l li			
1	ROB BONTA		
2	Attorney General of California EDWARD KIM		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General TRINA L. SAUNDERS		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 207764		
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013		
6	Telephone: (213) 269-6516 Facsimile: (916) 731-2117		
7	E-mail: Trina.Saunders@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant		
8		י אורים ה	
	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2022-094200	
12	J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D. 201 S. Miller St., Ste. 103	A G G Y G A TO Y	
13	Santa Maria, CA 93454-5248	ACCUSATION	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 38124,	٠.	
15	Respondent.		
16			
17			
18	PARTIES		
19	1. Reji Varghese (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as		
20	the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs		
21	(Board).		
22	2. On or about March 8, 1982, the Board issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate		
23	Number A 38124 to J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's		
24	Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will		
25	expire on June 30, 2025, unless renewed.		
26	<u>JURISDICTION</u>		
27	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board, under the authority of the following		
28	laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise		
	1		

(J. EDUARDO GUZMAN, M.D.) ACCUSATION NO. 800-2022-094200

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		

28

indicated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

4. Section 2004 of the Code states:

The board shall have the responsibility for the following:

- (a) The enforcement of the disciplinary and criminal provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
 - (b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- (c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.
- (d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- (e) Reviewing the quality of medical practice carried out by physician and surgeon certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the board.
 - (f) Approving undergraduate and graduate medical education programs.
- (g) Approving clinical clerkship and special programs and hospitals for the programs in subdivision (f).
 - (h) Issuing licenses and certificates under the board's jurisdiction.
 - (i) Administering the board's continuing medical education program.
- 5. Section 2227 of the Code states:
- (a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:
 - (1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.
- (2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the board.
- (3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.
- (4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the board.
- (5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.

7. Section 2266 of the Code states:

The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct.

8. Unprofessional conduct is conduct which breaches rules or ethical codes of a profession or conduct which is unbecoming a member in good standing of a profession. (*Shea v. Board of Medical Examiners* (1978) 81 Cal.App.3rd 564, 575.).

COST RECOVERY

9. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case, with failure of the licensee to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

DEFINITIONS

10. As used herein, the terms below will have the following meanings:

"Adderall" is a brand name for a combination medication which contains mixed amphetamine salts (the mixture is composed of equal parts racemic amphetamine and dextroamphetamine). It is generally used to treat attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, but also has a high potential for abuse. It is a Schedule II controlled substance pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (d)(1), and a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

"ADHD" means attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.

"Amphetamine" is a strong central nervous system stimulant that is used in the treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, narcolepsy, and obesity. It is also commonly used as a recreational drug. It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022. It is a Schedule II controlled substance, as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (d)(1). "Depakote" is a brand name for sodium valproate or divalproex sodium which is an anticonvulsant mood stabilizer drug that can be used to treat bipolar disorder and seizures. It can also help prevent migraine headaches. It can cause serious liver and pancreas problems, birth defects, and suicidal thoughts. It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

"Including" means including, without limitation.

"Lamotrigine" is an anticonvulsant medication used to treat seizures and bipolar disorder. It is sold under various brand names, including Lamictal XR, Lamictal ODT, Lamictal Starter (Orange) Kit. It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

"Latuda" is a brand name for lurasidone, which is an antipsychotic medication used to treat schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. It is a dangerous drug pursuant to Code section 4022.

"Luvox" is a brand name for "fluvoxamine" which is an SSRI used to treat OCD) in adults and children. It is a dangerous drug pursuant to Code section 4022.

"OCD" means obsessive-compulsive disorder.

"Prozac" is a brand name for fluoxetine, a medication used to treat depression, OCD, bulimia nervosa, and panic disorder. It is also an SSRI. It is dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

"SSRI" means selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors.

"Vyvanse" is a brand name for lisdexamfetamine, which is a stimulant used as part of a treatment program to control symptoms of ADHD (e.g., more difficulty focusing, controlling actions, and remaining still or quiet than other people who are the same age) in adults and children. It is a psychostimulant prodrug of the phenethylamine and amphetamine chemical classes. It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022.

