



1 visit indicated a plan to follow-up with a biopsy of a right-sided mole, which was presumably  
2 discovered during a gynecological examination that day.

3 4. There was no documentation of urinary incontinence in any section of the February  
4 24, 2021, medical records from Respondent for Patient A.

5 5. Respondent's medical records did not document any communication between  
6 Patient A and Respondent or his staff regarding incontinence, bladder issues, or conducting  
7 urodynamics testing<sup>3</sup> prior to Patient A presenting to Respondent's office for her biopsy  
8 appointment on March 5, 2021.

9 6. On March 5, 2021, within Respondent's notes in the Chief Complaint section of  
10 Patient A's medical records, there was inclusion of Urodynamics testing. This testing was not  
11 discussed with Patient A prior to this visit.

12 7. Patient A complained that when she presented for her appointment on  
13 March 5, 2021, for the biopsy of the Bartholin cyst, the room was set up for a Urodynamics study.  
14 After Patient A argued with Respondent and his office staff regarding the actual purpose of her  
15 visit, Patient A ultimately convinced Respondent to perform the biopsy.

16 8. Thereafter, over Patient A's objection that she had no bladder problems,  
17 Respondent insisted that Patient A complete the bladder test anyway and proceeded to conduct the  
18 Urodynamics study immediately following collection of the biopsy specimen. Patient A's medical  
19 records did not include documentation of a written or oral consent to the Urodynamics study  
20 performed on March 5, 2021.

21 9. Respondent scheduled the Urodynamics study *prior* to Patient A's March 5, 2021,  
22 appointment. However, the first mention in Respondent's medical records of urinary incontinence  
23 and pelvic pressure for Patient A was from the March 5, 2021, visit.

24 10. Respondent's records are inaccurate because Patient A did not discuss urinary  
25 incontinence with Respondent at any time and, in fact, Patient A had never complained to  
26 Respondent of any problems with her bladder.

27  
28 <sup>3</sup> A Urodynamic study is a test used to help diagnose problems with urination or urinary incontinence. It involves insertion of a catheter into the bladder and may involve an additional catheter placed in a patient's vagina or rectum.



**COUNT II**

**NRS 630.3062(1)(a) - Failure to Maintain Appropriate Medical Records**

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

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

21. Respondent failed to maintain complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of Patient A, by, among other things, failing to document either subjective or objective urinary incontinence or any discussion regarding the degree of bother that urinary incontinence presented for Patient A in support of him performing the Urodynamics study.

22. Respondent’s records are inaccurate because Patient A never discussed urinary incontinence with Respondent and, in fact, Patient A had never complained to Respondent of any problems with her bladder.

23. Finally, there are numerous additional inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and omissions in Respondent’s records for Patient A, whose medical records were not timely, legible, accurate, or complete.

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

**COUNT III**

**NRS 630.301(8) - Failure to Provide Procedures, Studies, Services, Referrals**

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

NRS 630.301(8) provides that the failure to offer appropriate procedures or studies, to provided necessary services or to refer a patient to an appropriate provider, when the failure occurs with intent of positively influencing the financial well-being of the practitioner are grounds for discipline.

///



1           34.    NRS 630.301(6) provides that disruptive behavior with patients that interferes with  
2 patient care or has an adverse impact on the quality of care rendered to a patient is grounds for  
3 initiating disciplinary action against a physician.

4           35.    Respondent's behavior by performing a Urodynamic study procedure of which  
5 Patient A did not consent and which was conducted for no medical purpose, was demeaning,  
6 humiliating, and traumatizing to Patient A and thus adversely affected the quality of care rendered  
7 to her.

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

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

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

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

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

18           4.    That the Board award fees and costs for the investigation and prosecution of this  
19 case as outlined in NRS 622.400;

20           5.    That the Board make, issue and serve on Respondent its findings of fact,  
21 conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

DATED this 8 day of September, 2023.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: Deonne E. Contine

DEONNE E. CONTINE  
General Counsel  
IAN J. CUMINGS  
Deputy General Counsel  
9600 Gateway Drive  
Reno, NV 89521  
Tel: (775) 688-2559  
Email: [dcontine@medboard.nv.gov](mailto:dcontine@medboard.nv.gov)  
[icumings@medboard.nv.gov](mailto:icumings@medboard.nv.gov)  
*Attorneys for the Investigative Committee*

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

**VERIFICATION**

STATE OF NEVADA        )  
                                  : ss.  
COUNTY OF CLARK     )

Aury Nagy, 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 8th day of September, 2023.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
AURY NAGY, M.D.  
*Chairman of the Investigative Committee*