription for a controlled substance or dangerous drug must be maintained in a separate file pursuant to the requirements set forth in NAC 453.480.
- (c) Keep all controlled substances and dangerous drugs in a locked storage area. Access to the storage area must be restricted to the persons described in NRS 453.375.
- (d) Ensure that each package or container in which a controlled substance is dispensed, except samples in the manufacturer's packages, is clearly labeled pursuant to the requirements set forth in NRS 639.2801.
- (e) Ensure that the package or container in which a controlled substance or dangerous drug is dispensed complies with all state and federal packaging requirements.
 - (f) Be deemed to be a pharmacy as that term is used in NAC 639.926 and shall comply with that section.
- 2. A practitioner may dispense dangerous drugs or controlled substances only after the patient has been informed by the practitioner that the patient may request a written prescription and have it filled at another location of the patient's choosing.
- 3. A record regarding the dispensing of a controlled substance or dangerous drug made and kept pursuant to this section must be maintained on paper or in a computer. If the record is:
 - (a) Maintained on paper, the record must:
 - (1) Include all the information required to be on the prescription pursuant to NRS 639.2353 and NAC 453.440;

⁴ NAC 639.745 Duties of certain practitioners concerning dispensing of controlled substances and dangerous drugs. (NRS 639.070, 639.0727)

Include all the information required to be on the prescription pursuant to NRS 639.2353 and NAC 453.440;
 Contain a certification, either in the computer or a separate paper document, initialed and dated by the patient

⁽²⁾ Contain a certification, either in the computer or a separate paper document, initialed and dated by the patient that the patient has been informed by the practitioner in accordance with subsection 2 and that the patient has agreed to have the practitioner dispense the controlled substance or dangerous drug; and

⁽³⁾ Be searchable for any item required by paragraph (a) of subsection 1 to be included in the record.

- 33. NAC 639.945(2) provides that the owner of any business or facility licensed, certified or registered by the Pharmacy Board is responsible for the acts of all personnel in his or her employ.
- 34. NAC 639.945(3) provides that, for purposes of applying Pharmacy Board regulations:
 - [A] bona fide therapeutic relationship between the patient and practitioner shall be deemed to exist if the patient was examined in person, electronically or telephonically by the practitioner within the 6 months immediately preceding the date the practitioner dispenses or prescribes a drug to the patient and, as a result of the examination, the practitioner diagnosed a condition for which a given drug therapy is prescribed.
- 35. Accordingly, any physician or physician assistant who—whether by serving as a so-called "medical director" of, or by furnishing dangerous drugs or hypodermic devices to, or by some other relationship or circumstance with any "medical spa" wherein dangerous drugs or hypodermic devices are possessed, controlled, accessed, prescribed, administered, and/or dispensed—engages in conduct that violates any regulation adopted by the Pharmacy Board, including but not limited to NAC 639.742(1)-(3), (4)(a)-(b), or 639.945(1)-(3), has violated the Nevada Medical Practice Act and is subject to discipline by the Board.

II. THE PERTINENT HISTORY OF CRIMINAL AND UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF TAMMY LYNN HANKINS, PA-C

36. On or about March 1, 2012, in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, in and for the County of Mohave (Arizona Court), in Case No. CR-2012-00287, a Grand Jury indicted Tammy Lynn Hankins (Hankins), a physician assistant who at that time held a license to practice medicine in the State of Arizona, on five (5) criminal counts of violations of Arizona law, including COUNT 1: FRAUDULENT SCHEMES AND ARTIFICES, CLASS 2 FELONY; COUNT 2: OBTAIN OR PROCURE THE ADMINISTRATION OF A NARCOTIC DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 3 FELONY; COUNT 3: OBTAINING A DANGEROUS DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 3 FELONY; COUNT 4: ATTEMPTED OBTAINING A DANGEROUS DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 4 FELONY; COUNT 5: ATTEMPTED OBTAINING A DANGEROUS DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 4 FELONY.

