

BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

In the Matter of Charges and Complaint

Case No. 23-28073-1

Against:

ORLANDO LAMAR WELLS, M.D.,

Respondent.

FILED

NOV 15 2023

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF

MEDICAL EXAMINERS

BY: 

COMPLAINT

The Investigative Committee¹ (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board), by and through Donald K. White, Senior Deputy General Counsel and attorney for the IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that Orlandis Lamar Wells, 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 relative to this Complaint a medical doctor holding an active license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada (License No. 10558). Respondent was originally licensed by the Board on July 7, 2003.

2. Patients A-I² were all patients of Respondent at various times while Respondent held an active license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

3. Patient A was a twenty-five (25) year-old female at the time of the events at issue and was a patient of Respondent from on or about October 6, 2015, to on or about October 6, 2016.

///

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 Rachakonda D. Prabhu, M.D., Ms. Sandy Peltyn and Victor M. Muro, M.D.

² Patient A's through Patient I's true identities are not disclosed herein to protect their privacy, but is disclosed in the Patient Designation served upon Respondent along with a copy of this Complaint.

1 4. Patient B was a thirty-eight (38) year-old male at the time of the events at issue and
2 was a patient of Respondent from on or about June 2, 2016, to on or about October 6, 2016.

3 5. Patient C was a twenty-eight (28) year-old female at the time of the events at issue
4 and was a patient of Respondent from on or about June 2, 2016, to on or about October 20, 2016.

5 6. Patient D was a thirty (30) year-old male at the time of the events at issue and was
6 a patient of Respondent from on or about May 26, 2016, to on or about September 19, 2016.

7 7. Patient E was a thirty (30) year-old female at the time of the events at issue and
8 was a patient of Respondent from on or about June 17, 2016, to on or about October 3, 2016.

9 8. Patient F was a forty (40) year-old male at the time of the events at issue and was a
10 patient of Respondent from on or about June 16, 2016, to on or about October 3, 2016.

11 9. Patient G was a thirty-five (35) year-old female at the time of the events at issue
12 and was a patient of Respondent from on or about June 2, 2016, to on or about October 6, 2016.

13 10. Patient H was a twenty-nine (29) year-old male at the time of the events at issue
14 and was a patient of Respondent from on or about March 8, 2016, to on or about May 5, 2016.

15 11. Patient I was a forty-one (41) year-old female at the time of the events at issue and
16 was a patient of Respondent from on or about May 25, 2016, to on or about October 17, 2016.

17 12. Eight (8) of the nine (9) patients' records were nearly identical with regards to the
18 physical exam and plan sections (demonstrating a lack of individual care for each of the nine (9)
19 patients); Respondent occasionally prescribed methadone for all patients except Patient I as
20 needed for pain and oxycodone for all patients as needed for pain, which is extremely dangerous
21 and also demonstrates a failure to maintain proper medical records, as medical records when
22 compared to prescriptions show these incongruencies; there is no indication that Respondent
23 utilized urine drug screening to ensure compliance with the patients' pain medications; except for
24 Patient H³, and Respondent documented that the other eight (8) patients had nearly identical
25 physical exams and diagnoses, resulting from the same straight leg tests and the FABER tests.

26 ///

27 ///

28 _____
³ Upon information and belief, Respondent did not have access to Patient H's medical records and therefore he did not provide them.

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

3 **COUNTS XXVII – XXXV (Patients A – I)**

4 **NRS 630.306(1)(g) - Continual Failure to Exercise Skill or Diligence**

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

7 30. Continual failure by the Respondent to exercise the skill or diligence or use the
8 methods ordinarily exercised under the same circumstances by physicians in good standing
9 practicing in the same specialty or field is grounds for disciplinary action against a licensee
10 pursuant to NRS 630.306(1)(g)

11 31. Respondent continually failed to exercise skill or diligence when he failed to
12 comply with the *Guidelines for the Chronic Use of Opioid Analgesics*, the vast majority of his
13 documentation was copied and pasted for all patients, Respondent failed to give these nine (9)
14 patients individualized care (the plan in his medical records for all patients were identical), at
15 times he prescribed methadone as needed, which is extremely dangerous due to elevated risk of
16 overdose, failed to obtain informed consent from some patients, and inappropriately continued
17 these nine (9) patients on relatively high doses of opioids with little or no justification in the
18 medical records, which were copied and pasted resulting in nearly identical diagnoses and
19 treatment plans.

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

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

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

26 2. That the Board set a time and place for a formal hearing after holding an Early
27 Case Conference pursuant to NRS 630.339(3);
28

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 CLARK)

Chowdhury H. Ahsan, M.D., Ph.D., FACC, 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 16th day of November, 2023.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: 

CHOWDHURY H. AHSAN, M.D., Ph.D., FACC
Chairman of the Investigative Committee