

1 **BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS**
2 **OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

3 * * * * *

4
5 **In the Matter of Charges and Complaint**

Case No. 23-28365-2

6 **Against:**

7 **BARRY JAMES RIVES, M.D.,**

8 **Respondent.**

FILED

NOV 15 2023

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF
MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: 

9
10 **COMPLAINT**

11 The Investigative Committee¹ (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners
12 (Board), by and through Ian J. Cumings, Deputy General Counsel and attorney for the IC, having
13 a reasonable basis to believe that Barry James Rives, M.D., (Respondent) violated the provisions
14 of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter
15 630 (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), hereby issues its Complaint, stating the IC's charges
16 and allegations as follows:

17 1. Respondent was at all times relative to this Complaint a medical doctor holding an
18 active license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada (License No. 10642). Respondent was
19 originally licensed by the Board on September 16, 2003. Respondent's specialty is listed as
20 general surgery and abdominal surgery on the Board's website.

21 2. Patient A² was a fifty-three (53) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.

22 3. Patient A previously had a hernia that had been repaired in 2014 with mesh.

23 4. On July 3, 2015, Patient A presented to Respondent for a laparoscopic reduction
24 and repair of a recurrent incarcerated incisional hernia.

25 ///

26
27 ¹ The Investigative Committee of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, at the time this formal
28 Complaint was authorized for filing, was composed of Board members Mr. M. Neil Duxbury, Chair, Aury Nagy,
M.D., and Michael C. Edwards, M.D., FACS.

² Patient 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.

1 5. Respondent's operative note documented significant adhesion of the transverse
2 colon to the mesh utilized in the previous hernia repair. Respondent elected to continue operating
3 laparoscopically and utilized a LigaSure device to extract the transverse colon from the mesh,
4 causing at least two (2) colotomies (incisions in the intestine).

5 6. Despite two (2) confirmed colotomies, Respondent did not convert the laparoscopic
6 surgery to an open surgery and attempted to repair the damage with a gastrointestinal anastomosis
7 (GIA) stapler.

8 7. On or about July 4, 2015, Patient A's condition worsened, and she was transferred
9 to the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) with a high white blood cell count.

10 8. On or about July 5, 2015, Patient A continued to deteriorate, and required
11 intubation. A computed tomography (CT) scan of Patient A's abdomen did not show any blockage
12 of the lungs. Respondent failed to document a reason for the patient's worsening condition and
13 elected not to take Patient A back into surgery for re-exploration to determine if there was any
14 additional bowel perforations, despite two (2) confirmed colotomies during the July 3, 2015,
15 laparoscopic hernia repair.

16 9. From on or about July 6, 2015, until on or about July 8, 2015, Respondent
17 continued to document examinations of the patient but failed to mention any post-surgical
18 complications or sepsis.

19 10. On July 9, 2015, Respondent documented that the Patient did not have signs or
20 symptoms of sepsis. Patient A's family sought a second opinion from another surgeon who
21 advised there was a possible leak from one or both of the colotomies and recommended a
22 diagnostic laparoscopic exploration.

23 11. On July 10, 2015, Respondent maintained his opinion that there was no sign of leak
24 or sepsis and failed to address the second opinion in the medical record.

25 12. On July 14, 2015, Respondent documented that Patient A had an elevated fever,
26 elevated white blood cell count, and ordered a repeat CT. Respondent did not elect to surgically
27 intervene despite Patient A's worsening condition. The CT scan demonstrated free air and fluid
28 outside of the bowel, confirming a bowel leak.

1 13. On July 16, 2015, Patient A underwent a laparotomy performed by another surgeon
2 who discovered a hole in Patient A’s colon with extensive fecal peritonitis and adhesions.

3 **COUNT I**

4 **NRS 630.301(4) - Malpractice**

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

7 15. NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a Physician is grounds for initiating
8 disciplinary action against a licensee.

9 16. NAC 630.040 defines malpractice as “the failure of a physician, in treating a
10 patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar
11 circumstances.”

12 17. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent failed
13 to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when
14 rendering medical services to Patient A by causing a perforation of Patient A’s bowels during the
15 July 3, 2015, laparoscopic surgery by use of a LigaSure device and failing to convert the surgery
16 to an open surgery despite the confirmation of two (2) colotomies.

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

19 **COUNT II**

20 **NRS 630.301(4) - Malpractice**

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

23 20. NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a Physician is grounds for initiating
24 disciplinary action against a licensee.

25 21. NAC 630.040 defines malpractice as “the failure of a physician, in treating a
26 patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar
27 circumstances.”

28 ///

1 22. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent failed
2 to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when
3 rendering medical services to Patient A by failing to adequately manage Patient A's post-surgical
4 complications by not recognizing clear signs of sepsis, bowel perforation, and failing to intervene
5 surgically after Patient A deteriorated.

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

8 **COUNT III**

9 **NRS 630.3062(1)(a) - Failure to Proper Complete Medical Records**

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

12 25. NRS 630.3062(1)(a) provides that the "failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate
13 and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient" constitute
14 grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.

15 26. Respondent failed to maintain complete medical records relating to the diagnosis,
16 treatment and care of Patient A, by failing to correctly document his actions when he treated
17 Patient A, whose medical records were not timely, legible, accurate, and complete by failing to
18 address Patient A's sepsis and worsening clinical presentation in the medical record.

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

21 **WHEREFORE**, the Investigative Committee prays:

22 1. That the Board give Respondent notice of the charges herein against him and give
23 him notice that he may file an answer to the Complaint herein as set forth in
24 NRS 630.339(2) within twenty (20) days of service of the Complaint;

25 2. That the Board set a time and place for a formal hearing after holding an Early
26 Case Conference pursuant to NRS 630.339(3);

27 3. That the Board determine what sanctions to impose if it determines there has been
28 a violation or violations of the Medical Practice Act committed by Respondent;

- 1 4. That the Board award fees and costs for the investigation and prosecution of this
- 2 case as outlined in NRS 622.400;
- 3 5. That the Board make, issue and serve on Respondent its findings of fact,
- 4 conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and
- 5 6. That the Board take such other and further action as may be just and proper in these
- 6 premises.

7 DATED this 15th day of November, 2023.

8 INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
9 NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

10 By: _____

11 IAN J. CUMINGS
12 Deputy General Counsel
13 9600 Gateway Drive
14 Reno, NV 89521
15 Tel: (775) 688-2559
16 Email: africke@medboard.nv.gov
17 Attorney for the Investigative Committee

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

VERIFICATION


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE OF NEVADA)
 : ss.
COUNTY OF WASHOE)

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

DATED this 15th day of November, 2023.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: 
BRET W. FREY, M.D.
Chairman of the Investigative Committee