9600 Gateway Drive Reno, Nevada 89521

BEFORE THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

In the Matter of Charges and Complaint

Against: 6

MATTHEW OBIM OKEKE, M.D.,

Respondent.

Case No. 24-22461-3

FILED

FEB 2 3 2024

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF

COMPLAINT

The Investigative Committee¹ (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners (Board), by and through Sarah A. Bradley, J.D., MBA Deputy Executive Director and attorney for the IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that Matthew Obim Okeke, 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-probation license to practice medicine the State of Nevada (License No. 14957). Respondent was originally licensed by the Board on October 8, 2003.²
- Patient A³ was a 28 year-old female at start of the events at issue in this 2. Complaint.4

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 Bret W. Frey, M.D., Carl N. Williams, Jr., M.D., and Col. Eric D. Wade, USAF (Ret.) (Public Member).

² Respondent's original license number issued on October 8, 2003, was 10668. Respondent was issued license number 14957 on September 6, 2013.

³ 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.

⁴ The earliest record regarding Patient A that was provided to the Board investigator in connection with this investigation is dated January 20, 2014, when Patient A was 28 years old. The earliest documentation of a romantic relationship between Patient A and Respondent is a trip they took from September 29, 2019, through October 6, 2019. Patient A was 34 years old at that time. This Complaint will focus on events that occurred from 2019 through March 2022, when patient was 34 years old through 36 years old. Patient A told the Board investigator that she first saw Respondent as a patient in 2013, but the records provided by Respondent do not corroborate that. Instead, as

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

- On January 20, 2014, Respondent saw Patient A for a psychiatric evaluation and 3. diagnosed her with generalized anxiety disorder and major depressive disorder.
- 4. In 2014, 2015, 2018, 2019, and 2021, Respondent provided psychiatric care to Patient A.5
- Respondent asserts that he had a romantic and/or sexual relationship with Patient A 5. starting at the end of 2013, before he saw her as a patient in January 2014.
- Respondent engaged in active medication management of Patient A's medications during twenty-one (21) visits dated January 20, 2014, January 29, 2014, March 5, 2014, March 31, 2014, July 11, 2014, August 15, 2014, September 12, 2014, October 16, 2014, November 14, 2014, December 29, 2014, January 29, 2015, June 5, 2018, September 30, 2018, January 28, 2019, February 28, 2019, March 19, 2019, April 10, 2020, March 16, 2021, April 16, 2021, May 19, 2021, and June 14, 2021.
 - 7. Respondent and Patient A had a bona fide physician-patient relationship.
- 8. Respondent and Patient A's bona fide physician-patient relationship overlapped with Respondent and Patient A's personal relationship that was romantic and/or sexual in nature.
- 9. In a Residential Lease Agreement dated June 19, 2019 (Residential Lease), Respondent is listed as the Tenant of a residential property located in Las Vegas, Nevada.
 - 10. Respondent signed the Residential Lease as the Tenant on June 21, 2019.
- In paragraph 14 of the Residential Lease, Patient A is listed as an occupant of the 11. premises.
- 12. In a Residential Lease Agreement Addendum dated June 8, 2020, Respondent added Patient A to his residential lease.
- The document states "Tenant hereby to add girl friend [. . .] as signer to sign all 13. document related to this lease property."

previously stated in this footnote, the first record received by the Board investigator from Respondent regarding his care of Patient A is dated January 20, 2014.

⁵ Upon information and belief, it appears that Patient A saw another provider at Grand Desert Medical during the years and months when she did not see Respondent for psychiatric care because Respondent provided only the records for visits with Patient A for the dates listed in this Complaint. This statement is supported by a review of Patient A's Patient Report in the PMP which shows that, while Respondent provided multiple prescriptions to Patient A for controlled substances during the time period at issue in this Complaint, he was not the only prescriber of these medications for her.