Hankins' Arizona Case History

- 37. On or about November 28, 2012, the Arizona Regulatory Board of Physician Assistants ("Arizona Board"), in Case No. PA-11-0127A, found Hankins, who had been the holder of a license to practice medicine as a physician assistant in the State of Arizona (License No. 2228), guilty of unprofessional conduct. Specifically, the Arizona Board found Hankins guilty with respect to two (2) patients, Patient JC and Patient MW, determining that Hankins deviated from the standard of care by inappropriately and excessively prescribing controlled substances to patients, risking addiction or overdose with a possible fatal outcome.
- 38. For the foregoing misconduct, the Arizona Board found Hankins guilty of unprofessional conduct pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute (ARS) §32-2501(18)(i) ("prescribing or dispensing controlled substances or prescription-only drugs for which the physician assistant is not approved or in excess of the amount authorized pursuant to this chapter"); ARS §32-2501(18)(j) ("any conduct or practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to 'the health of a patient or the public"); ARS § 32-2501 (18)(p) ("failing or refusing to maintain adequate records on a patient"), and ARS § 32-2501(18)(z) ("failing to furnish legally requested information to the [Arizona Board] or its Investigator in a timely manner."). The Arizona Board also found that a practice restriction was needed in order to protect the public, and ordered that Hankins be issued a Letter of Reprimand, placed on probation for one (1) year with additional conditions and restrictions.

Expiration of Hankins's Arizona License

39. Hankins's license to practice medicine as a physician assistant in the State of Arizona (License No. 2228) was due for renewal by June 1, 2013; Hankins did not renew, and her Arizona license expired by operation of law on May 20, 2014.

Arizona Criminal Conduct by Hankins

40. On or about September 14, 2013, the Arizona Court found that Hankins had knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily pled guilty to the offense of: COUNT 3: OBTAINING A DANGEROUS DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 3 FELONY. On or about October 2, 2013, the Arizona Court entered its judgment finding Hankins guilty of the foregoing charge, and sentenced Hankins to a suspended

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

19

20

18

21

23

22

24

25 26

27 28 imposition of sentence and placing the Defendant on probation for a period of four years commencing October 2, 2013, among other conditions of probation.

- 41. On or about January 17, 2014, pursuant to a Petition to Revoke Probation, the Arizona Court ordered that Hankins be held without bond pending hearing on said petition.
- 42. On or about August 11, 2014, the Arizona Court found Hankins guilty of violating her probation for the following crimes: OBTAINING A DANGEROUS DRUG BY FRAUD, CLASS 3 FELONY, and SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH A MINOR, CLASS 6 FELONY. For the first crime, Hankins was sentenced to two and one-half (2.5) years with the Arizona Department of Corrections, as a minimum sentence, to date from August 11, 2014, and was given credit for two hundred eight (208) days served prior to sentencing. For the second crime, Hankins was sentenced to one (1) additional year of incarceration, that sentence to run consecutive to the other.
- Hankins was not licensed to practice medicine as a physician assistant in the 43. State of Nevada before March 6, 2020.
- 44. Hankins does not hold an active Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) registration, and has not held a valid registration since 2016. Hankins also does not hold and has never held an active license or registration with the Pharmacy Board.

III. RESPONDENT'S AIDING AND ABETTING THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF VIDA SPA, AND RELATED **PHARMACY LAWS**

- Vida Spa LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company, formed July 22, 2016, 45. managed by Gisselle Platfoot ("Vida Spa"), and also doing business as "Vida Spa" and "Vita Medical Spa Las Vegas," is a self-described "medical spa" located at 3225 S Rainbow Blvd #107 and/or #206, Las Vegas, NV 89146.
- 46. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Vida Spa was licensed in Clark County, Nevada, under Clark County Business License No. 2003447.081-172, under the business category of "Cosmetology Establishment - Other Services." The owners listed under this license are Art Matrix, Inc. and Gisselle Platfoot.
- 47. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Vida Spa had no other business licenses except for the Clark County Business License No. 2003447.081-172.

