BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR THE HEALING ARTS STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR THE HEALING ARTS,)	
Petitioner,)	
V.) Case No.:	2023-000683 2024-000436
WILLIAM J. MACK, M.D.,)	2024-003747
Respondent.)	

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

The Missouri State Board of Registration for the Healing Arts ("Board"), in accordance with the law, and pursuant to properly served notice, took up this matter against Dr. William J. Mack, M.D. ("Respondent"), at its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, January 16, 2025, via WebEx and at the Special Olympics Training Center, 305 Special Olympics Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65101, for the purposes of determining whether Respondent's physician and surgeon license is subject to discipline pursuant to sections 334.100.2(8) and 334.102.7(1)(b), RSMo.1

The members of the Board present for the hearing constituted a quorum under the law; only those members of the Board, who were present, participated in the hearing, the deliberations, and any votes concerning this matter. The Board was represented by Adam Grayson, Contract Counsel. David A. Dykas, General Counsel, served as the Board's legal advisor in this proceeding. Respondent was present at the hearing and was not represented by legal counsel.

During the hearing, the Board admitted into the record the Complaint and took official notice of the statutes and regulations referenced therein. The following exhibits were offered by Petitioner: Exhibit 1, Affidavit of Kayci Hollingsworth, demonstrating the licensure status and last

¹ All references to Missouri statutes are to the Revised Statutes of Missouri (RSMo) (Cum. Supp. 2020), unless otherwise stated.

known addresses of the Respondent; Exhibit 2, Records from the Board of Healing Arts for the State of Kansas showing discipline imposed against the Respondent's license; Exhibit 3, Certified Records from State of Washington Department of Health showing discipline imposed by the Washington medical Commission on the Respondent's medical license; Exhibit 4, Notice of Intent to Use Business Records Pursuant to Affidavit with attached Business Records Affidavit with fifty-seven (57) pages of business records from the Board, with a certificate of service showing the records were mailed to the Respondent on December 31, 2024. The Respondent objected to the Board receiving and admitting each exhibit arguing that the exhibits were based upon the decisions of the Kansas and Washington Boards, which were under appeal, and therefore the use of such exhibits was "legally unethical." The Petitioner argued the affidavits were provided to the Respondent more than seven days prior, and were admissible under chapter 536, RSMo. The Respondent's objections to exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 were overruled; the exhibits were received and admitted into evidence.

In reaching the decision stated in this Order, each member of the Board present at the hearing read and considered the Complaint filed on December 6, 2024. The Complaint alleged Respondent's license is subject to discipline pursuant to sections 334.100.2(8) and 334.102.7(1)(b) RSMo., because final disciplinary actions were taken against the Respondent's medical licenses by the states of Washington and Kansas.

The Petitioner and the Respondent were each offered the opportunity to present opening statements; present evidence through the testimony of witnesses and exhibits; to cross-examine any witnesses called to testify; and to make closing arguments. Being fully advised of the above, the Board now enters its Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disciplinary Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

 The Board is an agency of the state of Missouri created and established pursuant to section 334.120, RSMo, for the purpose of executing and enforcing the provisions of Chapter 334, RSMo.

- 2. William J. Mack, M.D. ("Respondent") is licensed by the Board as a physician and surgeon, license number 2011036813, which was first issued on November 2, 2011. On the day of the hearing, the Respondent's license was active, and was current and active at all times relevant herein.
- 3. Respondent was licensed by the Kansas State Board of Healing Arts ("Kansas Board") as a physician and surgeon. Respondent's Kansas license was issued January 19, 2012, and suspended on January 8, 2024.
- 4. On or about January 8, 2024, the Kansas Board of Healing Arts ("Kansas Board") entered a Summary Order, which on January 30, 2024, became effective as a Final Order ("Kansas Order") indefinitely suspending Respondent's Kansas medical license.
- 5. The Kansas Order was based on Respondent's failure to comply with a prior order issued by the Kansas Board for the Respondent to submit to and complete a full fitness to practice evaluation in order for the Kansas Board to determine whether Respondent is able to practice medicine with reasonable skill and safety.
- 6. On August 16, 2023, the Kansas Board issued an Order Compelling Evaluation mandating the Respondent to submit to and complete a full fitness to practice evaluation no later than September 8, 2023.
- 7. The Order Compelling Evaluation was entered after a hearing held on August 11, 2023, during which the Respondent appeared pro se; the Kansas Board determined "A specialized, objective professional full fitness to practice evaluation is required to determine what, if any... may or may not affect [the Respondent's] ability to safely practice."
- 8. In the Order Compelling Evaluation, the Kansas Board found by reasonable suspicion the need to require the Respondent to undergo a full fitness to practice evaluation; and that a failure to comply would subject the Respondent's license to being temporarily or permanently revoked, suspended, or limited.