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

- 14. Both Patient A and Respondent signed the Residential Lease Agreement Addendum.
- 15. Text messages between Patient A and Respondent dated March 29, 2021, show Patient A wishing Respondent a happy birthday with both of them declaring love for each other.
- Text messages that same day also mention a "'dessert' anniversary" for 16. Respondent and Patient A that would be on March 30.
- The Board investigator received copies of multiple text messages between 17. Respondent and Patient A that appear to be dated between February 2021, through June 2021.
- 18. These text messages between Patient A and Respondent include declarations of love and appreciation for each other.
- These text messages allude to a sexual relationship between Patient A and 19. Respondent.
- 20. These text messages include a request from Patient A to Respondent asking him to "pls send the RX In," and Respondent replied, "I sent the meds".
- 21. These text messages include a message from Respondent to Patient A saying, "First action was to wire the funds to your account" and later "\$5G sent."
- 22. These text messages include a reference to a trip to Costa Rica that Patient A and Respondent were intending to take.
- 23. The Board investigator received additional information regarding the trip to Costa Rica including an email receipt for plane tickets for both Respondent and Patient A to/from Costa Rica as well as a receipt for a hotel stay in Costa Rica.
- According to the information received by the Board investigator, Respondent and 24. Patient A took a trip to Costa Rica from September 29, 2019, to October 6, 2019.
- 25. The Board investigator received information regarding multiple electronic fund transfers via Zelle from Respondent to Patient A.
- Romantic or sexual interactions between physicians and patients that occur 26. concurrently with the patient-physician relationship violate the standard of care for the practice of psychiatry.

27. Romantic or sexual interactions between physicians and patients that occur concurrently with the patient-physician relationship detract from the goals of the patient-physician relationship.

- 28. Romantic or sexual interactions between physicians and patients that occur concurrently with the patient-physician relationship may exploit the vulnerability of the patient, compromise the physician's ability to make objective judgements and decisions about the patient's health care, and ultimately may be detrimental to the patient's well-being.
- 29. It is a violation of the standard of care for a physician to prescribe medications to a patient that he or she has a romantic and/or sexual relationship with.
- 30. According to Patient A's Patient Report from the Nevada State Board of Pharmacy's Prescription Monitoring Program (PMP), Respondent provided nine (9) prescriptions for controlled substances to Patient A from March 2, 2019, through March 2, 2022.⁶
- 31. Specifically, Respondent provided the following prescriptions to Patient A during this time period:

Medication	Quantity	Days	Date Written	Date Filled
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	90	30	3/19/2019	3/20/2019
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	90	30	4/18/2019	4/22/2019
Zolpidem Tartrate 10 mg Tablet	30	30	4/10/2020	4/10/2020
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	60	30	3/16/2021	3/18/2021
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	60	30	4/16/2021	4/16/2021
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	60	30	5/19/2021	5/19/2021
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	60	30	6/14/2021	6/17/2021
Alprazolam .5 mg Tablet	30	30	6/30/2021	6/30/2021
Dextroamp-Amphetamin 30 mg Tablet	60	30	7/19/2021	7/19/2021

⁶ Respondent may have prescribed medications to Patient A prior to 2019 in conjunction with her appointments in 2014, 2015, and 2018, but the Board investigator's access to PMP records is limited to the preceding three (3) years. The Board investigator's query of Patient A's Patient Report from the PMP for this investigation was from March 2, 2019 to March 2, 2022.

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

32.	Respondent's prescribing of controlled substances for Patient A, as listed above
overlapped w	ith Respondent and Patient A's personal relationship that was romantic and/or sexual
in nature.	