6

7 8 9

11 12

13

14

10

15

16

17

18 19 20

23

21

22

2425

26

- 48. Gisselle Platfoot, manager of Vida Spa, at all times relevant to this Complaint, did not hold a license to practice medicine or any healing art as a "provider of health care," as defined in NRS 629.031, from any occupational licensing board in the State of Nevada, and was not otherwise a practitioner as defined in NRS 639.0125.
- 49. Vida Spa is "a facility that provides health care, other than a medical facility". See NRS 449.442. At all times relevant to this Complaint, neither Respondent, Hankins, Vida Spa, nor Gisselle Platfoot held a permit pursuant to NRS 449.442 to perform general anesthesia, conscious sedation or deep sedation. Additionally, neither Respondent, Hankins, Vida Spa, nor Gisselle Platfoot held a current accreditation by a nationally recognized organization approved by the State Board of Nevada Bureau of Healthcare Quality and Compliance.
- 50. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Vida Spa was not a "medical facility," as defined in NRS 449.0151, and not "the office" of a physician or physician assistant licensed pursuant to NRS chapter 630 or 633, qualified dentist, advanced practice registered nurse or podiatric physician, as provided in NRS 454.217.
- 51. On March 24, 2021, the Pharmacy Board issued a Citation and Order to Cease and Desist (Platfoot Citation) to Vida Spa and Gisselle Platfoot, whereby the Pharmacy Board determined that Vida Spa and Gisselle Platfoot were possessing, administering, prescribing and/or dispensing controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs for Nevada patients from Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law. Specifically, the Platfoot Citation states that Vida Spa and Gisselle Platfoot did not have a dispensing registration and are therefore prohibited from possessing, dispensing and/or administering controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs. The Platfoot Citation finds that Vida Spa and Gisselle Platfoot violated, attempted to violate, assisted or abetted in the violation of or conspired to violate, without limitation, NRS 453.226, NRS 453.316, NRS 453.321(1)(a), NRS 453.331 (l)(c)(d)(t)&(i), NRS 453.381(1), NRS 453.40l(l)(a), NRS 639.0727, NRS 639.100(1), NRS 639.23505, NRS 639.281, NRS 639.2813, NRS 639.310, NAC 639.742, 21 U.S.C. § 822(a)(2), 21 U.S.C. § 823(f), 21 U.S.C. § 84l(a), 21 U.S.C. § 842(a), 21 U.S.C. § 846 and 21 CFR §§ 1306.03-1306.05. The Platfoot Citation orders Vida Spa and Gisselle Platfoot, pursuant to NRS 639.2895(1), to immediately cease and desist possessing, administering,

prescribing and/or dispensing controlled substances for Nevada patients, and also assessed an administrative fine of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) pursuant to NRS 639.2895(3).

- 52. Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa, from on or about September 9, 2019, through on or about November 1, 2019.
- 53. During Respondent's service as "medical director" of Vida Spa, which was licensed only as a "cosmetology establishment," Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees and agents provided medical treatment and/or prescriptions and/or administered dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices and/or dispensed dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices to at least seven (7) patients, as set forth below, which conduct by Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents constitutes the practice of medicine in Nevada:

PATIENT A

- 54. Patient A⁵ was a fifty-seven (57) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 55. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient A, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.⁶
- 56. On October 9, 2019, Hankins, who did not have her own DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, utilized the prescribing credentials of Respondent, to issue fraudulent prescriptions to Patient A for Tramadol (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 50 mg tablets, 24 ct. for 3 days, and Diazepam (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 10 mg tablets, 8 ct. for 3 days; these prescriptions were called-in to the pharmacy by Hankins, or by a Vida Spa employee or agent acting at Hankins's direction, and the prescriptions were filled the same day.
- 57. Hankins instructed Patient A to take Schedule IV controlled substances in a manner that materially deviated from the issued prescriptions; Hankins instructed Patient A to take Tramadol 50mg, 2 tablets, and Diazepam 10 mg, 1 tablet, at 2:00 p.m., on October 10, 2019, for the

⁵ Patients A's true identity is not disclosed herein to protect her privacy, but is disclosed in the Patient Designation served upon Respondent along with a copy of this Complaint, along with identifying information for all other patients B through G referred to herein.

⁶ It is inferred that Respondent was Hankins' "Supervising Physician." However, there is no evidence clinically, practically nor by credentials that this relationship with Hankins existed.

purpose of conscious sedation for an invasive, surgical, liposuction procedure Hankins planned to perform on Patient A at Vida Spa at 3:00 p.m. that day.

- A to deviate from the issued prescription in order to conceal the purpose of the medications, which was conscious sedation, and thereby to conceal a violation by Vida Spa of NRS 449.442(1)-(2).
- 59. Respondent did not see or treat Patient A, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient A, and did not specifically direct Hankins to issue prescriptions to Patient A.
- 60. On October 10, 2019, at Vida Spa, at approximately 3:00 p.m., Hankins performed a liposuction procedure on the arms of Patient A. Hankins administered tumescent anesthesia with Lidocaine and Epinephrine to Patient A, which Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescription or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient A, from a general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs obtained and maintained by Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law.
- 61. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this invasive surgical procedure on Patient A at Vida Spa.

PATIENT B

- 62. Patient B was a thirty-one (31) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 63. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient B, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 64. On October 7, 2019, Hankins, who did not have her own DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, utilized the prescribing credentials of Respondent, to issue fraudulent prescriptions to Patient B for Tramadol 50 mg tablets (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance), 20 ct. for 3 days, Promethazine 25 mg tablets, 12 ct. for 2 days, Sulfameth/Trimethprim 800/160 mg tablets, 20 ct. for 10 days; these prescriptions were called-in to the pharmacy by Hankins, or by a Vida Spa employee or agent acting at Hankins's direction, and the prescriptions were filled the same day.
- 65. Respondent did not see or treat Patient B, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient B, and did not specifically direct Hankins to issue prescriptions to Patient B.

- 66. On October 8, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins performed a liposuction procedure on the arms of Patient B. Hankins administered tumescent anesthesia with Lidocaine and Epinephrine to Patient B, which Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescription or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient B, from a general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs obtained and maintained by Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law.
- 67. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this invasive surgical procedure on Patient B at Vida Spa.

PATIENT C

- 68. Patient C was a forty-three (43) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 69. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient C, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 70. On October 9, 2019, Hankins, who did not have her own DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, utilized the prescribing credentials of Respondent, to issue fraudulent prescriptions to Patient C for Tramadol (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 50 mg tablets, 24 ct. for 3 days, Diazepam (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 10 mg tablets, 12 ct. for 4 days, Promethazine 25 mg tablets, 20 ct. for 5 days, and Sulfameth/Trimethprim 800/160 mg tablets, 20 ct. for 10 days; these prescriptions were called-in to the pharmacy by Hankins, or by a Vida Spa employee or agent acting at Hankins's direction, and the prescriptions were filled the same day.
- 71. Hankins instructed Patient C to take the Schedule IV controlled substances in a manner that materially deviated from the issued prescriptions; Hankins instructed Patient C to take Tramadol 50mg, 2 tablets, and Diazepam 10 mg, 1 tablet, one hour in advance of an invasive, surgical liposuction procedure Hankins planned to perform on Patient C at Vida Spa on October 9, 2019, for the purpose of conscious sedation.
- 72. Hankins wrote the prescriptions for these controlled substances and instructed Patient C to deviate from the issued prescription in order to conceal the purpose of the medications, which was conscious sedation, and thereby to conceal an apparent violation by Vida Spa of NRS 449.442(1)-(2).