"Wellbutrin®" is a brand name for bupropion, which is an antidepressant medication used to treat major depression and to assist with smoking cessation. It is also sold under various brand names including, Zyban, Voxra, Aplenzin and Budeprion, among others. It is a dangerous drug as defined in Code section 4022. It is alsothought to work in the brain and nerves on the chemical messengers norepinephrine and dopamine. Wellbutrin XL is used to treat major depressive disorder.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Gross Negligence)

- 11. Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234 (b) of the code in that he was grossly negligent in the care and treatment of Patient A¹. The circumstances are as follows:
- 12. On or about June 6, 2018, Patient A, a then 12 -year-old, female, presented to Respondent for a psychiatric evaluation, and for Respondent to assume the management of her psychotropic medications, which had been previously managed by another provider (Doc2). Respondent documented a psychiatric evaluation or "Clinical Assessment" which consisted of a three-page document containing primarily checked boxes. Respondent documented that Patient A was taking Vyvanse and Adderall prescribed by a different physician from Doc2

¹ For privacy reasons, the patient in this pleading is identified as Patient A. The patient's full name will be disclosed upon a timely request for discovery pursuant to Government Code section 11507.6.

26

27

28

(Doc3), and that Patient A's last physical examination was a year before this visit and conducted by a physician other than himself. Respondent documented that Patient A was a victim of abuse, specifically that she had been fondled by a friend of her mother. No contact information was documented for any of the previous physician(s) who prescribed medications to Patient A (i.e., Doc2 and Doc 3) or conducted her physical examination. Respondent's medical 'records for Patient A did not contain a documented medical history, including any cardiac history or any family medical or psychiatric history. Respondent's medical records for Patient A did not include any rating scale for ADHD, any authorization to disclose and exchange information with the most recent prescribing physician, the primary care provider, or the school, or any collateral history from outside sources. Respondent failed to adequately document Patient A's vital signs. Respondent diagnosed Patient A with ADHD, predominately inattentive presentation, Depressive Disorder not otherwise specified, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and one medical condition, chronic fatigue. However, he failed to adequately document any rationale substantiating the diagnoses. Respondent failed to obtain any outside records to substantiate these diagnoses. Respondent only documented attention/concentration problems to support his ADHD diagnosis. Additionally, Respondent only documented "hypervigilance" to support his PTSD diagnosis. Respondent's documented treatment plan was to "improve" "poor concentration difficulty" with an intervention of medications and psychotherapy, and improve depressed mood and PTSD by the same intervention. Respondent's evaluation notes for this visit concluded with a statement that the patient is "already in therapy." However, Respondent failed to document the therapist's name, contact information, release of information to speak with the therapist to obtain collateral information and coordinate care, or a stated plan to do so.

13. Between 2018, and Patient A's last visit, on or about December 16, 2022, Respondent documented fifty-three visits with Patient A. Patient A's father was present during these visits, with the exceptions of the last six to eight appointments in 2022, and one appointment on or about August 16, 2019. During the time period Respondent treated Patient A, he was responsible for Patient A's medication management. Respondent prescribed the following medications to Patient A during his course of treating Patient A: Adderall, Depakote, Latuda, Luvox, Prozac, Vyvanse,

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

27 28

26

and Wellbutrin.

- Respondent's medical records for Patient A contain lab results dated December 27. 2018. They include results from a comprehensive metabolic panel, including liver function tests and valproic acid levels.
- On or about January 30, 2019, Respondent documented that unspecified lab results for Patient A were within normal limits. This note appears to refer to the December 27, 2018 labs, which are the only lab results contained in Respondent's medical records for Patient A However, Respondent did not document the valproic acid level, which was high at 119, based on a range for seizure control, but appropriate for mania control- a symptom of bipolar disorder never elicited or documented in Respondent's medical records for Patient A.
- 16. On or about August 16, 2019, approximately one week before Patient A's fourteenth birthday, Respondent saw Patient A alone. Respondent documented that Patient A came to the visit without her father and noted that Patient A had begun to text and send sexual pictures of herself to strangers.
 - On or about June 21, 2019, Respondent increased Patient A's dose of Depakote.
- 18. On or about September 13, 2019, Respondent discontinued Patient A's Depakote, due to weight gain, which Respondent indicated was a known adverse effect. Respondent initiated a trial of lamotrigine at an appropriate initial dose of 25mg/day for four weeks. However, Respondent prescribed 120 tablets, instead of 30 tablets, which indicates an abrupt increase in titration from 25mg to 200mg/day.
- On or about October 11, 2019, Respondent increased Patient A's lamotrigine dose 19. further to 300mg/day.
- 20. On or about October 28, 2022, Patient A presented to Respondent alone; she was not accompanied by an adult. At this visit, Patient A was still a minor. Respondent documented the following at that visit: Patient A was very upset with her diagnosis of bipolar disorder, but her mood and affect was appropriate; Patient A's condition was stable; and Patient A's treatment plan included Latuda 20mg at bedtime, and Vyvanse 36mg in the morning. Respondent failed to document any history for Patient A at this visit. Subsequently, Patient A reported to third parties

that during this visit, Respondent asked her if she had ever given a blow job or knew what an orgasm felt like. Patient A also alleged that Respondent asked her if she found him attractive.

