

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. 22-27891-1

6   **Against:**

**FILED**

7   **GEORGE PETER CHAMBERS, M.D.**

SEP 21 2022

8   **Respondent.**

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF  
MEDICAL EXAMINERS  
By: 

9  
10                                   **COMPLAINT**

11           The Investigative Committee<sup>1</sup> (IC) of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners  
12 (Board), by and through Brandee Mooneyhan, J.D., Deputy General Counsel and attorney for the  
13 IC, having a reasonable basis to believe that George Peter Chambers, M.D., (Respondent) violated  
14 the provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 and Nevada Administrative Code  
15 (NAC) Chapter 630 (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), hereby issues its Complaint, stating the  
16 IC's charges 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. 10476). Respondent was  
19 originally licensed by the Board on April 30, 2003, and specializes in obstetrics and gynecology.

20           2.       As noted by the Committee on Ethics of the American College of Obstetricians and  
21 Gynecologists (ACOG), the "relationship between obstetrician-gynecologists and their  
22 patients . . . requires a high level of trust and professional responsibility," because the practice of  
23 this medical specialty "includes interactions in times of intense emotion and vulnerability for  
24 patients and involves sensitive physical examinations and medically necessary disclosure of  
25 private information about symptoms and experiences." See AGOC Committee Opinion No. 796,  
26 *Sexual Misconduct* (January 2020).

27  
28           <sup>1</sup> 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 Victor M. Muro, M.D., Chowdhury H. Ahsan,  
M.D., Ph.D., FACC, and Ms. Pamela J. Beal.



1 Nonetheless, Patient A did as Respondent directed and sent the two (2) photographs via text  
2 message to the phone number Respondent provided.

3 13. In his medical record of the November 17, 2020, encounter, Respondent indicated  
4 that he inserted two (2) fingers in Patient A's vagina, stating: "On sizing the introital opening with  
5 my two examining fingers, the vagina opened to a width of 7cm horizontally and vertically."

6 14. In his response to a request for information in the IC's investigation of this matter,  
7 Respondent repeated his assertion that he inserted only two (2) fingers in Patient A's vagina  
8 during the November 17, 2020, encounter, stating that he "inserted one finger into her vagina" in  
9 his evaluation of her pelvic floor muscles, and "then inserted [his] two examining fingers to check  
10 the tonicity of her pubococcygeus muscles by asking her to squeeze her vagina."

11 15. Respondent did not document in the medical record, nor inform the IC during its  
12 investigation, that during the November 17, 2020, encounter with Patient A, he inserted four (4)  
13 fingers into her vagina.

14 16. After his physical examination of Patient A, Respondent informed Patient A that  
15 during the examination, he had attempted to "fist" her, that is, insert his entire hand into her  
16 vagina, *see Artemie v. State*, No. A-10463, 2011 WL 5904452, at \*8 (Alaska Ct. App. Nov. 23,  
17 2011), but had been unable to insert his entire hand, and he showed her how much of his hand he  
18 had been able to insert.

19 17. Respondent also showed Patient A the two (2) photographs that she had texted him,  
20 which he had printed following the physical examination, and used them to explain the procedures  
21 he proposed to perform on her. Respondent included the two (2) photographs in Patient A's  
22 medical record.

23 18. After her encounter with Respondent on November 17, 2020, Patient A suffered  
24 pain and tenderness in her genital area.

25 19. The other approximately ten (10) photographs Respondent took of Patient A's  
26 vaginal and rectal area, which he did not direct her to send to him, were not for purposes of  
27 medical examination or treatment.

28 ///





**COUNT IV**

**NRS 630.3062(1)(a) – Failure to Maintain Accurate Medical Records**

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

37. 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.

38. Respondent failed to maintain accurate and complete medical records relating to the diagnosis, treatment and care of Patient A when he failed to document in the record of his November 17, 2020, encounter with her that he had inserted four (4) fingers into her vagina during the encounter.

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

**PATIENT B**

40. Patient B<sup>3</sup> was a thirty-five (35) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.

41. Patient B was a patient of Respondent for several years, and had an appointment with him on October 29, 2018.

42. During his October 29, 2018, encounter with Patient B, Respondent explained that he would pay her or other patients one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to allow him to take, or arrange for the taking of, nude photographs of the patient(s), ostensibly to use in an advertisement for his services.

43. The nude photographs for which Respondent offered to pay Patient B or other patients were not for purposes of medical examination or treatment.