- 73. Respondent did not see or treat Patient C, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient C, and did not specifically direct Hankins to issue prescriptions to Patient C.
- 74. On October 9, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins performed a liposuction procedure on the arms of Patient C. Hankins administered tumescent anesthesia with Lidocaine and Epinephrine to Patient C, which Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescriptions or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient C, from a general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs obtained and maintained by Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law.
- 75. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this invasive surgical procedure on Patient C at Vida Spa.

PATIENT D

- 76. Patient D was a twenty-two (22) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 77. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient D, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 78. On October 12, 2019, Hankins, who did not have her own DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, utilized the prescribing credentials of Respondent, to issue fraudulent prescriptions to Patient D for Tramadol (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 50 mg tablets, 24 ct. for 3 days and Diazepam (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 10 mg tablets, 8 ct. for 3 days; on information and belief, these prescriptions were called-in to the pharmacy by Hankins, or by a Vida Spa employee or agent acting at Hankins's direction, and the prescriptions were filled the same day.
- 79. On information and belief, Hankins instructed Patient D to take the Schedule IV controlled substances in a manner that materially deviated from the issued prescriptions; Hankins instructed Patient D to take Tramadol 50mg, 2 tablets, and Diazepam 10 mg, 1 tablet, one hour in advance an invasive, surgical liposuction procedure Hankins planned to perform on Patient D at Vida Spa on October 13, 2019, for the purpose of conscious sedation.
- 80. On information and belief, Hankins wrote the prescriptions for these controlled substances and instructed Patient D to deviate from the issued prescription in order to conceal the

purpose of the medications, which was conscious sedation, and thereby to conceal an apparent violation by Vida Spa of NRS 449.442(1)-(2).

- 81. Respondent did not see or treat Patient D, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient D, and did not specifically direct Hankins to issue prescriptions to Patient D.
- 82. On October 13, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins performed a liposuction procedure on the abdomen and medial inferior upper arms of Patient D. Hankins administered tumescent anesthesia with Lidocaine and Epinephrine to Patient D, which Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescription or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient D, from a general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs obtained and maintained by Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law.
- 83. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this invasive surgical procedure on Patient D at Vida Spa.

PATIENT E

- 84. Patient E was a thirty-three (33) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 85. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient E, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 86. On October 8, 2019, Hankins, who did not have her own DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, utilized the prescribing credentials of Respondent, to issue a fraudulent prescription to Patient E for Tramadol (a Schedule IV Controlled Substance) 50 mg tablets, 20 ct. for 4 days, which prescription was filled the same day.
- 87. Respondent did not see or treat Patient E, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient E, and did not specifically direct Hankins to issue a prescription to Patient E.
- 88. On October 8, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins performed a liposuction procedure on the arms of Patient E. Hankins administered tumescent anesthesia with Lidocaine and Epinephrine to Patient E, which Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescriptions or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient E, from a general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs obtained and maintained by Vida Spa in violation of federal and state law.

89. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this invasive surgical procedure on Patient E at Vida Spa.

PATIENT F

- 90. Patient F was a male of unknown age at the time of the events at issue.
- 91. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient F, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 92. On October 24, 2019, Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescription or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient F, "Botox," a neuromodulator that is derived from Clostridium botulinum or is biosimilar to or the bioequivalent of such a neuromodulator, and "Versa," a hyaluronic acid dermal filler, both of which are dangerous drugs as defined by NRS 454.201, from Vida Spa's general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs used for general administration and dispensing to patients.
- 93. Respondent did not see or treat Patient F, and did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient F.
- 94. On October 24, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins injected, and thereby administered pursuant to NRS 454.191, the aforementioned Botox and Versa into various locations on the face of Patient F.
- 95. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this injection procedure on Patient F at Vida Spa.

PATIENT G

- 96. Patient G was a sixty-six (66) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.
- 97. At all times relevant to Hankins's treatment of Patient G, Respondent was the so-called "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 98. On October 29, 2019, Hankins obtained, without a patient-specific prescription or an order from a licensed practitioner for Patient G, "Xeomin," a neuromodulator that is derived from Clostridium botulinum or is biosimilar to or the bioequivalent of such a neuromodulator, and "Versa," a hyaluronic acid dermal filler, both of which are dangerous drugs as defined by

NRS 454.201, from Vida Spa's general store of controlled substances and dangerous drugs used for general administration and dispensing to patients.