- Patient A's prescription for Zolpidem Tartrate (Ambien) 10 mg Tablets, 33. 30 quantity, for 30 days, was written on April 10, 2020, and there is not sufficient justification for this prescription in her medical records for her telemedicine appointment with Respondent on this day.
- Under "Assessment," her medical records indicate "[i]nsomnia, unspecified 34. G47.00."
- However, there is nothing listed in the "Chief Complaint" section or other portion 35. of Patient A's medical records for April 10, 2020, that indicates that Patient A was experiencing a symptom that warranted her need to receive a prescription for a controlled substance to help with sleep.
- Respondent also does not make any note in Patient A's medical records regarding 36. his decision to prescribe Ambien to Patient A on April 10, 2020.
- A review of Patient A's medical records maintained by Respondent show other 37. concerns with regard to the completeness and accuracy of those records, including but not limited to the following:
- In a progress note dated January 29, 2014, Patient A's medical records A. outlined symptoms of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and states in the "Chief Complaint" section that Patient A often loses "pencils, toys, assignments," and that her "grades are poor."
- Upon information and belief, this error is due to Respondent using a B. template for symptoms of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in a child/adolescent.
- Similarly, on that same day, January 29, 2014, Respondent assesses C. Patient A with, "Attention Deficit Disorder of Childhood Without Hyperactivity 314.00."
 - This is inaccurate given that Patient A was a 28-year old female on that day. D.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- These same errors are included in Patient A's medical records for an E. appointment with Respondent on March 16, 2021, in the "Chief Complaint" section.
- Upon information and belief, these errors are included due to Respondent's F. use of a template and his failure to review that template to ensure that only accurate information about Patient A's medical condition and symptoms are included in her medical records.
- Use of templates is not helpful if Patient A's medical records are not G. updated with interim information that accurately reflect Patient A's symptoms, diagnoses, and treatment plan.
- According to Patient A's Patient History Report in the PMP, Respondent only 38. queried Patient A's prescription history twice. Both queries regarding Patient A occurred on the same day, March 18, 2022.
- Respondent was prescribing dextroamphetamine-amphetamine (Adderall) to 39. Patient A in daily quantities of 60 mg to 90 mg per day during the time period at issue in this complaint.
- The Federal Drug Administration has found that only in rare cases is it necessary to 40. prescribe more than 40 mg per day to a patient.
- Respondent does not address this issue and/or his decision to prescribe Adderall to 41. Patient A at these higher levels in her medical records.

COUNT I

NRS 630.301(4) - Malpractice

- All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by 42. reference as though fully set forth herein.
- NRS 630.301(4) provides that malpractice of a physician is grounds for initiating 43. disciplinary action against a licensee.

111

26 ///

27

⁷ These same errors are not seen in Patient A's medical records for other visits with Respondent in 2014, 2015, 2019, 2020, and 2021. Upon information and belief, these errors highlight a copy and paste error and/or an over-reliance on templates in Patient A's medical records.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4	44.	N	AC 6	30.040 defir	nes ma	lpractio	ce as	s "the failure	of a physi	cian .	in tr	eating a
patient,	to	use	the	reasonable	care,	skill,	or	knowledge	ordinarily	used	under	simila
circums	tanc	es."										

- As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent failed 45. to use the reasonable care, skill or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances when rendering medical services to Patient A when he treated her as a patient and prescribed controlled substances to her at the same time that he had a romantic and/or sexual relationship with her and/or when he failed to check Patient A's Patient Report from the PMP and/or when he failed to justify and/or explain his prescription of Ambien for Patient A in her medical records and/or when he failed to justify and/or explain prescribing Adderall to Patient A at levels exceeding those recommended by the FDA in her medical records.
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 46. provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT II

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

- All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by 47. reference as though fully set forth herein.
- NRS 630.3062(1)(a) provides that the "failure to maintain timely, legible, accurate 48. and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient" constitute grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.
- Respondent failed to maintain complete medical records relating to his care of 49. Patient A by failing to ensure that her medical records were clear, legible, accurate, and complete.
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 50. provided in NRS 630.352.

111

26 ///

/// 27

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

COUNT III

NRS 630.306(1)(b)(3) - Violation of Statutes and Regulations of the **Nevada State Board of Pharmacy**

- All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by 51. reference as though fully set forth herein.
- NRS 639.23507 requires that a prescribing practitioner before issuing an initial 52. prescription for controlled substances listed in schedule II, III, or IV, or an opioid that is a controlled substance listed in schedule V, and at least once every ninety (90) days thereafter for the duration of the course of treatment using the controlled substance, obtain a patient utilization report (Patient Report) regarding the patient from the PMP.
- Respondent failed to obtain Patient Reports for Patient A as required by 53. NRS 639.23507.
 - 54. This conduct violates NRS 630.306(1)(b)(3).
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 55. provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT IV

