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. 23-12762-4	
6	Against:	FILED	
7	SAMUEL RODOLFO CHACON, M.D.,	OCT - 4 2023	
8	Respondent.	NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS	
9		By:	
10	COMPLAINT		
11	The Investigative Committee ¹ (IC) of the	ne Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners	
12	(Board), by and through its counsel, Ian J. Cumings, Deputy General Counsel and attorney for the		
13	IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that Samuel Rodolfo Chacon, M.D., (Respondent)		
14	violated the provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 and Nevada		
15	Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 630 (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), hereby issues		
16	its Complaint, stating the IC's charges and allegations as follows:		
17	1. Respondent was at all times relativ	e to this Complaint a physician holding an active	
18	license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada (License No. 9105). Respondent was		
19	originally licensed by the Board on July 27, 1999, with a specialty in Obstetrics/Gynecology.		
20	2. Patient A ² was a forty-four (44) ye	ar-old female at the time of the events at issue.	
21	3. On February 5, 2019, Patient A presented to the emergency room following		
22	complaints of mild cramping and dysuria (pain or difficulty urinating), where she was diagnosed		
23	with uterine fibroids.		
24	4. On February 6, 2019, Patient A wa	as seen by a urologist who documented Patient A	
25	had intermittent hematuria (blood in the urine) for	or one (1) week prior to her visit with right flank	
26			
27		ate Board of Medical Examiners, at the time this formal	
28	Complaint was authorized for filing, was composed of Board members Aury Nagy, M.D., Chairman, Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., and Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel. 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 0	f 6	

pain, urinary urgency, abdominal pain, and dysuria without a history of trauma prior to the onset
 of her symptoms.

5. On February 11, 2019, Patient A was referred by her primary care physician to Respondent for her recurrent urinary tract infection (UTI) symptoms and uterine fibroids to be evaluated for a potential hysterectomy. Upon Patient A's initial clinical presentation, Respondent documented Patient A had abnormal (heavy) uterine bleeding and dysmenorrhea (pelvic pain) associated with her known uterine fibroids and agreed with Patient A to perform an endometrial biopsy.

6. Patient A returned to Respondent on February 15, 2019, with complaints of pelvic 9 Respondent diagnosed Patient A with stress urinary 10 pain associated with menstruation. incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse. Respondent's records from the February 15, 2019, visit 11 are contradictory. Respondent documented Patient A had received Kegel exercise instructions, 12 13 and then asserts Patient A had failed conservative management with pelvic floor exercises and 14 wished to proceed with definitive surgical management of her pelvic pain and urodynamic stress 15 urinary incontinence. This visit was Patient A's first time having received any information from Respondent about Kegel exercises. 16

7. During the February 15, 2019, visit Respondent performed a urodynamics study
without clinical indication, as Patient A did not complain of stress urinary incontinence and was
referred for a consultation for a hysterectomy for her known uterine fibroids and heavy bleeding
during her menstrual cycles. Respondent diagnosed Patient A with stage two (2) uterovaginal
prolapse without a proper supporting examination or indication documented in the medical record.

8. On March 19, 2019, Respondent performed a laparoscopically assisted vaginal
 hysterectomy, bilateral salpingectomy, anterior and posterior repair, enterocele repair,
 perineoplasty, transobturator mid-urethral sling, and sacrospinous ligament vaginal vault
 suspension, despite no clinical indication or complaints of pelvic organ prolapse.

- 26 ///
- 27 111
- 28 ///

1	<u>COUNT I</u>		
2	NRS 630.301(4) - Malpractice		
3	9. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by		
4	reference as though fully set forth herein.		
5	10. NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a Physician is grounds for initiating		
6	disciplinary action against a licensee.		
7	11. NAC 630.040 defines malpractice as "the failure of a physician, in treating a		
8	patient, to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar		
9	circumstances."		
10	12. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent failed		
11	to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when		
12	rendering medical services to Patient A when he performed an unnecessary urodynamics study		
13	and surgery to treat pelvic organ prolapse, which was not indicated.		
14	13. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as		
15	provided in NRS 630.352.		
16	<u>COUNT II</u>		
17	NRS 630.3062(1)(a) - Failure to Maintain Proper Medical Records		
18	14. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by		
19	reference as though fully set forth herein.		
20	15. NRS 630.3062(1)(a) provides that the "failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate		
21	and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient" constitute		
22	grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.		
23	16. Respondent failed to maintain proper medical records relating to the diagnosis,		
24	treatment and care of Patient A, by, among other things, documenting pelvic organ prolapse and		
25	urinary incontinence without patient complaints prior to performance of surgery or a urodynamics		
26	study on Patient A.		
27	17. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as		
28	provided in NRS 630.352.		

II

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

COUNT III

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

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

19. 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.

20. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent violated NRS 603.301(8) with regard to Patient A's medical conditions when Respondent failed to offer appropriate procedures or studies and failed to provide necessary services or refer Patient A to an appropriate provider. Respondent's failure to perform all of the aforementioned occurred with the intent of positively influencing the financial well-being of the Respondent and/or Respondent's practice.

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

COUNT IV

NRS 630.301(7) – Violation of Patient Trust and Exploitation of Physician and Patient Relationship for Financial or Personal Gain

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

22 23. NRS 630.301(7) provides that "engaging in conduct that violates the trust of a
23 patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and the patient for financial or other
24 personal gain" is grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.

25 24. As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent
violated the trust of and exploited the relationship between Respondent and Patient A when he
performed surgical procedures on Patient A to correct stage two (2) uterovaginal prolapse that was
28 ///

1	not indicated because his decisions were not based on any documented patient complaints or				
2	medical diagnoses.				
3	25. By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as				
4	provided in NRS 630.352.				
5	WHEREFORE, the Investigative Committee prays:				
6	1. That the Board give Respondent notice of the charges herein against him and give				
7	him notice that he may file an answer to the Complaint herein as set forth in				
8	NRS 630.339(2) within twenty (20) days of service of the Complaint;				
9	2. That the Board set a time and place for a formal hearing after holding an Early				
10	Case Conference pursuant to NRS 630.339(3);				
11	3. That the Board determine what sanctions to impose if it determines there has been				
12	a violation or violations of the Medical Practice Act committed by Respondent;				
13	4. That the Board award fees and costs for the investigation and prosecution of this				
14	case as outlined in NRS 622.400;				
15	5. That the Board make, issue and serve on Respondent its findings of fact,				
16	conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and				
17	6. That the Board take such other and further action as may be just and proper in these				
18	premises.				
19	DATED this day of October, 2023.				
20	INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS				
21	NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAE EXAMITERS				
22	By:				
23	IANJ. CUMINOS Deputy General Counsel				
24	9600 Gateway Drive Reno, NV 89521				
25	Tel: (775) 688-2559 Email: <u>icumings@medboard.nv.gov</u>				
26	Attorney for the Investigative Committee				
27					
28					
	5 of 6				

	1	VERIFICATION			
	2	2 STATE OF NEVADA) : ss.			
	3	COUNTY OF CLARK)			
	4	Aury Nagy, 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	7 the foregoing Complaint; and that based upon information discovered in the course of th			
	8	8 investigation into a complaint against Respondent, he believes that the allegations and charges			
	9	9 the foregoing Complaint against Respondent are true, accurate and correct.			
	10	DATED this 4th day of October, 2023.			
	11	INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS			
12 13	12				
	13	By:			
	14	AURY NAGY, M.D. Chairman of the Investigative Committee			
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
		6 of 6			