- 99. Respondent did not see or treat Patient G, did not direct or supervise Hankins in her treatment of Patient G.
- 100. On October 24, 2019, at Vida Spa, Hankins injected, and thereby administered pursuant to NRS 454.191, the aforementioned Xeomin and Versa into various locations on the face of Patient G.
- 101. Hankins was not supervised by any licensed physician while performing this injection procedure on Patient G at Vida Spa.

IV. RESPONDENT'S MEDICAL DIRECTORSHIP OF VIDA SPA

- 102. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Hankins did not consult with Respondent regarding any procedures she performed or participated in while "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 103. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Respondent did not review or sign any charts for Hankins and was not present during any procedures she performed.
- 104. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Respondent provided his prescribing credentials and permitted Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot or Vida Spa's employees and agents to prescribe controlled substances to patients under his DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board.
- 105. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Respondent was not present at Vida Spa during its regular business hours, nor during any times relevant to this Complaint.
- 106. Despite Hankins's public history of criminal and unprofessional conduct, and incarceration, Respondent, as "medical director" of Vida Spa, did not investigate or exercise ordinary and reasonable diligence to determine whether Hankins was authorized to practice medicine at Vida Spa, and took no action to prohibit the unlicensed practice of medicine at Vida Spa by Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees and agents.
- 107. Respondent did not inform the Board that Hankins was practicing medicine at Vida Spa without a license.
 - 108. Respondent was an independent contractor of Vida Spa.

- 109. Respondent was not a manager, officer or employee of Vida Spa.
- 110. Respondent had no ownership or member interest in Vida Spa, nor did he have authority, by contract or otherwise, to manage the affairs of Vida Spa.
- 111. Neither Gisselle Platfoot nor any of Vida Spa's employees, agents or other independent contractors were employed by Respondent during the time Respondent served as "medical director" of Vida Spa.
- 112. Respondent has held a valid controlled substance registration issued by the Pharmacy Board (License No. CS24310) since March 3, 2016.
- 113. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Respondent did not hold a dispensing practitioner license issued by the Pharmacy Board.
- 114. Respondent did not apply to the Pharmacy Board for a certificate of registration to dispense controlled substances or dangerous drugs at Vida Spa.
- 115. While "medical director" of Vida Spa, Respondent permitted Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents to utilize his medical license and controlled substance registration to prescribe and procure dangerous drugs and controlled substances, which are available only by prescription.
- 116. While "medical director" of Vida Spa, Respondent permitted dangerous drugs and controlled substances to be left unlocked and readily accessible at Vida Spa in the sole possession, custody and control of Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents, and beyond the supervision or restraint of Respondent.
- 117. All of the dangerous drugs and controlled substances left in the custody and control of Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents were at no time stored in a secure, locked room or cabinet accessible only by Respondent. Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents had unrestricted access to dangerous drugs, controlled substances, hypodermic devices and other dangerous medical devices and poisonous substances.
- 118. Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents possessed, controlled, stored, prescribed, administered and/or dispensed controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices without a dispensing license as required by the Pharmacy Board.