- 9. In its Order Compelling Evaluation, the Kansas Board accepted the assertions in the Motion to Compel, which included the Respondent being cited for five violations in the City of Leawood Municipal Court for the following: Improper driving on laned road; Vehicle Liability Insurance Liability Coverage Required; Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs misdemeanor; Possession of Marijuana; and Use/Possession with intent to use drug paraphernalia into human body.
- 10. On or about August 28, 2023, the Respondent filed a Petition for Reconsideration requesting the Kansas Board reconsider the Order Compelling Evaluation; on September 5, 2023, the Kansas Board denied the Respondent's Petition.
- 11. On or about September 13, 2023, the Respondent filed a Petition for Judicial Review in Johnson County, Kansas, District Court; on or about November 6, 2023, Respondent's Petition for Judicial Review was dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be made.
- 12. In the Kansas Order, indefinitely suspending the Respondent's medical license, issued on January 8, 2024, and effective on January 30, 2024, the Kansas Board determined that the Respondent had failed to comply with the August 16, 2023, Order Compelling Evaluation.
- 13. The Kansas Order entered by the Kansas Board constitutes final disciplinary action taken by another state's licensing authority against Respondent's right to practice as a physician.
- 14. The Respondent was licensed as a physician in the state of Washington.
- 15. On or about August 6, 2024, the Washington Medical Commission entered an Order Suspending ("Washington Suspension Order") Respondent's Washington medical license.
- 16. The Washington Suspension Order was based on the disciplinary action taken by the Kansas Board.
- 17. The order entered by the Washington Board constitutes final disciplinary action taken by another state's licensing authority against Respondent's right to practice as a physician.
- 18. In his testimony before the Board, the Respondent testified to the following:

- a. The actions by the Kansas and Washington medical boards were the first incidents of public discipline against his license.
- b. He has appealed the decisions of the Kansas and Washington medical boards; in Kansas, the appellate case is awaiting transcripts; and in Washington, he has requested a judicial review.
- c. The Respondent did not bring documentation as to either appeal; he is unsure of the case number of either case but does know the internal case number for the Washington case.
- d. The Respondent obtained a Missouri license as his residence was near to Missouri.
- e. He has previously practiced at the VA facilities in Topeka and Leavenworth in the field of psychiatry.
- f. The Respondent last saw patients and refilled medication about a week before the January 8, 2024, Kansas Final Order, which suspended his license.
- g. At this time, he is not actively seeing patients, although he does have a private practice in Leawood, Kansas which he has maintained for twelve years.
- h. As he is not currently practicing medicine, the Respondent has been working building a recording studio; music and singing has been avocation of the Respondent's for some time, and the Respondent indicated a desire for his medical career to be financially supportive of a musical career.
- i. As mentioned in the Kansas Board's disciplinary case, the Respondent had been stopped while driving by law enforcement; the Respondent indicated the stop was not legal in that he did not cross over the line; although he did submit to a breathalyzer which was over the legal limit of .08, the Respondent asserts that impairment is subjective. A vape was found in the car, but the Respondent reports that it was not his. The Respondent reports that he should have appealed the conviction, but his lawyer talked him out of it, and he was placed on probation.

- j. Regarding the Kansas Board's determination and order for the Respondent to have a fit to practice evaluation; the Respondent contests the need for such an evaluation as ordered by the Kanas Board; and indicated that it was unethical.
- k. The Respondent has not taken the evaluation as ordered by the Kansas Board. He has previously taken internal peer evaluations as part of prior jobs, which the Respondent feels should be "proof enough."
- I. When asked if the Kansas Board ever asked him to enter a physician wellness program or a drug monitoring program, the Respondent stated: "I think that's what they wanted, but it's not required because I don't have a drug problem." As to an evaluation, the Respondent indicated: "That's what they're wanting to force because then they want to slap a diagnosis on me that's not valid. I don't have a problem."
- m. The Respondent indicated that the criminal court as part of the DUI probation had him evaluated both at the beginning and the end of the probation, which indicated that he did not have a psychiatric or substance abuse diagnosis. He showed those reports to the Kansas Board, which he thought would be the end of it. The Respondent did not bring those reports or evaluations with him.
- 19. The actions taken by the Kansas Board and the Washington Board against the Respondent's right to practice his profession as physician in those states are cause to initiate a hearing and discipline Respondent's license pursuant to section 334.102.7(1)(b) and 334.100.2(8), RSMo.
- 20. The Board finds the discipline imposed is necessary to protect the public.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 21. The Board has jurisdiction to conduct a disciplinary hearing against Respondent pursuant to section 334.102.7(1), RSMo, which states:
 - 334.102.7(1) The board may initiate a hearing before the board for discipline of any licensee's license or certificate upon receipt of one of the following:

* * * * *

(b) Evidence of final disciplinary action against the licensee's license.

certification or registration issued by any other state, by any other agency or entity of this state or any other state or the United States or its territories, or any other country;

* * * *

(2) The board shall provide the licensee not less than ten days notice of any hearing held pursuant to chapter 536.