- 21. On or about October 28, and November 4, 2022, Respondent prescribed Latuda to Patient A.
- 22. On or about August 25, 2023, as part of the investigation into the care and treatment Respondent provided to Patient A, Respondent was interviewed by Board representatives. During this interview, Respondent explained that Patient A's ADHD was diagnosed by "some other psychologist, I'm assuming." Respondent further reported that according to her father, Patient A was diagnosed at school, and that Respondent relied upon this reported diagnosis and continued her medication. Respondent determined that Patient A looked sluggish and therefore identified Patient A as having chronic fatigue. During Respondent's interview, he also reported that he did not provide psychotherapy to Patient A.
- 23. Respondent committed the following instances of gross negligence in the care and treatment of Patient A in that Respondent:
 - A. Completed a psychiatric evaluation of Patient A without taking and/or documenting, an adequate history, or making any attempt to obtain collateral information, including medical records from her previous providers;
 - B. Made psychiatric diagnoses without adequately substantiating them, including with criteria outlined in the DSM-5, and based the diagnoses solely on Patient A's appearance on a single visit;
 - C. Failed to adequately obtain and/or document, an informed consent for the prescribing of any psychotropic medications to Patient A;
 - D. Prescribed the psychostimulant medications, including Vyvanse and Adderall, to
 Patient A without obtaining any history or objective evidence to ensure Patient A could
 safely take the medications;
 - E. Prescribed antipsychotic medications, including Latuda, to Patient A without following consensus guidelines for safe initiation and monitoring for adverse effects;
 - F. Rapidly increased Patient A's lamotrigine, which increases the risk of inducing life-

threatening Stevens-Johnson Syndrome, and failed to obtain informed consent for this increase in dosage.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 24. Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234 (c) of the code, in that Respondent was repeatedly negligent in the care and treatment of Patient A. The circumstances are as follows:
- 25. The facts and allegations set forth in the First Cause for Discipline are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
- 26. The standard of care applicable to the initiation of psychiatric services with Patient A begins with a psychiatric evaluation that may take place over several appointments and a sufficient, yet appropriate, period of time. The purpose of the psychiatric evaluation is to make a working diagnosis of the patient, formulate the case, and develop a recommended treatment plan to be discussed with the patient and agreed to by the patient. Diagnoses may be added or discontinued over the course of treatment with adequate formulation and explanation reviewed with the patient and documented in the medical record. Respondent committed negligence when he failed to perform and/or document a substantive formulation in connection with his psychiatric evaluation for Patient A.
- 27. Respondent committed negligence when he documented a treatment plan for Patient A on or about June 6, 2018 that included psychotherapy, but subsequently failed to provide psychotherapy to Patient A or coordinate a treatment plan with a concurrent treating psychotherapist.
- 28. Respondent committed negligence when he failed to obtain and/or document, a developmentally-appropriate medical, personal, and social sexual history for Patient A relevant to the diagnosis, formulation, and treatment planning, including psychotropic medication while including only a trauma/sexual abuse history for Patient A.
- 29. Respondent also negligently failed to adequately document an elicited menstrual history from Patient A when prescribing psychotropic medications that could adversely affect a

2.7

pregnancy.

30. Respondent's acts and/or omissions constitute repeated negligent acts under the Code, and therefore subject Respondent's medical license to discipline.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Maintain Adequate and Accurate Records)

- 31. Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under section 2266 of the code in that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records related to the care and treatment of Patient A. The circumstances are as follows:
- 32. The facts and allegations set forth in the First and Second Causes for Discipline are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.

DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS

33. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D., Complainant alleges that on or about May 17, 2019, in a prior disciplinary action titled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D.* before the Medical Board of California, in Case Number 800-2016-027559, Respondent's license was revoked, revocation stayed, and placed on probation for three years, with various terms and conditions for the below standard of care treatment he rendered to two patients in regards to the prescribing of medications. That decision is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 38124, issued to Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;
- 3. Ordering Respondent J. Eduardo Guzman, M.D., to pay the Board the costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of probation

		·
1	monitoring; and	
2	4. Taking such other and further a	ction as deemed necessary and proper.
3		
4		
5	DATED: <u>DEC 0 6 2024</u>	REJI VARGHESE
6		Executive Director Medical Board of California
7	,	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
8		Complainant
9	LA2024603697 Accusation - Medical Board.docx	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21	·	
22	-	
23	· .	
24		•
25	·	
26		,
27		
28		