44. Telling Patient B during a medical encounter that he would pay her or other patients one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to pose for nude photographs that were not for purposes of medical examination or treatment was sexually suggestive and/or sexually demeaning to Patient B and violated the professional boundaries of a medical encounter between a doctor and a patient.

---

<sup>3</sup> Patient B’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.

COUNT V

**NRS 630.301(7) – Engaging in Conduct That Violates the Trust of a Patient and Exploits the Relationship With the Patient for Financial or Other Personal Gain**

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

46. NRS 630.307(7) provides that “engaging in conduct that violates the trust of the patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and the patient for financial or other personal gain” constitutes grounds for initiating discipline against a physician.

47. In expressing to Patient B in the midst of a medical encounter that he would pay her or other patients one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to pose for nude photographs for Respondent to use for purposes other than for medical examination or treatment, Respondent violated Patient B’s trust and exploited his relationship with her in order to realize financial or other personal gain for himself.

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

**PATIENT C**

49. Patient C<sup>4</sup> was a twenty-seven (27) year-old female at the time of the events at issue.

50. Patient C visited Respondent’s practice in 2019 for routine gynecological care and to address dysmenorrhea and pelvic pain.

51. At an encounter on or about October 15, 2019, Patient C mentioned to Respondent that she was struggling financially.

52. After the October 15, 2019, encounter, Respondent told Patient C he was seeking models to participate in a photography session in which photos would be taken of the model’s vaginal area and nude body, ostensibly for inclusion in Respondent’s “portfolio” of work and/or an advertisement. Respondent offered to pay Patient C one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to

///

---

<sup>4</sup> Patient C’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 participate in such a photography session, as well as give her a thumb drive with the “boudoir”  
2 photos resulting from the session.

3 53. Patient C thought it was odd that Respondent was soliciting photographs of her  
4 vaginal area as representative of his work because he had never performed any cosmetic  
5 procedure on her genitals.

6 54. The nude photographs for which Respondent offered to pay Patient C were not for  
7 purposes of medical examination or treatment.

8 55. Offering to pay Patient C one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to pose for nude  
9 photographs that were not for purposes of medical examination or treatment was sexually  
10 suggestive and/or sexually demeaning to Patient C and violated the professional boundaries of a  
11 medical encounter between a doctor and a patient.

12 **COUNT VI**

13 **NRS 630.301(7) – Engaging in Conduct That Violates the Trust of a Patient and Exploits the**  
14 **Relationship With the Patient for Financial or Other Personal Gain**

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

17 57. NRS 630.307(7) provides that “engaging in conduct that violates the trust of the  
18 patient and exploits the relationship between the physician and the patient for financial or other  
19 personal gain” constitutes grounds for initiating discipline against a physician.

20 58. In offering to pay Patient C one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to pose for nude  
21 photographs for Respondent to use for purposes other than for appropriate medical examination or  
22 treatment, Respondent violated Patient C’s trust and exploited his relationship with her in order to  
23 realize financial or other personal gain for himself.

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

26 **PATIENTS A, B, AND C**

27 60. As set forth by the above-outlined facts, Respondent has demonstrated a pattern of  
28 failing to use the reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used by obstetrician-



1 gynecologists in good standing by repeatedly engaging in sexual improprieties with more than one  
2 patient.

3 61. As set forth by the above-outlined facts, Respondent repeatedly exploited his  
4 relationships with patients and violated patients' trust by engaging in sexual improprieties that  
5 constitute sexual misconduct.

6 62. Respondent's repeated acts of sexual misconduct and violations of the Medical  
7 Practice Act as set forth above undermine the public's trust and respect for the medical profession  
8 and thereby bring the medical profession into disrepute.

9 **COUNT VII**

10 **NRS 630.306(1)(g) – Continual Failure to Practice Medicine Properly**

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

13 64. NRS 630.306(1)(g) provides that "continual failure to exercise the skill or diligence  
14 or use the methods ordinarily exercised under the same circumstances by physicians in good  
15 standing practicing in the same specialty or field" constitutes grounds for initiating discipline  
16 against a physician.

17 65. By repeatedly engaging in sexual misconduct with Patients A, B, and C, as set forth  
18 above, Respondent has continually failed to exercise the skill and diligence and use the methods  
19 ordinarily exercised under the same circumstances by physicians in good standing practicing in his  
20 field of obstetrics and gynecology.

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

23 **COUNT VIII**

24 **NRS 630.301(9) – Disreputable Conduct**

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

27 68. NRS 630.301(9) provides that engaging in conduct that brings the medical  
28 profession into disrepute constitutes grounds for initiating discipline against a physician.



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

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     )

Victor M. Muro, 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 21 day of September, 2022.

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: *Victor M. Muro*  
VICTOR M. MURO, M.D.  
*Chairman of the Investigative Committee*

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

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4  
5 **In the Matter of Charges and**  
6 **Complaint Against**  
7 **GEORGE PETER CHAMBERS, Jr., M.D.**  
8 **Respondent.**

Case No. 22-27891-1

FILED

OCT - 2 2023

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF  
MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By: 

9  
10 **FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER**

11 The above-entitled matter came on regularly for decision before the Nevada State Board of  
12 Medical Examiners (Board), on September 15, 2023, at the Board's office located at 9600  
13 Gateway Drive, Reno, Nevada, 89521, on the Complaint filed herein.  
14 George Peter Chambers, Jr., M.D., (Respondent), who was duly served with notice of the  
15 adjudication, was present and represented by his counsel, Liborius I. Agwara, Esq. The  
16 adjudicating members of the Board participating in these Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law,  
17 and Order (FOFCOL) were: Aury Nagy, M.D., Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel, Bret W. Frey, M.D.,  
18 Col. Eric D. Wade, USAF (Ret.), Carl N. Williams, M.D., and Irwin B. Simon, M.D., FACS.  
19 Harry Ward, Esq., Deputy Attorney General, served as legal counsel to the Board.

20 The Board, having received and read the Complaint and exhibits admitted in the matter  
21 and filed into the record in this case, the "Findings and Recommendations/Synopsis of Record,"  
22 (Findings and Recommendations) prepared by the Hearing Officer, Nancy Moss Ghusn, Esq., who  
23 presided over the hearing, and the transcript of the hearing, proceeded to make a decision pursuant  
24 to the provisions of Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 630 and Nevada Administrative  
25 Code (NAC) Chapter 630 (collectively, the Medical Practice Act), NRS Chapter 622A, and NRS  
26 Chapter 233B, as applicable.

27 ///

28 ///

1 The Board, after due consideration of the record, evidence and law, and being fully  
2 advised in the premises, makes its FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND  
3 ORDER in this matter, as follows:

4 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

5 **I.**

6 Respondent held a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada issued by the Board  
7 at all relevant times.

8 **II.**

9 On September 21, 2022, the Investigative Committee filed its formal Complaint in Case  
10 No. 22-27891-1, alleging Respondent violated the Medical Practice Act. Respondent was  
11 personally served with the Complaint on September 26, 2022. The Complaint alleged eight (8)  
12 violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Acts, including: two (2) violations of NRS 630.301(6)  
13 – Disruptive Behavior (Counts I and II); one (1) violation of NRS 630.306(1)(b)(1) - Engaging in  
14 Conduct Intended to Deceive (Count III); one (1) violation of NRS 630.3062(1)(a) - Failure to  
15 Maintain Accurate Medical Records (Count IV); two (2) violations of NRS 630.301(7) - Engaging  
16 in Conduct That Violates the Trust of a Patient and Exploits the Relationship with the Patient for  
17 Financial or Other Personal Gain (Counts V and VI); one (1) violation of NRS 630.306(1)(g) -  
18 Continual Failure to Practice Medicine Properly (Count VII); and one (1) violation of  
19 NRS 630.301(9) - Disreputable Conduct (Count VIII). Respondent filed an answer in response to  
20 the allegations set forth in the Complaint.

21 **III.**

22 An Order was filed on October 26, 2022, scheduling the Early Case Conference (ECC) for  
23 the pending matter for October 31, 2022. This Order was served upon Respondent's counsel at  
24 that time, Maria Nutile, Esq., by email and US Mail. The Early Case Conference was held at the  
25 scheduled time wherein all parties appeared telephonically. As a result of the ECC, the  
26 Pre-Hearing Conference was scheduled for November 21, 2022. Respondent's counsel at the time,  
27 Ms. Nutile, was served a copy of the Scheduling Order by email and US Mail. At the time fixed  
28 for the Pre-Hearing Conference, legal counsel for the Investigative Committee, Brandee

1 Mooneyhan, Deputy General Counsel, appeared, as well as the Hearing Officer, Nancy Moss  
2 Ghusn, Esq. and counsel for Respondent, Maria Nutile, Esq. At the Pre-Hearing Conference,  
3 counsel for the Investigative Committee and Respondent provided the Hearing Officer with the  
4 mandated Pre-Hearing Conference Disclosures and had copies of both the Pre-Hearing  
5 Conference Statement and the mandated Pre-Hearing Disclosures available for the parties.  
6 Respondent was timely and properly served with the Pre-Hearing Conference Statement and the  
7 mandated Pre-Hearing Disclosures in accord with NRS and NAC Chapters 630, NRS Chapters  
8 241, 622A and 233B, and the requirements of due process. At the Pre-Hearing Conference, dates  
9 for hearing were set and an Order Setting Hearing was issued on December 6, 2022, with the  
10 formal hearing to commence on February 15 and 16, 2023. These hearing dates were eventually  
11 vacated and an Order Rescheduling Hearing was issued March 8, 2023, scheduling the formal  
12 hearing to commence May 2, 2023, May 3, 2023, and June 1, 2023.

13 IV.

14 On May 2, 2023, May 3, 2023, June 1, 2023, and June 2, 2023, a contested case hearing  
15 was held before the Hearing Officer to receive evidence and to hear arguments. The Hearing  
16 Officer received the complete Record of Proceedings, including the transcript of the testimony  
17 received and the exhibits admitted. Upon receipt of the Record of Proceedings, the hearing was  
18 closed. The Hearing Officer filed the Findings and Recommendations on August 21, 2023. The  
19 matter was scheduled for final adjudication on September 15, 2023, at a regularly scheduled  
20 Board meeting. The notice of the adjudication was mailed to Respondent on August 16, 2023, via  
21 US Certified Mail, with a copy by email as well. On August 21, 2023, Respondent was sent a  
22 copy of the Hearing Officer's Findings and Recommendations via Fed Ex 2-Day Mail, with a  
23 copy by email. Additionally, on September 5, 2023, via Fed Ex 2-Day mail, Respondent was  
24 given a copy of the Memorandum of and Disbursements and Attorneys' Fees and a packet of the  
25 materials to be presented as the scheduled Board meeting.

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

V.

Pursuant to NRS 622A.300(5)(a), the Findings and Recommendations of the Hearing Officer are hereby approved by the Board in their entirety and are hereby specifically incorporated and made part of this Order by reference. *See Exhibit 1.*

VI.

In accord with the Findings and Recommendations, the Board hereby finds that Counts V, VI, VII and VIII set forth in the Complaint, as recapitulated in Paragraph II above, have been established by a preponderance of the evidence.

VII.

If any of the foregoing Findings of Fact is more properly deemed a Conclusion of Law, it may be so construed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

The Board has jurisdiction over Respondent and the Complaint, and an adjudication of this matter by the Board members as set forth herein is proper.

II.

Respondent was timely and properly served with the Complaint, and all notices and orders in advance of the hearing and adjudication thereon, in accord with NRS and NAC Chapters 630, NRS Chapters 241, 622A and 233B, and the requirements of due process.

III.

With respect to the allegations of the Complaint, the Board concludes that Respondent has violated NRS 630.301(7), as alleged in Count V and VI; has violated NRS 630.306(1)(g), as alleged in Count VII; and has violated NRS 630.301(9) as alleged in Count VIII. Accordingly Respondent is subject to discipline pursuant to NRS 630.352.

IV.

The Board finds that, pursuant to NRS 622.400, it may recover from Respondent reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by the Board as part of its investigative administrative and disciplinary proceedings against Respondent as it hereby enters this Finding

1 of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order finding that Respondent has violated the Medical Practice  
2 Act, which the Board has the authority to enforce.

3 V.

4 The Board has reviewed the Investigative Committee's Memorandum of Costs and  
5 Disbursements and Attorneys' Fees, and the Board finds them to be the actual fees and costs  
6 incurred by the Board as part of its investigative, administrative and disciplinary proceedings  
7 against Respondent, and finds them to be reasonable based on: (1) the abilities, training,  
8 education, experience, professional standing and skill demonstrated by Board staff and attorneys;  
9 (2) the character of the work done, its difficulty, its intricacy, its importance, the time and skill  
10 required, the responsibility imposed and the prominence and character of the parties where, as in  
11 this case, they affected the importance of the litigation; (3) the work actually performed by the  
12 Board's attorneys and staff, and the skill, time and attention given to that work; and (4) the  
13 product of the work and benefits to the Board and the people of Nevada that were derived  
14 therefrom.

15 VI.

16 If any of the foregoing Conclusions of Law is more properly deemed a Finding of Fact, it  
17 may be so construed.

18 **ORDER**

19 Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and good cause  
20 appearing therefore,

21 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

22 1. Pursuant to NRS 630.352(4)(e) and NRS 622A.410(1), respectively, Respondent's  
23 license to practice medicine, License No. 10476, is immediately revoked and Respondent may no  
24 apply for reinstatement of a license for a period of two (2) years, with this revocation stayed  
25 pending Respondent's timely completion of the following items:

26 a. Sign an appropriate release with CPEP and complete and unconditionally  
27 pass the PROBE Ethics & Boundaries Course offered by CPEP on or before March 15, 2024.<sup>1</sup>

28 <sup>1</sup> Information about this course is available at <https://www.cpepdoc.org/cpep-courses/probe-ethics-boundaries-program-united-states-2/>.



1           b.       Satisfactorily complete the Professional Boundaries Program through  
2 PACE at the University of San Diego by March 15, 2024.

3           c.       Respondent shall reimburse the Board the reasonable costs and expenses  
4 actually incurred in the investigation and prosecution of this case in the amount of fifty-four  
5 thousand two hundred seventeen dollars and thirty-seven cents (\$54,217.37) by  
6 March 15, 2024; and

7           d.       Respondent shall pay fines in the amount of one thousand five hundred  
8 dollars (\$1,500) for each count found proven, for a total of six thousand dollars (\$6,000), by  
9 March 15, 2024.

10         2.       Respondent's license will be on probation for two (2) years and his license will be  
11 subject to the following conditions until further order of the Board:

12           a.       Respondent shall continue to strictly comply with the terms set forth in the  
13 previously signed Stipulation and Order, filed February 22, 2023, specifically:

14                 i.       Respondent shall refrain from taking photos or videos of any  
15 patient;

16                 ii.       In non-hospital settings, Respondent shall be accompanied by a  
17 medical chaperone during the entirety of all patient interactions;

18                         a.       Respondent shall submit the names of proposed medical  
19 chaperones to the Board's Compliance Officer at least three (3) days prior to utilizing them;

20                         b.       All chaperones will have documented training as a medical  
21 chaperone, *see* <https://pbieducation.com/courses/ctp-2/>, with certificate of such training provided  
22 to the Board's Compliance Officer prior to them acting as a chaperone;

23                         c.       Respondent shall be responsible for recording the first and  
24 last name of the chaperone present in the record of every patient encounter;

25                         d.       Respondent shall notify the IC within twenty-four (24) hours  
26 if there is a change to the identity or availability of the chaperone;

27       ///

28       ///

1 e. Respondent shall allow Board personnel and/or a private  
2 monitoring company (for example, Strategic Management Services or similar) to review any  
3 patient records and/or interact with chaperones without prior notice to him; and

4 f. Respondent shall bear all costs related to the required  
5 chaperones.

6 iii. In hospital settings, Respondent will ensure the presence of a nurse  
7 during all patient examinations (including but not limited to pelvic examinations) and deliveries  
8 and be responsible for ensuring that the nurse's presence is recorded in the notes of all such  
9 encounters.

10 b. After two (2) years from the date of this Order, Respondent may petition  
11 the Board to appear at a public meeting to request the Board remove the foregoing conditions on  
12 his license.

13 3. Respondent shall immediately cease advertising or holding himself out, on his  
14 website, social media platforms, letterhead, or other communications to current or potential  
15 patients that he is "certified" in any area unless it is in strict compliance with the provisions of  
16 NRS 629.076(1).

17 4. Respondent shall be issued a Public Letter of Reprimand; and

18 5. Respondent's discipline shall be reported to the appropriate entities, including the  
19 National Practitioner Databank (NPDB).

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 DATED this 2nd day of October, 2023.

22  
23 NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 NICK M. SPIRTOS, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.  
27 President of the Board  
28

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

CERTIFICATION

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

I certify that the foregoing is the full and true original FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER on file in the office of the Board of Medical Examiners in the matter of George Peter Chambers, Jr., M.D., Case No. 22-27891-1.

I further certify that Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., is the President of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners and that full force and credit is due to his official acts as such; and that the signature to the foregoing ORDER is the signature of said Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand in my official capacity as Secretary-Treasurer of the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners.

DATED this 2nd day of October, 2023.

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS



MAGGIE ARIAS-PETREL  
*Secretary-Treasurer and Public Member of the Board*