* * * * *

(3) Upon a finding that cause exists to discipline a licensee's license the board may impose any discipline otherwise available when disciplining licensees of that same profession.

* * * *

22. The Board has cause to impose discipline on Respondent's physician and surgeon's license pursuant to section 334.100.2(8), RSMo, which states:

334.100.2(8) Revocation, suspension, restriction, modification, limitation, reprimand, warning, censure, probation or other final disciplinary action against the holder of or applicant for a license or other right to practice any profession regulated by this chapter by another state, territory, federal agency or country, whether or not voluntarily agreed to by the licensee or applicant, including, but not limited to, the denial of licensure, surrender of the license, allowing the license to expire or lapse, or discontinuing or limiting the practice of medicine while subject to an investigation or while actually under investigation by any licensing authority, medical facility, branch of the Armed Forces of the United States of America, insurance company, court, agency of the state or federal government, or employer;

* * * * *

23. Upon the Board's finding that cause exists to discipline the Respondent's license, the Board considered the authorized disciplines for a physician and surgeon as found in section 334.100.4 RSMo., which states as follows:

After the filing of such complaint before the administrative hearing commission, the proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of chapter 621. Upon a finding by the administrative hearing commission that the grounds, provided in subsection 2 of this section, for disciplinary action are met, the board may, singly or in combination, warn, censure or place the person named in the complaint on probation on such terms and conditions as the board deems appropriate for a period not to exceed ten years, or may suspend the person's license, certificate or permit for a period not to exceed three years, or restrict or limit the person's license, certificate or permit for an indefinite period of time, or revoke the person's license, certificate, or permit, or administer a public or private reprimand, or deny the person's application for a license, or permanently withhold issuance of a license or require the person to submit to the care, counseling or treatment of physicians designated by the board at the expense of the individual

to be examined, or require the person to attend such continuing educational courses and pass such examinations as the board may direct.

* * * * *

24. In its deliberations regarding the period of time that the Respondent may not apply for reinstatement, the Board considered section 334.100.5 RSMo., which states:

334.100.5 In any order of revocation, the board may provide that the person may not apply for reinstatement of the person's license for a period of time ranging from two to seven years following the date of the order of revocation. All stay orders shall toll this time period.

ORDER OF REVOCATION

- 25. Upon the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, it is the ORDER of the Missouri State Board of Registration for the Healing Arts that the physician license issued to Respondent, William J. Mack, M.D., number 2011036813, is hereby **REVOKED**.
- 26. Respondent shall immediately cease practicing in the state of Missouri; and within fifteen (15) days of the effective date of this Order, he shall return his pocket card and license to the Board.
- 27. If Respondent is licensed in other jurisdictions, he shall forward written notice of this disciplinary action to the licensing authorities of those jurisdictions within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Order. Respondent shall submit a copy of the written notice to the Board contemporaneously with sending it to the relevant licensing authority. If Respondent is not licensed in other jurisdictions, he shall notify the Board of that fact, in writing, within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.
- 28. Respondent shall, within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Order, forward written notice of this disciplinary action to all employers, hospitals, nursing homes, out-patient centers, clinics and any other facility where Respondent practices or has privileges. Respondent shall, contemporaneously with the giving of such notice, submit a copy of the notice to the Board for verification by the Board or its designated representative. If Respondent does not have an employer, staff privileges or practice at any facility, he shall notify the Board of that fact, in writing, within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

29. Respondent shall, within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Order, forward written

notice of this disciplinary action to any allied health care professionals that supervises

Respondent. Respondent shall, contemporaneously with the giving of such notice, submit a

copy of the notice to the Board for verification by the Board or its designated representative.

If Respondent does not supervise any allied health professionals, he shall notify the Board of

that fact, in writing, within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

30. For purposes of this Order and unless otherwise specified herein, all reports, documentation,

evaluations, notices or other materials that Respondent is required to submit to the Board

shall be forwarded to the Missouri State Board of Registration for the Healing Arts, Attention:

Enforcement, P.O. Box 4, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

31. Respondent is advised that his compliance with the terms of this Order and the discharge of

his professional obligation to transfer his patients' care and records to other providers will be

assessed by the Board for compliance with section 324.042, RSMo.

32. This document shall be maintained by the Board as an open and public record as provided in

Chapters 324, 334 and 610, RSMo, and the Board will report this action to the National

Practitioner Data Bank and the Federation of State Medical Boards.

SO ORDERED, EFFECTIVE THIS 24 TDAY OF FCBNUMY, 2025.

James Leggett, Executive Director

Missouri State Board of Registration for the Healing Arts