- 119. Respondent was not present when Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees and agents possessed, controlled, stored, prescribed, administered and/or dispensed controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices obtained using Respondent's medical license and controlled substance registration.
- 120. Respondent neither received nor accounted for the controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices possessed, controlled, stored, prescribed, administered and/or dispensed by Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents.
- 121. Respondent did not have a bona fide therapeutic relationship with any of the seven (7) patients to whom Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees and agents provided medical treatment(s) and/or prescriptions and/or administered dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices and/or dispensed dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices.
- 122. Respondent did not personally write a prescription or order for any controlled substances and/or dangerous drugs to any of the seven (7) patients to whom Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees and agents provided medical treatment and/or prescriptions and/or administered dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices and/or dispensed dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices.
- 123. Respondent was not on-site at Vida Spa or otherwise immediately available when Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and Vida Spa's employees or agents provided medical treatment and/or issued prescriptions for, administered and dispensed controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices to these seven (7) patients.
- 124. Respondent did not personally administer or dispense at Vida Spa, or personally direct any of Gisselle Platfoot, Hankins or any other of Vida Spa's employees or agents to administer or dispense at Vida Spa, and did not exercise sufficient control of Vida Spa operations to ensure that dangerous drugs and controlled substances were administered and dispensed only for medically necessary purposes and according to prevailing standards of care.
- 125. Respondent supplied controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices to Gisselle Platfoot, Hankins, and Vida Spa's employees or agents and permitted unqualified persons to circumvent laws pertaining to the legal sale of such articles, and allowed others to utilize

his medical credentials and controlled substance registration to administer, dispense and prescribe controlled substances, dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices to those whom he did not have a bona fide therapeutic relationship.

- 126. Respondent failed to ensure that he had the required ownership or employment relationship with respect to Vida Spa and its employees and agents for any of them to be, in fact, his medical assistants as defined by NRS 630.0129 and to comply with the requirements of NAC 630.800-840.
- 127. Respondent also failed to ensure that he had the legal and practical control of Vida Spa's operations to effectively control the conduct of Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot and Vida Spa's employees and agents in performance of all medical activities as his medical assistants or otherwise, in order to prevent prohibited conduct and ensure that his medical assistants possessed the knowledge, skill and training to perform their tasks safely and properly.

COUNT I

NRS 630.301(4) – Malpractice

- 128. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 129. NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a physician is grounds for initiating disciplinary action against a licensee.
- 130. 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."
- 131. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent failed to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when serving as "medical director" of Vida Spa, by, among other failures, aiding and abetting the unlicensed practice of medicine by Hankins, Platfoot and others in rendering medical services to Patient A, B, C, D, E, F and G, by permitting unlicensed individuals, Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot, and other Vida Spa employees and agents, to provide prescriptions and/or administer dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices and/or dispense dangerous drugs and hypodermic devices to patients, by providing his prescribing credentials and permitting Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot or Vida Spa's

employees and agents to prescribe controlled substances to patients under his DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, and by not being present at Vida Spa during its regular business hours, nor during any times relevant to this Complaint.

132. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT II

NRS 630.305(1)(e) – Aiding the Unlicensed Practice of Medicine

- 133. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 134. Including, but not limited to the conduct set forth herein, Respondent, aided, assisted, and advised, directly and indirectly, unlicensed persons, including, but not limited to Hankins and Gisselle Platfoot, to engage in the practice of medicine on patients at Vida Spa, specifically including but not limited to Patients A, B, C, D, E, F and G, which conduct was contrary to the provisions of NRS Chapter 630 and the regulations of the Board,
- 135. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT III

NRS 630.306(1)(b)(3) - Engaging in Conduct that Violated Pharmacy Board Regulations

- 136. All of the allegations in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein
- 137. NRS 630.306(1)(b)(3) provides that engaging in conduct that violates a regulation adopted by the Pharmacy Board is grounds for initiating disciplinary action.
- 138. Including but not limited to the conduct described herein, Respondent engaged in conduct that violates regulations adopted by the Pharmacy Board, specifically including but not limited to NAC 639.742(1)-(3), (4)(a)-(b), 639.945(1)-(3), and NAC 639.742(1).
- 139. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners as provided in NRS 630.352.