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

- All of the allegations in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated as if fully set 56. forth herein.
- Engaging in any act that is unsafe or unprofessional conduct in accordance with 57. regulations adopted by the Board is grounds for disciplinary action against a licensee pursuant to NRS 630.306(1)(p).
- As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent wrote 58. prescriptions to Patient A for Adderall in a manner that deviated from the standard of care for the prescribing of Adderall and Respondent engaged in a romantic and/or sexual relationship while treating her as a patient and/or prescribing controlled substances to her.
 - Respondent's conduct as summarized in ¶ 58 was unsafe and unprofessional. 59.

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

111

By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 60. provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT V

NRS 630.301(9) - Disreputable Conduct

- 61. All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- NRS 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical 62. profession into disrepute is grounds for initiating disciplinary action or denying licensure.
- Respondent engaged in conduct that brings the medical profession into disrepute by 63. providing psychiatric care to Patient A while he was engaged in a romantic and/or sexual relationship with her.
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 64. provided in NRS 630.352.

COUNT VI

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

- All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by 65. reference as though fully set forth herein.
- NRS 630.301(7) provides that "engaging in conduct that violates the trust of a 66. patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and the patient for financial or other personal gain" is grounds for initiating discipline against a licensee.
- As demonstrated by, but not limited to, the above-outlined facts, Respondent 67. violated the trust of Patient A and exploited the physician-patient relationship between Respondent and Patient A by gaining intimate knowledge of Patient A during psychiatric treatment, while concurrently engaging in a romantic and/or sexual relationship with her.
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 68. provided in NRS 630.352.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNT VII

NRS 630.3062(1)(h) - Fraudulent, Illegal, Unauthorized, or Otherwise Inappropriate Prescribing of Controlled Substances Listed in Schedule II, III, or IV

- All of the allegations contained in the above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by 69. reference as though fully set forth herein.
- By prescribing medications to Patient A while he was engaged in a romantic and/or 70. sexual relationship with Patient A, Respondent engaged in fraudulent, illegal, unauthorized, or otherwise inappropriate prescribing of controlled substances listed in schedule II, III, or IV.
 - This conduct violates NRS 630.3062(1)(h). 71.
- By reason of the foregoing, Respondent is subject to discipline by the Board as 72. provided in NRS 630.352.

WHEREFORE, the Investigative Committee prays:

- That the Board give Respondent notice of the charges herein against him and give 1. 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;
- That the Board set a time and place for a formal hearing after holding an Early 2. Case Conference pursuant to NRS 630.339(3);
- That the Board determine what sanctions to impose if it determines there has been 3. a violation or violations of the Medical Practice Act committed by Respondent;
- That the Board award fees and costs for the investigation and prosecution of this 4. case as outlined in NRS 622.400;
- That the Board make, issue, and serve on Respondent its findings of fact, 5. conclusions of law and order, in writing, that includes the sanctions imposed; and

111

26 ///

27 ///

	1	ı
	2	
	3	
	4	i
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	ľ
ì	13	
200 (200)	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 23 day of February, 2024.
INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS
By: SARAH A. BRADLEY, J.D., MBA Deputy Executive Director 9600 Gateway Drive Reno, NV 89521 Tel: (775) 688-2559 Email: bradleys@medboard.nv.gov Attorney for the Investigative Committee

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners

VERIFICATION

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 23 day of February, 2024.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By:

BRET W. FRLY, M.D.

Chairman of the Investigative Committee

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am employed by the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and that on the 26th day of February, 2024, I served a file-stamped copy of the foregoing COMPLAINT and PATIENT DESIGNATION via USPS Certified Mail, postage pre-paid, to the following parties:

MATTHEW OBIM OKEKE, M.D. c/o Liborius Agwara, Esq. Law Offices of Libo Agwara, Ltd. 2785 E. Desert Inn Rd., Ste. 280 Las Vegas, NV 89121

Tracking No.: 9171 9690 0935 0241 6159 78

DATED this _____day of February, 2024.

MERCEDES FUENTES

Legal Assistant

Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners