

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

9600 Gateway Drive
Reno, NV 89521

Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.
Board President



Edward O. Cousineau, J.D.
Executive Director

*** * * MINUTES * * ***

OPEN SESSION BOARD MEETING

Held in the Conference Room at the Offices of the
Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners
325 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 225, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

and Videoconferenced to

The Conference Room at the Offices of the
Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners
9600 Gateway Drive, Reno, Nevada 89521

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2026 – 8:00 a.m.

Board Members Present

Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., President
Bret W. Frey, M.D., Vice President
Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel, Secretary-Treasurer
Chowdhury H. Ahsan, M.D., Ph.D., FACC
Ms. Pamela J. Beal
Irwin B. Simon, M.D., FACS
Joseph Olivarez, P.A.-C
Jason B. Farnsworth, RRT, MBA
Hugh L. Bassewitz, M.D., FAAOS
Apeksha Desai, M.D., MBA
Ms. Kathleen A. Conaboy

Board Members Absent

None

Staff/Others Present

Edward O. Cousineau, J.D., Executive Director
Sarah A. Bradley, J.D., MBA, Deputy Executive Director
Donya Jenkins, Chief of Finance and Human Resources
Laurie L. Munson, Chief of Administration and Information Systems
Ernesto Diaz, Chief of Investigations
Deonne E. Contine, J.D., General Counsel
Donald K. White, J.D., Senior Deputy General Counsel
Ian J. Cumings, J.D., Senior Deputy General Counsel
William P. Shogren, J.D., Deputy General Counsel
Alexander J. Hinman, J.D., Deputy General Counsel
Kory Linn, Chief of Licensing
Rosalie Bordelove, J.D., Chief Deputy Attorney General

Agenda Item 1

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Roll Call/Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., at 8:07 a.m.

Mr. Cousineau took roll call. All Board members were present with the exception of Irwin B. Simon, M.D., FACS, and Jason B. Farnsworth, RRT, MBA. Mr. Cousineau announced there was a quorum.

Agenda Item 2

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Spirtos asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment. No public comment was received.

Agenda Item 3

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- (a) January 29, 2026 Board Meeting – Open Session
- (b) February 20, 2026 Board Meeting – Open Session

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the Minutes of the January 29, 2026 Board Meeting – Open Session. Dr. Ahsan seconded the motion, and it passed, with Ms. Conaboy abstaining because she was not present at the January 29, 2026 Board Meeting and all remaining Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the Minutes of the February 20, 2026 Board Meeting – Open Session. Ms. Conaboy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (NAC) CHAPTER 630

a) Update Regarding Regulations, LCB File No. R055-25, Needed to Fully Implement the Licensure and Regulation of Genetic Counselors Pursuant to SB189 From the 2025 Legislative Session

Ms. Bradley provided an update regarding these proposed regulations. She reported that the Legislative Commission considered the regulations at a meeting held on February 26, 2026, and voted six in favor of approving the regulations and six against approving the regulations. Because a majority did not vote in favor of approving the regulations, they were not approved at that meeting. The objection raised by Senator Daly and the other Commission members who voted against approving the regulations was that the regulation draft allowed the Genetic Counseling Advisory Council to continue past the 2031 sunset contained in the enabling statute. To modify the regulations to address this objection, Ms. Bradley stated that the regulations would need to be revised by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) as we request, a second public hearing would be required to be held, and the revised regulations would again be brought back to the Board for adoption. Therefore, the regulations will not be effective for several more months. Ms. Bradley explained that the regulation draft proposed continuing the Advisory Council consistent with the Board's pattern and practice of creating an advisory body for professions that are licensed by the Board but do not have representation on the Board. She said she thought what needed to be done was to remove Sections 29–31 from the regulation and resubmit it for approval and perhaps revisit this issue in 2030.

(b) Update Regarding Regulations, LCB File No. R112-25, Needed to Fully Implement Limited Licensure and Regulation for Foreign Trained Medical Doctors Pursuant to SB124 From the 2025 Legislative Session

Ms. Bradley stated she had just received a draft of LCB File Number R112-25, the regulations pertaining to foreign medical graduates and foreign-trained physicians and would circulate the draft to the Board members that afternoon. She requested that they review the draft and provide comments and said she would also review it to ensure it contained what the Board wanted. She explained the next step would be to schedule a public hearing and said she hoped she would be able to present the regulations for adoption at the Board's June meeting.

Dr. Frey asked how many potential applicants the Board anticipated.

Ms. Bradley provided an estimate of potential applicant interest. She said as of January 2026, the Office of New Americans had a list of 120 interested individuals and approximately 80 individuals had contacted the Board directly and noted that a couple of applicants were close to having all required materials ready. She stated the Board had created a dedicated email address for applicants and inquiries related to SB 124, sb124info@medboard.nv.gov, and that the Board was working with the Office of New Americans (ONA) to identify potential applicants and to share information with potential applicants and members of the community. She said the ONA Director, Iris Jones, has been a really good partner with the Board.

(c) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process on Proposed Amendments to NAC 630.050, NAC 630.135, NAC 630.230(1)(m), NAC 630.505(2)(a), NAC 630.513, NAC 630.715, Section 10 From LCB File No. R068-23, Section 12 From LCB File No. R069-23, and Sections 2, 5, 6 and 7 From LCB File No. R033-24; Adding A New Provision Clarifying the Requirements for Licensure By Endorsement as a Physician Pursuant to NRS 630.1605(1)(b)(3)(II), as Amended; Adding New Provisions Regarding Deficiencies in a Physician Assistant or Genetic Counselor Application for Licensure Which Prevent Further Action on the Application or Result in Denial of the Application

Ms. Bradley summarized the proposed regulatory changes. Some of the changes are intended to incorporate changes made in the 2025 Legislative Session. One such amendment is to NRS 630.1605 regarding licensure by endorsement. She explained the statute removed the 36-month progressive postgraduate training requirement for licensure by endorsement and allows the Board to prescribe by regulation other areas the Board could waive for such applicants. She noted some difficulty in drafting clear language in this regard and emphasized that issuance of any license is always discretionary.

Discussion ensued regarding the 36-month progressive postgraduate training requirement. Ms. Bradley stated the definition of progressive postgraduate training had been updated in the statute.

She explained the proposed regulations also added the ability to appeal a denial of licensure in NAC 630.135, which is consistent with regulations for other licensé types issued by the Board, and said the remaining proposed changes were largely clean-up language and consistency edits.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board proceed with the proposed regulatory changes. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 5

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF ATIF B. MALIK, M.D., FOR BOARD AUTHORIZATION TO TAKE THE SPECIAL PURPOSE EXAMINATION (SPEX)

This matter was not considered by the Board at this meeting.

Agenda Item 6

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF ANDREW PATRINELLIS, M.D., FOR BOARD AUTHORIZATION TO TAKE THE SPECIAL PURPOSE EXAMINATION (SPEX)

Kevin Murphy, Esq., was present with Dr. Patrinellis as his legal counsel.

Dr. Patrinellis stated he was before the Board to request the Board's sponsorship to sit for the SPEX and, contingent upon passing, the opportunity to apply for medical licensure in Nevada. Dr. Patrinellis summarized his background, undergraduate and medical school training, residency, and his 20 years of full-time primary care practice in Napa Valley, California, with additional experience as a skilled nursing facility medical director, in hospital-based medicine, and inpatient and outpatient care for aging veterans. He then described events leading to the voluntary surrender of his California medical license in 2020 following an investigation regarding a personal relationship with a patient. He explained he was eligible to reapply for licensure in 2022; however, in 2022, California passed AB 1636, which prohibits any physician who has been accused of any kind of inappropriate relationship who has also surrendered his or her license from reapplying.

Dr. Patrinellis explained that in 2020, he began drinking essentially every day and then detailed his recovery beginning in 2021. He enrolled in a five-year contract with a physicians' recovery program

in Los Angeles and has been in compliance with the program for four-and-a-half years. He stated he had completed a professional boundaries course, actively engages in continuing medical education and is now a completely different person.

Dr. Frey said he applauded Dr. Patrinellis for being so candid with the Board. He said his story is one that resonates with each and every one of us in some way and it sounds as though Dr. Patrinellis is very committed to a life of sobriety, to being a family man, and to being a good community member as well as a strong primary care physician, which Nevada frankly needs.

Ms. Arias-Petrel asked Dr. Patrinellis what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Patrinellis said he would love to return to primary care practice and is interested in practicing with underserved communities such as in correctional facilities and other community-based settings.

Dr. Ahsan asked whether Dr. Patrinellis planned to apply for licensure in any other states.

Dr. Patrinellis said he did not. He lives in Bakersfield and wants to remain geographically near his daughter.

Ms. Beal asked if Dr. Patrinellis had reached out to any organizations that serve underserved communities, such as federally qualified health centers.

Dr. Patrinellis said he did not have that much connection in Nevada yet, as he does not live here, but he has been reading up on various opportunities.

Dr. Desai stated Dr. Patrinellis had not practiced clinical medicine for four years and asked about his plan for reentry into clinical practice. Dr. Patrinellis said he planned to look into a preceptorship to address the practice gap.

Mr. Cousineau stated taking and passing SPEX will show Dr. Patrinellis' competency.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board sponsor Dr. Patrinellis to take SPEX. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 7

DISCIPLINARY ACTION TRAINING FOR BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Bradley presented an overview of the disciplinary action process and stated the handout which had been provided to Board members, as well as the PowerPoint presentation, would be retained and available to Board members in Govenda for reference. She outlined the statutory authority governing administrative hearings, disciplinary actions and petitions for judicial review. She provided a definition of a contested case and explained that a license to practice a profession is a protected property interest, and the Board is required to follow due process in any proceeding which may impact a licensee's license. She then described due process requirements that apply to the Board's administrative proceedings. She stated the burden of proof in an administrative hearing is always on the Investigative Committee, and it is a preponderance of the evidence. She described the importance of impartial adjudicators, when a potential adjudicator should disclose a relationship, and when they should abstain from adjudicating a matter. She explained that in general, ex parte communications between Board members and Board attorneys and staff are prohibited in adjudications; however, there is an exception with settlement agreements because there is specific language contained in the settlement agreements that the licensee waives that prohibition and

expressly states that Board members may ask Board attorneys and staff questions about the settlement agreement prior to the Board meeting.

Ms. Bradley outlined the adjudication process and reminded Board members not to conduct their own external investigations. Decisions in adjudications should be made solely on the evidence provided at the hearing.

Ms. Bradley outlined the available options for discipline in the event disciplinary action is imposed upon a licensee as a result of an adjudication. She distinguished between revocations and suspensions, stating a revocation removes the license and a suspension does not remove the license; however, the licensee may not practice until the suspension is lifted.

Ms. Bradley outlined the process for judicial review of a Board order and for a stay of the Board's order. She noted that by statute, courts will give deference to the Board in their review and the burden of proof in a judicial review is on the licensee to show the Board's decision was invalid.

Ms. Bradley discussed settlement agreements and the process for review, discussion and approval or rejection of proposed settlements by Board members. She then discussed voluntary surrenders in lieu of other disciplinary action. She said that a voluntary surrender is essentially an agreed-to revocation, it is discipline, and it is a reportable action.

Ms. Bradley then discussed summary suspensions for health, safety and welfare concerns and suspensions for failure to comply with Board orders, noting that the Investigative Committee is contacted for approval before staff initiates either emergency or compliance-related suspension actions.

Agenda Item 8

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID KAYLE McCLEVE, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 24-42281-1

Lisa J. Zastrow, Esq., was present with Mr. McCleve as his legal counsel.

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bordelove confirmed that all adjudicating Board members had received and reviewed the materials regarding this matter. She then provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Frey summarized the facts of the underlying case. He stated that the hearing officer had recommended that Counts II and IV were supported and said he agreed with those findings. He said Count II was failure to maintain complete medical records and stated this was self-evident and non-refutable and he believed the count was well-supported. With respect to Count IV, practicing beyond the scope of license, pursuant to testimony from Mr. McCleve's supervising physician, Mr. McCleve did not have express authorization to administer Botox in any setting at that point in time. Additionally, Mr. McCleve's supervising physician's specialty is emergency medicine, and he did not have any formal training in cosmetic procedures. Therefore, he could not reasonably provide supervision to Mr. McCleve for cosmetic procedures.

Mr. Olivarez stated he agreed with Dr. Frey that Counts II and IV were well-supported in the record. Dr. Desai also agreed.

With respect to Count I, Dr. Frey said the definition of malpractice in NAC 630.040 is the failure of a provider, while treating a patient, to use reasonable care, skill, or knowledge ordinarily used under similar circumstances. This is essentially a reasonable provider standard, and this definition is used when determining whether an act constitutes malpractice. He said he thinks Mr. McCleve's act in treating the patient in this case constitutes malpractice because Mr. McCleve did not use reasonable care in rendering treatment to the patient.

Discussion ensued regarding the reasonableness standard and whether Mr. McCleve exercised reasonable judgment while rendering treatment to the patient in this case. Dr. Desai, Mr. Olivarez, Dr. Ahsan and Ms. Conaboy all voiced that Mr. McCleve's conduct was not reasonable in this case.

Regarding Count III, Dr. Frey said he thinks Mr. McCleve did not have an active supervision agreement on file with the Board that authorized Mr. McCleve to provide treatment to the patient in this case. Dr. Frey noted that testimony in the record from the supervising physician that was on file for Mr. McCleve at this time indicated that they were not meeting on a regular basis, and he had not authorized Mr. McCleve to provide any aesthetic procedures at that time. Dr. Frey also stated that Mr. McCleve's supervising physician of record testified that it would not have been reasonable for Mr. McCleve to think he was still under his supervision for the procedure provided in this case. Additionally, the address listed on the supervision agreement that was on file between Mr. McCleve and that supervising physician was not an emergency department, specifically North Vista Hospital, and that supervising physician does not have privileges at the hospital where Mr. McCleve performed the unauthorized procedure.

Dr. Frey said the hearing officer found Counts I and III were not supported and that he respectfully disagreed with those findings as he had previously stated.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board reject the hearing officer's findings and recommendations with respect to Counts I and III and accept the hearing officer's findings and recommendations with respect to Counts II and IV, as previously discussed. He stated with respect to the facts before the Board, he believes Counts II and IV are supported and agrees with the hearing officer's findings on those counts. With respect to the facts before the Board, he believes Counts I and III are well-supported, in disagreement with the hearing officer, and he rejects the hearing officer's findings on those counts. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Bradley presented the Investigative Committee's disciplinary recommendations, which included the following: Mr. McCleve's license to practice as a physician assistant be revoked, and, pursuant to NRS 622A.410, he may not reapply for a new license for two years after the date of the Board's Order; pursuant to NRS 622.400, that the Board find that the costs and fees incurred in the matter totaling \$32,131.10 are reasonable, necessary, and were actually incurred; that those costs be assessed against Mr. McCleve, with payment stayed until such time as he re-applies for licensure, at which time the costs would become immediately due and payable in full; that Mr. McCleve receive a public reprimand; and that the discipline be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank and other applicable authorities.

Ms. Zastrow stated with respect to discipline, the current trajectory of what she had just heard in terms of the deliberations gave her grave concern. She objected to the Investigative Committee's recommendations for discipline, arguing that the Board had rejected the hearing officer's findings and in doing so violated Mr. McCleve's due process rights, and argued the merits of the underlying findings.

Ms. Bradley objected, stating Ms. Zastrow's comments were limited to the disciplinary recommendations.

Ms. Zastrow asserted that Mr. McCleve had been all but exonerated by the hearing officer who heard three days of deliberations and the Board wanted to look at the record in a vacuum without taking into account the actual facts, which go directly to discipline.

Ms. Bordelove stated there was an objection that hadn't been ruled upon, simply limiting the comments to discipline because that was what was before the Board at that moment because the Board had already deliberated and voted with respect to violations.

Dr. Spirtos asked Ms. Zastrow to limit her comments to the discipline that had been proposed.

Ms. Bordelove stated Ms. Zastrow could make her arguments with respect to whether or not the findings regarding the violations were appropriate if she chooses to appeal the Board's decision at that time. If she wanted to make further comments at this time, she asked Ms. Zastrow to confine those comments to a response to the disciplinary recommendations that had been presented by the Investigative Committee.

Ms. Zastrow argued that all of her comments went directly to discipline, stated they bent over backwards to enter into a settlement agreement with the Board's counsel, characterized the Investigative Committee's recommendations as punitive and stated the Board should reverse what it found, accept the hearing officer's findings, impose nominal discipline and that Mr. McCleve should not have to pay any of the legal fees.

Ms. Bradley clarified that the Investigative Committee was not asking that the fees be paid at that time; it was asking that they be assessed and stayed and would only be due and payable if and when Mr. McCleve were to reapply for licensure in Nevada. She said she wanted to put an objection on the record to any references made by Ms. Zastrow regarding settlement discussions, stating that those comments were not relevant, were not before the Board at this time, and she thinks it misstates what occurred with regard to a possible settlement in the case.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board accept the Investigative Committee's disciplinary recommendations as presented. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 9

CONSIDERATION OF REVOCABLE DELEGATION AND AUTHORIZATION BY THE BOARD TO THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE BOARD TO DEFEND THE BOARD'S FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, ORDERS AND ACTIONS IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID KAYLE McCLEVE, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 24-42281-1, IN ANY CIVIL OR CRIMINAL PROCEEDING, STATE OR FEDERAL, THAT IMPLICATES THE BOARD'S ADJUDICATION OF THIS CASE, TO PARTICIPATE IN, DEFEND AGAINST, OR TO INITIATE ON ITS BEHALF ANY PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OR APPEAL THEREFROM, TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL OR STATEMENT OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE ON ITS BEHALF, TO NEGOTIATE AND SETTLE CLAIMS ON ITS BEHALF, AND TO TAKE COMPARABLE ACTIONS AND MAKE COMPARABLE DECISIONS ON ITS BEHALF

Dr. Desai moved that the Board authorize the Board's counsel to defend the Board's findings, conclusions, orders and actions in this matter. Ms. Conaboy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID JAMES SMITH, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-47823-1

Lyn E. Beggs, Esq., was present with Dr. Smith as his legal counsel.

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bordelove confirmed that all adjudicating Board members had received and reviewed the materials regarding this matter. She then provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Spirtos stated the Complaint in this case alleged one count of NRS 630.301(3), disciplinary action by another state medical board, in this case the Medical Board of California. Dr. Spirtos summarized the facts of the underlying case and stated that Dr. Smith's license in California had been revoked in 2024. This Board had previously imposed discipline against Dr. Smith in 2024, stemming from the proceedings in California, which included a stayed revocation and probation. He stated he concurred with the hearing officer's findings that there was a violation.

Dr. Bassewitz and Dr. Ahsan both stated they agreed with the hearing officer's findings.

Dr. Bassewitz moved that the Board adopt the hearing officer's findings in their entirety. Dr. Ahsan seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Mr. White presented the Investigative Committee's disciplinary recommendations, which included the following: Dr. Smith's license to practice medicine be revoked and pursuant to NRS 622A.410, he may not reapply for a new license for a minimum period of five years from the date of the Board's Order; pursuant to NRS 622.400, that the Board find that the costs and fees incurred in the matter totaling \$13,904.77 are reasonable, necessary, and actually incurred; that those costs be assessed against Dr. Smith, with payment stayed until such time as he reapplies for licensure, at which time the costs will become immediately due and payable in full; that Dr. Smith receive a public reprimand; and that the discipline be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank and other applicable authorities.

Ms. Beggs said that she wanted to clarify that the vote to adopt the hearing officer's findings was for a finding that Dr. Smith violated NRS 630.301(3), as set forth in Count I of the Complaint. Dr. Spirtos confirmed that it was.

Ms. Beggs said she thought it was germane to note that Dr. Smith had been on probation with this Board since June 2024 pursuant to a settlement agreement. Dr. Smith was placed on probation for a period of two years, which would be expiring in June 2026, and Dr. Smith has been in compliance with all terms of the settlement agreement. She said Dr. Smith was amenable to probation and her recommendation in this case was probation. She said the revocation in California does not equate to a requirement that Dr. Smith's license in Nevada be revoked. The sole count is that the California Board took disciplinary action against Dr. Smith, not the underlying actions that took place in California. Dr. Smith appropriately notified the Nevada Board of the California revocation and there was no attempt to hide it. She said she thinks it is very notable that none of the issues Dr. Smith has had in Nevada relate to patient care and that all of these facts should be taken into consideration. She said her alternative recommendation for discipline was that the Board revoke Dr. Smith's license but stay the revocation and place Dr. Smith on probation for three to five years, noting that three years would equate to a total of five years' probation; require payment of the costs; issue a public reprimand; assess a \$2,500 fine; and Dr. Smith is amenable

and willing to participate in any additional ethics training or continuing medical education the Board deems appropriate.

Dr. Bassewitz asked about the terms of Dr. Smith's current probation, and Ms. Beggs outlined those.

Dr. Spirtos asked whether Dr. Smith had been treating patients in Nevada with intrathecal pumps, and Ms. Beggs stated he had not; however, his probation in Nevada did not restrict him from doing so.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board amend the Investigative Committee's disciplinary recommendations and revoke Dr. Smith's license, stay the revocation and place him on probation for five years, which would include a prohibition from management of intrathecal pumps; issue a public reprimand; and require reimbursement of the costs in the amount of \$13,904.77, which are reasonable, within 120 days.

Ms. Beal requested an amendment to Dr. Spirtos' motion to include a \$2,500 fine.

Dr. Spirtos accepted the amendment to the motion, and Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the amended motion. A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 11

CONSIDERATION OF REVOCABLE DELEGATION AND AUTHORIZATION BY THE BOARD TO THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE BOARD TO DEFEND THE BOARD'S FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, ORDERS AND ACTIONS IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID JAMES SMITH, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-47823-1, IN ANY CIVIL OR CRIMINAL PROCEEDING, STATE OR FEDERAL, THAT IMPLICATES THE BOARD'S ADJUDICATION OF THIS CASE, TO PARTICIPATE IN, DEFEND AGAINST, OR TO INITIATE ON ITS BEHALF ANY PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OR APPEAL THEREFROM, TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL OR STATEMENT OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE ON ITS BEHALF, TO NEGOTIATE AND SETTLE CLAIMS ON ITS BEHALF, AND TO TAKE COMPARABLE ACTIONS AND MAKE COMPARABLE DECISIONS ON ITS BEHALF

Ms. Conaboy moved that the Board authorize the Board's counsel to defend the Board's findings, conclusions, orders and actions in this matter. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 12

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF KELLY JAMES TURNER, M.D., TO TERMINATE PROBATIONARY STATUS ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Dr. Turner explained that pursuant to a settlement agreement entered into with the Board, his license had been reactivated and placed on probation for three years. He explained he subsequently let his Nevada license lapse because he was unable to find a position in Nevada due to his previous history with the Texas Medical Board. He said he had been working in Texas for the last four years. The Texas Board's oversight ended in December 2024, and there were currently no restrictions on his license there. He has been offered a position at the emergency room at Henderson Hospital and will hopefully start work there in May 2026. However, conditions of his employment with Henderson Hospital include

that he have an unrestricted license. He said he has maintained sobriety and continues to attend county medical society meetings in Texas once a week.

Ms. Bradley stated Dr. Turner's license was currently on probation until December 1, 2026; however, he had the option to come before the Board prior to that to request early termination of the probation, and he has completed everything that was required of him. Therefore, staff had no objection to his request.

Dr. Bassewitz moved that the Board remove the probationary status from Dr. Turner's license. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 13

KIRK KERKORIAN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AT UNLV: MD PROGRAM UPDATE

Robert L. Hernandez, Jr., M.D., Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and Education at the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine at UNLV, presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Board providing highlights of the UNLV School of Medicine MD program and describing how the program prepares students for the USMLE Step 1 and Step 2 Clinical Knowledge Examinations.

Dr. Hernandez said the first class of medical students matriculated in July 2017, the program achieved full LCME accreditation in February 2021, it graduated its first class of medical students in May 2021, the program moved into the Kirk Kerkorian Medical Education Building in November 2022, and the program retained full LCME accreditation in February 2026. He said the sixth Commencement and Academic Hooding Ceremony will take place on May 8, 2026, and the tenth entering class, the Class of 2030, will matriculate in July 2026.

Dr. Hernandez provided matriculation and graduation statistics for the program and described the program curriculum. He then described how the program prepares and supports students for success with USMLE licensing examinations, named those primarily responsible for the academic support services unit, and provided statistics regarding the results achieved by program attendees on the USMLE Step 1 and Step 2 Examinations.

Mr. Olivarez said he thinks what the program is doing with EO1 and EO2 students and first-generation students is wonderful for access to care for patients in Nevada. He asked whether there were any plans to add a physician assistant program in the future.

Mr. Hernandez said that falls outside the College of Medicine, but he would be a strong proponent for that.

Ms. Beal thanked Dr. Hernandez for his presentation and said she is very impressed with the USMLE Step 1 and Step 2 results.

Ms. Arias-Petrel also thanked Dr. Hernandez and agreed the USMLE results are very impressive. She said she would like to see initiatives to retain graduates in Nevada, and Dr. Hernandez concurred.

Dr. Spirtos suggested that a representative of the Board could be invited to speak with students about ways to prevent having to appear before the Board for disciplinary matters.

Agenda Item 14

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF JAMES MICHAEL MURPHY, M.D., FOR REMOVAL OF PRECEPTORSHIP CONDITION ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

Dr. Murphy explained the Board had granted him a license contingent upon his participation in a 12-month preceptorship. He had completed most of the preceptorship; however, has encountered difficulty obtaining hospital privileges due to a gap in his practice as well as the fact he is under a preceptorship. He worked in a local surgery center until November, when the surgery center closed. Red Rock Anesthesia Consultants has an opportunity for him; however, they do not think they will be able to proceed if he is still under the preceptorship. Therefore, he was requesting that the Board remove the preceptorship condition from his medical license.

Dr. Frey asked whether any concerns had been raised during the preceptorship. Johnna LaRue, the Board's Compliance Officer, stated there were no issues reported from Dr. Murphy's preceptorship.

Dr. Frey asked about Dr. Murphy's caseload during the preceptorship. Dr. Murphy said he had more cases on some days than others.

Ms. Beal moved that the Board remove the preceptorship condition from Dr. Murphy's medical license. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 15

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF DEVENDRAKUMAR PATEL, M.D., FOR REMOVAL OF PRECEPTORSHIP CONDITION ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

Lyn E. Beggs, Esq., was present with Dr. Patel as his legal counsel.

Ms. Beggs explained that Dr. Patel was requesting removal of the preceptorship condition on his medical license. She stated that Dr. Patel had completed his 12-month preceptorship without issues.

Dr. Desai moved that the Board remove the preceptorship condition from Dr. Patel's medical license. Dr. Bassewitz seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 16

REPORTS

(a) Investigative Committees

Dr. Frey reported that at its February 13, 2026 meeting, Investigative Committee A considered 48 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 1 case, sent 5 cases out for peer review, requested an appearance in 1 case, issued 4 letters of concern, referred 3 cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 34 cases.

Dr. Ahsan reported that at its February 4, 2026 meeting, Investigative Committee B considered 42 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 2 cases, sent 2 cases out for peer review, requested an appearance in 2 cases, issued 6 letters of concern, referred no cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 30 cases.

Dr. Spirtos reported that at its February 6, 2026 meeting, Investigative Committee C considered 19 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 2 cases, sent 1 case out for peer review, requested an appearance in 1 case, issued 3 letters of concern, referred 2 cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 10 cases.

(b) Nevada State Medical Association

Jacqueline L. Nguyen, Esq., Executive Director and Policy Director of the Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA), reported she had accepted the position of full-time Executive Director and Policy Director. She said Dr. Lali Sekhon would be installed as President of the Washoe County Medical Society on June 12, 2026; Dr. Kathleen Benson would be installed as President of the Clark County Medical Society on May 20, 2026; and Dr. Jeffrey Roth would be installed as President of the NSMA on August 22, 2026.

Ms. Nguyen reported that NSMA is collaborating with various other agencies and particularly the Nevada Health Authority to ensure they can be a partner to them on any of their initiatives. Specifically, they just created an NSMA Medicaid Stakeholder Committee, which will meet quarterly and will be open to all physician members and their staff so they will have a direct point of contact to discuss Medicaid and the challenges they are experiencing. The first meeting will be held in August. NSMA is also collaborating with the Nevada Health Authority and other agencies to function as a conduit of information to NSMA members. Ms. Nguyen said if there is anything on which the Board would like to collaborate with NSMA, such as outreach or education, NSMA would be happy to do so. Additionally, NSMA is reaching out to specialty groups and their leadership to better understand the issues they are facing.

Ms. Nguyen stated SB5 from the 2025 Special Legislative Session contained quite a number of sections regarding expedited credentialing, noting Section 19, which provides requirements for expedited hospital credentialing. NSMA has been working with the Nevada Hospital Association to identify lag times in credentialing and develop a better process, and they have already arrived at some solutions. Under Sections 30 and 34 of SB5, the Board of Medical Examiners is tasked with creation of a portal to help expedite the process and she has spoken with Ms. Bradley about whether there is anything NSMA can do to assist in this regard. NSMA is also working with the Nevada Division of Insurance to update the uniform credentialing form they use. NSMA is reviewing its resolutions and there is a resolution specifically regarding when a physician must disclose when under investigation. She stated she is working with Ms. Bradley to understand the Board's process and there is a possibility the topic could be agendaized for discussion at a future Board meeting or addressed via a request for an advisory opinion.

(c) Clark County Medical Society

No report was provided at this meeting.

(d) Nevada Academy of Physician Associates

Alyssa Nishihira, PA-C, President of the Nevada Academy of Physician Assistants (NAPA), was not present, but had submitted a written report prior to the meeting, which had been provided to all Board members.

(e) Genetic Counselors Association of Nevada

Julia Prinzi, MS, LCGC, President of the Genetic Counselors Association of Nevada (GCAN), stated she is a cardiac genetic counselor, one of six founding members of GCAN, and she is honored to

be one of the Board's appointees to the newly formed Genetic Counseling Advisory Council. Ms. Prinzi explained that following the implementation of SB189, establishing licensure for genetic counselors, GCAN was formed to support the integration, regulation and advancement of genetic counseling services in Nevada. She described GCAN's mission and goals and named those currently on its leadership team. She said GCAN has a dedicated website that will include a statewide directory of genetic counselors to increase visibility and improve access to care in Nevada and plans to continue advocacy efforts through participation in licensure initiatives and collaboration with the Board to support high-quality patient care across the State. She said the passage of SB189 was an important milestone for health care in Nevada. Formally recognizing genetic counselors as providers of health care strengthens their integration with clinical teams and allows for streamlined credentialing with hospitals and insurance companies, which was previously not possible. This ensures timely access to genetics counseling care in critical situations. Additionally, licensure supports professional autonomy, including independent genetic test ordering, allowing for more efficient care delivery, and opportunities to expand the workforce across the State. On behalf of Nevada's genetic counselors, she thanked the Board for its continued partnership and support.

Ms. Beal asked for clarification as to when a genetic counselor would order a test independently of a physician, and Ms. Prinzi explained it is only for genetic tests, and provided an example.

Ms. Conaboy asked whether there are any genetic counseling education programs in Nevada, and Ms. Prinzi said there were none currently.

Agenda Item 17

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JASON SHAYNE DAZLEY, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-43193-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Dazley alleging four violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Dazley had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Hinman then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Beal asked whether Dr. Dazley was still with the Prime IV Hydration & Wellness Clinic, and Mr. Hinman said he was not.

Ms. Beal moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Ms. Conaboy seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 18

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. GARY ALAN MAYMAN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-8736-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Mayman alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Mayman had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Hinman then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Bassewitz seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 19

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. SCOTT FRANKLIN SHEPHERD, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-27715-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Dr. Simon and Mr. Farnsworth joined the meeting at 12:40 p.m.

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Shepherd alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Shepherd had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Hinman then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey stated he was recusing himself from consideration of the matter because he is Dr. Shepherd's superior at the workplace.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Simon seconded the motion, and it passed, with all remaining adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Dr. Simon and Mr. Farnsworth left the meeting at 12:42 p.m.

Agenda Item 20

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. MICHAEL SCOTT ZIMMERMAN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-10981-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Zimmerman alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Zimmerman had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Hinman then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 21

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. CAROLYN ANNE MATZINGER, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-25231-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. White explained that Line 26 on page 8 of the proposed Settlement Agreement should say, "[t]hese twenty (20) hours of CME shall be in addition to" Mr. White then stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Matzinger alleging 44 violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Matzinger had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. White then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Conaboy asked how the Board would monitor the informed consents created by Dr. Matzinger to ensure appropriate language is being used, and Ms. Contine said the Board has the authority to request to see the informed consents.

Dr. Spirtos said this Complaint is the epitome of dangerous, unscientific, undocumented, financially exploitive and grossly substandard medical practice across multiple patients. There has been disregard for medical standards, failure to diagnose, failure to document, failure to treat and persistent use of non-FDA approved substances. In his opinion, all of these are categories of major misconduct, and he thinks the Board should reject the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Bassewitz concurred with Dr. Spirtos' assessment and said one of the concerns he had with the proposed Settlement Agreement was the lack of admission of malpractice.

Dr. Frey said the term "sham treatment" comes to mind when reading through the Complaint and there were multiple instances of sham treatments, and he concurs with Dr. Spirtos and Dr. Bassewitz that the proposed Settlement Agreement should be rejected.

Mr. Olivarez stated the Board had rejected a previously proposed Settlement Agreement in this case and asked what was different in this proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. White explained the difference was the clear incorporation of NRS 630.3735 in its entirety, which speaks to investigational drugs and investigational treatments, in order to better monitor Dr. Matzinger's practice in this regard.

Dr. Spirtos said Dr. Matzinger's website continues to advertise these treatments, which he finds very troublesome.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board reject the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 22

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. SONIA MICHELLE CEBALLOS, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-37813-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Cumings stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Ceballos alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Ceballos had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Cumings then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Bassewitz moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 23

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JAMES DONALD SULLIVAN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-46737-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Cumings stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Sullivan alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Sullivan had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Cumings then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 24

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. RILEY MADISON SWANSON, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 25-53188-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Cumings stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Ms. Swanson alleging three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Ms. Swanson had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Cumings then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Bassewitz disclosed that Ms. Swanson is an employee of his company but is not under his direct supervision or any fiduciary agreement.

Dr. Spirtos said he is respectful of what the Investigative Committee saw in more detail; however, as a general comment, he is concerned that in cases such as this, it may appear the Board is not concerned about public safety when there is no admission to malpractice by the practitioners. In this particular case, there were changes to the medical records, which is an act that is particularly dangerous and reflects poor character, to say the least.

Mr. Olivarez said following surgery, particularly spinal surgery, you must always be mindful of a DVT; however, he could see how it could have been missed in this instance, and he thought the bigger issue in this case was the medical records. Dr. Bassewitz concurred.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 25

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. MATTHEW AUDET CAIN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-50429-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Shogren stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Cain alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Cain had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Shogren then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 26

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. KEVIN FREDRICK LASKO, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-9779-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Shogren stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Lasko alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Lasko had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Shogren then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 27

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. KARL BRIAN ROMANESCHI, M.D., BME CASE NO. 25-11429-1

Dr. Spirtos named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Shogren stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Romaneschi alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and stated Dr. Romaneschi had no prior disciplinary history with the Board. Mr. Shogren then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Olivarez said this case is another example of what Dr. Frey had spoken about in an earlier matter regarding wrong side surgery and time-out protocols.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion.

Ms. Conaboy stated the events in this case occurred three years earlier and asked how the public would know about them since they have not been reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank.

Mr. Cousineau explained that once a formal complaint has been filed, it is a matter of public record. A complaint only contains allegations; however, they are public. Dr. Bassewitz added that if approved, the settlement agreement will be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 28

EXECUTIVE STAFF/STAFF REPORTS

(a) Investigations Division Report

Mr. Diaz reported that from December 11, 2025, through March 4, 2026, the Investigations Division received a total of 320 complaints. Of those, 118 cases were opened as formal investigations, 70 were not within the Board's jurisdiction, 46 were referred to other agencies and regulatory bodies, 16 were resolved through proactive measures, and 70 were either still pending review or were duplicate

complaints. The Division sent 10 courtesy letters to licensees informing them a complaint had been received by the Board against them. The total case count was 311, for an average of 44 cases per 7 investigators, including supervisors, and there were a total of 30 peer reviews, 19 of which had been assigned to a peer reviewer and 11 of which were pending assignment. There were 13 licensees in compliance or diversion.

(b) Quarterly Compliance Report

Ms. Jenkins reported that the total outstanding costs and fines at the end of the year were \$229,851 and total costs and fines collected during the fourth quarter of 2025 were \$154,402.

(c) Quarterly Update on Finances

Ms. Jenkins said she had included in the materials both a quarterly Profit and Loss vs Actual and a yearly one. She explained there are some timing situations to keep in mind while viewing both documents. The yearly adjustment for post-retirement benefits, which is primarily reflected in the long-term liability section, will not occur until the reports for both the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) and Public Employees Benefits Program (PEBP) come out in July or August. Those figures can materially affect the Board's yearly numbers. There may be other smaller adjustments as we prepare for audit. Still, the income, expenses, and assets reflected on these financial statements are relevant and useful.

Ms. Jenkins said with those things in mind, she would review a few key figures for the record. She stated the Balance Sheet reflects the assets and liabilities of the Board. She then highlighted key sections of the Balance Sheet for the quarter ending December 31, 2025. The total current assets were \$15,017,400 and the total assets were \$21,094,300. The total current liabilities were \$10,356,100, with total liabilities and net position of \$21,094,300. The net position of the Board is rounded to \$623,300.

Ms. Jenkins then highlighted various sections of the Profit and Loss Budget vs. Actual for the fourth quarter of 2025. The total income for the quarter was at 79.6 % of budget. This number is low, and we are keeping an eye on this downward trend. However, the second quarter of 2025 was 127.3% of budget and some of what we are seeing is based on timing issues in the Board's revenue recognition. For instance, the year-to-date income was 101.3% of budget. In the expense section, the personnel expenses were under budget by 6.5% and total expenses were at 97.1% of budget. The interest income for the quarter was \$87,000 rounded. The reduction to net position for the quarter is rounded to \$416,00.

Ms. Jenkins then highlighted various sections of the Profit and Loss Budget vs. Actual for the year ending December 31, 2025. The year-to-date income was 1.3% above budget, the personnel expenses were 8.6% under budget and the total expenses for the year were 7.2 % under budget. The interest for the year was \$271,400 and the addition to net position, before post-retirement benefits adjustments, was \$790,800, which is right on track. The reserves of the Board were at 8 months, and the Board's goal is to have 6 to 12 months in reserves. The Board is meeting that goal and is in a secure financial position.

Ms. Conaboy said she had been reading about possible steep increases in healthcare premiums effective July 1, 2026, and asked how that may impact the Board.

Ms. Jenkins said she had only seen a newspaper article that there may be some increases in costs beginning July 1, but she had not seen any announcements regarding what those may be so we will not know what those will look like until closer to that time. Open enrollment begins May 1, 2026, and those

changes will take effect July 1, 2026. The Board has sizeable reserves and if there is a substantial increase that will significantly exceed the budgeted amount, the Board could consider amending its budget to include those costs.

(d) Legal Division Report

Ms. Contine reported that the current total case count for the Legal Division was 55 cases, with 35 of those in progress and 20 complaints to be filed. This quarter, the Division had resolved 15 cases, filed 6 complaints, issued 16 letters of concern from the Investigative Committees and the Investigative Committees authorized the filing of formal complaints in 5 cases.

Dr. Spirtos asked whether there was a backlog in the Legal Division, and Ms. Contine stated there were 20 cases in which complaints had not yet been filed and she believed the majority of those were from the last year.

(e) Licensing Division Report

Ms. Linn stated the following numbers were as of February 24, 2026. She reported the total number of active licensees was 17,975. The total number of physician licensees was 13,616, of which 13,457 were unrestricted, there were 1,709 physician assistants, 1,966 practitioners of respiratory care, 579 residents, 89 perfusionists, 8 anesthesiologist assistants and 8 genetic counselors. As of this morning, the number of genetic counselors is up to 14. During the last quarter, the total number of physician licenses issued was 422, of which 256 were through the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (Compact). Compact licenses issued during the quarter accounted for 60.7% of the total unrestricted physician licenses issued. There were 74 physician assistant licenses, 20 respiratory care licenses and 8 genetic counselor licenses issued during the quarter. The Board began licensing genetic counselors on January 1, 2026. No perfusionist or anesthesiologist assistant licenses were issued during the quarter. During the quarter, the average licensing time for physicians was 35 days if those issued through the Compact are included, and 92 days without including those issued through the Compact. The average licensing time during the quarter for physician assistants was 63 days and 71 days for respiratory care licensees.

Ms. Arias-Petrel said she thought the number of licenses issued was commendable.

Dr. Desai asked Ms. Linn whether she thought there was a way the Board could reduce the timeline to issue physician licenses through the traditional pathway.

Ms. Linn explained staff was continually striving to improve processes and work on reducing licensing times; however, the majority of it is applicant-driven as well as awaiting receipt of verifications.

Agenda Item 29

LICENSURE RATIFICATION

- Ratification of Licenses Issued, Reinstatements of Licensure and Changes of Licensure Status Approved Since the December 12, 2025 Board Meeting

Dr. Frey moved that the Board ratify the licenses issued, reinstatements of licensure and changes of licensure status approved since the December 12, 2025 Board Meeting. Dr. Ahsan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

APPEARANCES FOR CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE

(a) Thomas Scott Bartley, CCP

Dr. Spirtos asked Mr. Bartley whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Ms. Arias-Petrel stated that Mr. Bartley had previously applied for licensure in Nevada and appeared before the Board on that application in September 2013. The reason for his appearance was that he had failed to disclose several arrests from 1985 to 2007. He ultimately withdrew his application during that appearance before the Board. She explained that Mr. Bartley was now before the Board on his current application for licensure. She asked Dr. Bartley why he answered negatively to the question regarding whether he had ever had staff privileges denied, suspended, limited, revoked or not renewed by a hospital when he had answered affirmatively to the same question on his previous application.

Mr. Bartley stated his privileges were never technically suspended or revoked. He explained the circumstances surrounding an incident that occurred at Providence Hospital in 2007, which led to his voluntarily enrollment in an alcohol counseling program that lasted approximately two to three months, and stated he subsequently decided to resign from his position there.

Ms. Arias-Petrel confirmed Mr. Bartley currently held a license in Missouri and asked what had changed since his last arrest in 2007 and why he wished to move to Nevada.

Mr. Bartley stated he had family in Nevada and intended to eventually retire here. He and his wife also have family in California. He said he had not yet applied for any jobs in Nevada.

Dr. Frey said the Board had a letter from the PRN Program that recommended if Mr. Bartley were to be licensed in Nevada that he participate in a monitoring program to validate that drinking is not an issue in his life, and asked Mr. Bartley if that seemed reasonable. Mr. Bartley stated it did.

Dr. Bassewitz asked Mr. Bartley whether he still drinks alcohol. Mr. Bartley disclosed that he had consumed half a glass of champagne at his daughter's wedding in July 2023, which he said was the last time he drank alcohol.

Dr. Bassewitz asked whether Mr. Bartley was currently enrolled in an alcohol treatment program, and Mr. Bartley stated he was not.

Dr. Frey asked Mr. Bartley whether he would be willing to participate in a period of monitoring in Nevada, and recommended a 12-month monitoring period, given Mr. Bartley's history. Mr. Bartley stated he was.

Mr. Cousineau stated that would be a conditional license and could potentially impact Mr. Bartley's licenses in other jurisdictions, and asked Mr. Bartley whether he was agreeable to that. Mr. Bartley indicated he was.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board grant Mr. Bartley's application for licensure, with the condition that he participate in a monitoring program beginning immediately and for a period of 12 months and that he return to the Board for that condition to be lifted. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(b) Gregory Raymond Brevetti, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Brevetti whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Ahsan summarized Dr. Brevetti's medical education and training. He then questioned Dr. Brevetti regarding his affirmative responses to Questions 5 and 6 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Brevetti described the circumstances surrounding the case of malpractice filed against him for an incident which occurred in 2015.

Dr. Ahsan asked Dr. Brevetti what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Brevetti said he intended to move from New York, and one of the places he is considering is Nevada. He met with three of the partners at Las Vegas Surgical Associates and was considering joining them but had not made a final decision.

Dr. Ahsan moved that the Board grant Dr. Brevetti's application for licensure. Dr. Bassewitz seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(c) Anup Chitnis, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Chitnis whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Dr. Frey stated that Dr. Chitnis had failed to disclose two cases of malpractice on his application for licensure and asked Dr. Chitnis whether he had personally completed his application.

Dr. Chitnis explained the hospital system he works for uses a credentialing company and he had provided them with all the information. He was not trying to hide anything, and the information appears on his National Practitioner Data Bank report and elsewhere.

Dr. Frey commented that these administrative oversights are quite common and that applications may be sent to a vendor; however, the final review should be conducted personally by the applicant.

Dr. Frey stated Dr. Chitnis' practice is about 70% administrative and 30% clinical and said he had indicated his future plans in Nevada were to provide emergency medicine services via telemedicine. He asked Dr. Chitnis how emergency services could be provided via telemedicine.

Dr. Chitnis explained his practice's umbrella is virtual urgent care, which is an offshoot of emergency medicine, but obviously less emergent. They handle common urgent care-type issues over video. This is a service they offer to all NYU Langone employees and NYU Langone has a data center with support staff in Nevada.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Chitnis' application for licensure. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(d) Austin Wand, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Wand whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Ms. Beal stated Dr. Wand was applying for licensure by endorsement because he had not passed a major examination within the last 10 years. She said Dr. Wand holds a lifetime certification by a specialty board of the American Board of Medical Specialties and currently held an active license in Ohio; however, he had not practiced clinical medicine since June 2019. Ms. Beal asked Dr. Wand what he had been doing to stay current in medicine.

Dr. Wand explained he had retired in Las Vegas, but wanted to remain active, so he went to work performing teleradiology for a California business associated with Menlo Park and Stanford. The Veterans Administration and the federal government only require an active state license. He practiced mainly thoracic radiology, but also some general radiology. He has been giving medical lectures to radiology residents at Mountain View Hospital for about five years and attends RSNA meetings for continuing education.

Ms. Beal asked Dr. Wand what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Wand said his primary plans were didactic teaching of medical students and residents and he also might occasionally review thoracic cases with the residents. He stated the UNLV Medical School was going to start a radiology residency program at University Medical Center (UMC) and to practice at UMC, he would be required to have an active Nevada medical license.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Wand why he was unwilling to take the Special Purpose Examination (SPEX). Dr. Wand said there are questions on the examination related to pediatrics and geriatrics, and many other areas that do not relate to his practice, and it is time-consuming and expensive.

Dr. Frey asked Dr. Wand when he last read films under a medical malpractice carrier and submitted for reimbursement, meaning in a non-educational setting, and Dr. Wand stated it was seven years ago.

Dr. Frey said Dr. Wand's expertise was significant and would be very beneficial to the School of Medicine; however, Dr. Wand had been out of practice for nearly a decade, and medicine has changed significantly during that time.

Dr. Ahsan stated the radiology program at UMC is going to be by UMC, and not UNLV, and emphasized that teaching alone did not require a medical license.

Dr. Frey expressed concern that with an unrestricted license, pressures from Dr. Wand's employer could lead to expectations that Dr. Wand perform more than CT reads.

Mr. Cousineau reiterated that Dr. Wand could continue teaching without a Nevada license and an unrestricted license would allow Dr. Wand to do anything. He said if Dr. Wand wanted an unrestricted license, the easiest way to do that would be to take SPEX and reapply. Dr. Spirtos concurred.

Mr. Cousineau explained that if the Board did not grant Dr. Wand a license by endorsement, it would not be a reportable event.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board decline to grant Dr. Wand a license by endorsement. Dr. Desai seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(e) William Wei-Chieh Chuang, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Chuang whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Desai asked Dr. Chuang why he failed to disclose two cases of malpractice on his application for licensure.

Dr. Chuang stated the application process had been prolonged and he was not aware of those cases at the time he initially submitted his application. He then described the circumstances surrounding the two cases of malpractice that had been filed against him for incidents that occurred in 2022 and 2023.

Dr. Bassewitz asked Dr. Chuang what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Chuang said he works for a teleradiology company and works from home. He won't be reading cases for patients in Nevada, but he will be working in Nevada.

Dr. Spirtos stated the two cases of malpractice that Dr. Chuang had not disclosed occurred before he submitted his application. Dr. Chuang acknowledged they occurred prior to submission of his application but said he was not aware of them until after he submitted his application.

Ms. Arias-Petrel noted that when applicants or third-party credentialing companies do not timely respond to requests for information, that causes delays in the application process.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Chuang's application for licensure. Dr. Bassewitz seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(f) Stephen Myron Goldstein, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Goldstein whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Dr. Bassewitz summarized Dr. Goldstein's medical education and training and stated Dr. Goldstein held a lifetime certification by the American Board of Surgery. He confirmed with Dr. Goldstein that he had not practiced general surgery since 2001 and had not practiced clinical medicine since December 2024. He stated that Dr. Goldstein was applying for licensure by endorsement because he had not passed a major examination in the last 10 years and asked Dr. Goldstein why he was not interested in taking the Special Purpose Examination (SPEX).

Dr. Goldstein stated that his License Specialist told him he did not need to take SPEX.

Mr. Cousineau clarified that it was not a requirement to take SPEX in order to obtain a licensure by endorsement; however, when someone has been out of clinical practice for so long or hasn't taken a major examination, the Board's staff would not recommend that they not take a major examination, i.e., SPEX, and Dr. Goldstein would not have needed to come before the Board for a licensure by endorsement if he had taken SPEX.

Dr. Bassewitz asked Dr. Goldstein what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Goldstein said he had obtained a position with Evalone Pro LLC in Las Vegas to perform histories and physical examinations for Social Security disability applicants under age 65, stating he would perform those only and would make no recommendations with regard to their applications.

Dr. Frey stated that one of the benefits of a SPEX examination is that it provides a window into a broader set of skills and said that Dr. Goldstein hasn't engaged in the type of histories and physicals that would be required to perform this type of screening.

Dr. Bassewitz stated that he appreciated the narrow scope Dr. Goldstein was presenting; however, an endorsement license is a full, unrestricted license to practice medicine, to prescribe, and to treat anything that a physician feels comfortable treating.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board decline to grant Dr. Goldstein a license by endorsement. Dr. Desai seconded the motion, and it passed, with Dr. Frey and Mr. Olivarez voting against the motion and all other Board members voting in favor of the motion.

(g) Andrei Nikolai Dokukin, M.D.

Mark Chase, Ph.D., MBA, Nevada Professionals Health Program, was present with Dr. Dokukin.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Dokukin whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Dr. Olivarez asked Dr. Dokukin to explain why he failed to disclose an arrest in 2018 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Dokukin said the omission was unintentional and acknowledged responsibility for it. He explained the response to that question was written by an associate who was not aware of the arrest.

Mr. Olivarez stated the larger issue was the conviction in 2022, which resulted in Dr. Dokukin being placed on criminal probation in the State of California until 2027 and being placed on probation by the California Medical Board until 2030.

Mr. Olivarez asked Dr. Dokukin what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Dokukin said he planned to serve as the Medical Director and staff physician for Ascaya Treatment Center in Las Vegas, which is a detox and residential facility, and described what he would do there.

Dr. Frey asked Dr. Dokukin whether he would be opposed to being placed on probation in Nevada, through 2030, to align with his probation with the California Medical Board, and Dr. Dokukin said he would not.

Mr. Chase stated that Dr. Dokukin had enrolled in a monitoring program on January 1, 2026, which was aligned with Dr. Dokukin's probation with the California Medical Board.

Mr. Cousineau stated if the Board granted Dr. Dokukin a license, it would be a conditional license.

Mr. Olivarez commended Dr. Dokukin on his sobriety and the work he is doing with addiction.

Dr. Bassewitz asked Dr. Dokukin whether he had experienced any relapses in sobriety and Dr. Dokukin acknowledged one relapse in 2018 but none since.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board grant Dr. Dokukin a conditional license contingent upon participation in his monitoring program until August 1, 2030. Dr. Desai seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(h) Deshdeepak Sahni, M.D.

This matter was not considered by the Board at this meeting.

(i) Moustafa Moataz Aboshady, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Aboshady whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Dr. Spirtos stated he was more than a little bit concerned with Dr. Aboshady's application and asked him to provide the Board with information regarding his criminal history and explain to the Board why he wanted to be licensed in Nevada.

Dr. Aboshady described the events which led to his conviction for conspiracy to make false statements and his subsequent prison sentence. He then described his professional activities since being released from prison. He has been working at Sunrise Medical Associates in California, initially at the front desk and is now the Chief Operating Officer. He practiced as a hospitalist for almost ten years and had a huge practice in Long Beach. He took and passed the Special Purpose Examination in 2023, applied for a license in Utah and was granted one. Since then, he has been looking for a clinical job and has interviewed with multiple companies; however, they require insurance credentialing. He said he has found a cash-practice opportunity in Reno with a physician who has agreed to be his preceptor.

Dr. Spirtos said Dr. Aboshady never responded to the Order to Show Cause from the DEA and Dr. Aboshady said he did not timely respond to it because the notice was given to his probation officer and not to him, and he tried to hire counsel but was advised there was insufficient time, so he chose to withdraw the application rather than defend without counsel.

Ms. Beal stated there appeared to be a gap in the information provided by Dr. Aboshady with respect to the criminal case.

Dr. Desai added that the information provided by Dr. Aboshady seemed incongruent with a sentence of 75 months.

Dr. Spirtos said there was a lack of totality of information provided to the Board regarding the facts surrounding Dr. Aboshady's conviction and said Dr. Aboshady had the opportunity to withdraw his application and submit a new application with all pertinent information. He explained that a withdrawal is not a reportable event; however, if his application went to a vote and his application was denied, that would be reportable.

Mr. Cousineau said a denial could potentially impact Dr. Aboshady's license in Utah. He recommended that Dr. Aboshady withdraw his application and if he chooses to reapply in the future, he retain legal counsel and be prepared to provide more thorough responses to the questions that have been asked.

Dr. Aboshady stated he wanted to withdraw his application.

(j) Cecilio Jacob Gomez Lituco, RRT

Dr. Spirtos asked Mr. Lituco whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said he did not.

Ms. Conaboy stated Mr. Lituco was before the Board because he had not practiced respiratory therapy in the last five years. She then summarized Mr. Lituco's license history in the State of California, which was currently in active status. She stated he has been clean and sober since 2013, has been a stay-at-home parent and also worked in other fields, and has provided certificates for 40 hours of continuing education. Mr. Lituco had also provided letters of recommendation attesting to his rehabilitation and stability.

Dr. Bassewitz asked Mr. Lituco whether he had practiced under his California license once it was reinstated. Mr. Lituco explained he had not worked under that license because it was difficult to find employment with a restricted license.

Mr. Cousineau stated Mr. Lituco's RRT certification will expire in April 2026 and asked whether he planned to recertify. Mr. Lituco stated he had already taken the examination.

Ms. Linn stated the results of that examination were now available and Mr. Lituco's RRT certification is now valid through 2031.

Dr. Frey asked Mr. Lituco about his plans for matriculating back into clinical practice. Mr. Lituco stated he anticipated a proctoring process.

Dr. Spirtos asked whether Mr. Lituco currently had any job offers. Mr. Lituco said he was waiting to see if he is granted a license in Nevada to apply for a position.

Ms. Conaboy moved that the Board grant Mr. Lituco's application for licensure. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Beal left the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Agenda Item 31

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CREATION OF A LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BOARD

Ms. Bradley explained that for the past couple of legislative sessions, the Board has created a Legislative Subcommittee to review bills and potentially take positions on behalf of the Board regarding those bills. The Board also has sometimes brought necessary legislative changes to the session through a legislator. The 2027 Legislative Session will begin in February 2027, and the intent of this agenda item is to begin to identify the Board's 2027 legislative changes and priorities now. Ms. Bradley said she will maintain a spreadsheet of the bills reviewed by the Subcommittee, and she will regularly provide updates

to all Board members. Once the Subcommittee has met and approved a list of possible statutory changes to pursue in the 2027 Legislative Session, she will provide a draft of those changes to the full Board for review and possible approval at either the September or December Board meeting. She recommended an odd-numbered membership for the Subcommittee for quorum purposes.

Mr. Cousineau suggested seven members, making four the required number for a quorum.

Board members who volunteered to participate on the Subcommittee included Dr. Frey, Dr. Spirtos, Ms. Conaboy, Ms. Arias-Petrel, Dr. Bassewitz and Mr. Olivarez. Ms. Beal and Mr. Farnsworth were not present but were named as possible members of the Subcommittee.

Discussion ensued regarding the composition of the Subcommittee. Dr. Spirtos offered to step off the Subcommittee to allow for both Ms. Beal and Mr. Farnsworth to be members of the Subcommittee. Further discussion ensued regarding the composition of the Subcommittee.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board create the Legislative Subcommittee comprised of Ms. Conaboy, Dr. Frey, Ms. Arias-Petrel, Ms. Beal, Dr. Bassewitz, Mr. Olivarez and Mr. Farnsworth. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The Board discussed logistics for the Subcommittee, including timing of meetings, communication to the full Board and use of lobbyist support. Ms. Bradley said the Board's lobbyist, Mike Sullivan, of the Ferraro Group in Las Vegas, would likely attend the first Subcommittee meeting and provide additional information to members. She also indicated that she would reach out to the Subcommittee members to set a meeting date.

Agenda Item 32

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Spirtos requested that the Board hold a one-day retreat in either Reno or Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Cousineau stated the topic would be placed on the agenda for discussion at the June Board meeting. Ms. Contine stated the retreat would have to be a public meeting. Mr. Cousineau explained that a retreat for the Board is the same thing as a Board meeting, which must be public and agendaized, and suggested various training sessions could be part of that agenda.

Agenda Item 33

STAFF COMMENTS/UPDATES

Mr. Cousineau reminded the Board that the 2026 Federation of State Medical Boards' annual meeting will be held in Baltimore the last week of April. Additionally, we are still working on new office space for the Board's office in Las Vegas. The space is located within the State complex about a half mile from the Board's current office. The goal is to be in the new space by the end of August; sooner if possible. We have been working with State representatives and other appropriate parties and will have an update for the Board at the June meeting.

Ms. Bradley stated she had a call with the Nevada Physician Wellness Coalition (NPWC) earlier this week and they are interested in collaborating with the Board. Dr. Spirtos previously mentioned the possibility of including something in the letters we send to licensees advising them of a pending investigation that this is a resource for them in the event the disciplinary proceedings cause them stress. Ms. Bradley said she would follow up with the NPWC and provide a future update to the Board.

Agenda Item 34
PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Spirtos asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment. No public comment was received.

Agenda Item 35
ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Spirtos adjourned the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

* * * * *