1///

28 | /

///

COUNT IV

NRS 630.3062(1)(h) – Fraudulent, Illegal, Unauthorized and Otherwise Inappropriate Prescribing of Controlled Substances

- 140. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 141. Pursuant to NRS 630.3062(1)(h), fraudulent, illegal, unauthorized or otherwise inappropriate prescribing, administering or dispensing of a controlled substance listed in schedule II, III or IV is grounds for disciplinary action or denying licensure.
- 142. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, providing his prescribing credentials and permitting Hankins, Gisselle Platfoot or Vida Spa's employees and agents to prescribe controlled substances to patients under his DEA registration and controlled substance license issued by the Pharmacy Board, by not being present at Vida Spa during its regular business hours, nor during any times relevant to this Complaint, by not investigating or exercising ordinary and reasonable diligence in his supervision of unlicensed persons at Vida Spa, by not taking any action to prohibit fraudulent prescribing under his own credentials at Vida Spa, by not informing the Board, Pharmacy Board and/or DEA that fraudulent prescriptions were being issued by Hankins under his credentials, among other conduct, Respondent issued fraudulent, illegal, unauthorized and otherwise inappropriate prescriptions for schedule II and IV controlled substances, Oxycodone-acetaminophen and Alprazolam, respectively, to Patients A, B, C, D and E, who were patients he did not see, examine or diagnose, and with whom he did not have a bona fide therapeutic relationship.
- 143. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT V

NRS 630.306(1)(p) – (Unsafe or Unprofessional Conduct)

144. All of the allegations in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

- 145. Engaging in any act that is unsafe or unprofessional conduct in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board is grounds for disciplinary action against a licensee pursuant to NRS 630.306(1)(p).
- 146. Pursuant to NAC 630.230(1)(g)-(i), it is unprofessional conduct to allow any person to act as a medical assistant in the treatment of a patient of the physician, unless the medical assistant has sufficient training to provide the assistance, to fail to provide adequate supervision of a medical assistant who is supervised by the physician, including, without limitation, supervision provided in the manner described in NAC 630.810 or 630.820, and to fail to provide adequate supervision of a physician assistant.
- 147. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent violated NAC 630.230(1)(g)-(i).
 - 148. Respondent's conduct was unsafe and unprofessional.
- 149. 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 what sanctions to impose if it determines there has been a violation or violations of the Medical Practice Act committed by Respondent;
- 4. That the Board award fees and costs for the investigation and prosecution of this case as outlined in NRS 622.400;
- 5. That the Board make, issue and serve on Respondent its findings of fact, conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and

27 | | / /

28 | 1 / / /

1	6. That the Board take such other and further action as may be just and proper in these
2	premises.
3	DATED this 30th day of August, 2021.
4	INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
5	NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS
6	By:
7	AARON B. FRICKE, ESQ. General Counsel
8	9600 Gateway Drive Reno, Nevada 89521
9	Tel: (702) 486-3813 Email: <u>africke@medboard.nv.gov</u> Attorney for the Investigative Committee
10	Attorney for the Investigative Committee
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	VERIFICATION	
2	STATE OF NEVADA)	
3	COUNTY OF CLARK : ss.	
4	Victor M. Muro, M.D., having been duly sworn, hereby deposes and states under penalty of	
5	perjury that he is the Chairman of the Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of	
6	Medical Examiners that authorized the Complaint against the Respondent herein; that he has read	
7	the foregoing Complaint; and that based upon information discovered in the course of the	
8	investigation into a complaint against Respondent, he believes that the allegations and charges in the	
9	foregoing Complaint against Respondent are true, accurate and correct.	
10	DATED this 30 day of August, 2021.	
11	INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE	
12	NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS	
13	By: Um mund Mo	
14	VICTOR M. MURO, M.D. Chairman of the Investigative Committee	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

Reno, Nevada 89521 (775) 688-2559 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am employed by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and that on the 31st day of August, 2021, I served a file-stamped copy of the foregoing **COMPLAINT**, via U.S. Certified Mail to the following parties:

SHERMAN WASHINGTON, M.D.
Complete Medical Center
1820 E. Lake Mead Blvd., Ste. M
North Las Vegas, NV 89030
Certified Mail Receipt No.: 9171 9690 0935 0252 1563 23

DATED this 3 st day of August, 2021.

MERCEDES FUENTES

Legal Assistant

Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners